

## Planning Committee

Auditorium, Shetland Museum and Archives, Hay's Dock, Lerwick

Tuesday 1 November 2016 at 2pm

### Present:

F Robertson	M Bell
P Campbell	B Fox
D Sandison	G Robinson

### Apologies:

S Coutts	A Manson
----------	----------

### In Attendance (Officers):

J Riise, Executive Manager – Governance and Law  
J Holden, Team Leader – Development Management  
J Barclay Smith, Planning Officer – Development Control  
C Gair, Traffic and Road Safety Engineer  
A Melkevik, Planning Officer  
P Sutherland, Solicitor  
L Adamson, Committee Officer

### Chair

Mr F Robertson, Chair of the Planning Committee, presided.

### Circular

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

### Declarations of Interest

None

### 17/16 Minutes

The Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2016 on the motion of Mr Sandison, seconded by Mr Fox.

**Local Review under Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) to be considered by the Planning Committee sitting as Local Review Body:**

### 18/16 Local Review Ref: 2015/445/PPF – LR24 - To construct dwelling house and access: East of Floodens, Laxo, Vidlin, Shetland, ZE2 9QD

The Committee considered a report by the Team Leader – Development Management [RECORD Appendix 1] for a decision following a Local Review.

The Chair explained that under the Planning Act 2006, the right for appeals to the Scottish Government was removed and in its place arrangements were made for Local Authorities to set up their own Local Review Body (LRB). Members of the Planning Committee received training to handle local reviews and powers

were delegated to officers to assess and determine applications against Council Policies.

The Chair advised that the process takes the form of a Hearing, where the objector and applicant/agent are given an opportunity to address the meeting and are allocated 5 minutes to make their representation. The Members of the LRB then have the opportunity to ask questions of the objector/applicant regarding matters of detail. Following which, the LRB would come to a determination based on established Policies and strategic requirements, where the decision of the LRB is full and final. An aggrieved appellant would have the opportunity, if they so wish, to take the matter up with the local Procurator Fiscal at the Sheriff Court, on matters of handing.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce to the LRB the planning application as submitted and determined.

The Planning Officer (A Melkevik) gave a slide presentation, which illustrated the following:

- Site and location plan
- Floor plan and elevations of dwelling house
- Photo - the site with the proposed access just off to the left.
- Photo - the view from the centre of the proposed access looking west.
- Photo - the two posts the applicant set out showing the available visibility splay at 148m and the required visibility splay at 160m.

During her presentation, the Planning Officer advised on the following: "The dwelling house proposed is a single storey property with two bedrooms. The external finishes proposed are grey concrete interlocking tiles for the roof and light grey horizontal timber weatherboarding for the external walls.

When the application was submitted the Roads Service were consulted as standard. The initial consultation from the Roads Service requested a number of amendments to be made including, the visibility splays to be shown, the access to be offset from the existing access by 20m, the passing place to the north to be removed and the road widened and also for level or design details to be provided. Revised plans were submitted, the Roads Service were consulted again, and their comments stated that the visibility splays shown were incorrect.

Further revised drawings were submitted as well as an amendment to the site boundary to include all development. The applicant had correspondence with the Roads Service directly with regard to the fact that a visibility splay of 148m is achievable but 160m visibility is the minimum required. The Planning Service was copied into the final email recommending refusal on the basis that the minimum required visibility splay could not be achieved and any shortfall would be unacceptable on road safety grounds.

The Key Issues slide, which formed part of the presentation, is set out below:

- Initial consultation requested: visibility splays to be shown, junction be offset by 20m, passing place to the north removed and road widened and level or design details to be provided.
- Revised plans were submitted and consultation response commented that: visibility splay lines were incorrectly drawn.

- Revised plans were submitted as well as an amendment to the site boundary to include all development. The applicant had correspondence with the Roads Service regarding the fact that 148m visibility splay was found to be achievable but 160m was required. The Roads Service states that any shortfall is unacceptable on road safety grounds.”

The Planning Officer concluded by advising that the application does not comply with the Shetland Local Development Plan (2014) policy TRANS3 which states that all development should provide a safe and adequate access, visibility splay and turning area, and for that reason the application was refused.

The Chair thanked the Planning Officer for the information provided.

The Chair advised that in this case, as there are no objectors to the proposed development, he would invite the appellant to address the meeting at this point.

Mr N Hay, the applicant, advised on the proposed development being to provide a 2 bed chalet for tourist accommodation, to be built on land that belongs to his in-laws, who own the croft. He said that the process was underway to hand over the croft to his wife. The land, he said, is not of the best quality, so that is a reason they have decided to build a chalet on the land. Mr Hay said that he is a mechanical technician at Sullom Voe; he referred to recent redundancies at Sullom Voe, and said that his job could be at risk. He said that the proposed chalet would provide income to his family if that were to happen. Mr Hay commented that in terms of economic development the proposal would improve the standard of living, and encourage people into the community and to Shetland.

Mr Hay advised from the pre-application discussion on site with the Roads Engineer, that two recommendations were made for the access point. The decision had been made to put in a service lay-by, which would affect their access and that of the neighbours. Mr Hay went on to say that one week later they received an e-mail from the Roads Service with recommendations to remove a brow to the East of the access and set back the fence to improve the visibility splay to 160m. Their agent then drew up plans for the access and chalet and these were submitted. They were then advised that their application was refused as the visibility splay to the West could not be achieved – he said that the Roads Service had gone back on their word as this had not been mentioned before. Mr Hay reported that they were then told that the visibility splay is measured 2.5m from the edge of the service lay-by, and that the shed to the West would need to be knocked down and rebuilt. He said that the cost for this was silly, so plans had stopped there.

Mr Hay advised that the alternative access proposed on the first site visit by the Roads Engineer was to use the existing access to Tha and Horn, but that was not an option as they have a limited budget. He said that the road from the existing access to the house site would be over 115m long and the last 20m is boggy ground, which would require a lot of digging out. Mr Hay advised that a contractor had estimated a cost of £6,000 to create the access road, which they cannot do on their tight budget. Mr Hay stated that this was the reason they had gone for the first proposal to put in a service lay-by.

In referring to the proposed new access point that had formed part of the presentation, Mr Hay said that plans had been drawn up again, which the Planning Service accepted, but the Roads Service refused as the visibility splay could not be achieved.

Mr Hay said that by removing the brow on the left of the road and setting the fence back would achieve 148m visibility splay, which he acknowledged was short of the 160m. He said that Members should bear in mind the planning gain by the Roads Service that to remove the brow and set back the fence would make the road safer for all road users. Mr Hay said that he accepted there were Visibility Splay guidelines to be followed, but he said that they were just guidelines.

Mr Hay referred to the site visit yesterday, where markers had been set out to show the visibility splay of 148m. He said that the shortfall of 12m is minimal, and that he could not see any safety impact on road users.

Mr Hay advised that the Community Council have had no issues with their proposals; the neighbours have no concerns, nor did the general public when the application was advertised in the Shetland Times. The only representation has been from the Roads Service who based their objection on guidance only.

Mr Hay asked Members to consider the points he has raised and he thanked them for the opportunity to address the meeting.

The Chair thanked Mr Hay for the information provided, and invited Members to ask any questions.

In referring to stopping distances for the UK Driving Test, Mr Robinson advised that when travelling at 60mph, the thinking distance is 18m and the braking distance is 55m, giving a total of 73m. He said that even with that distance being doubled, it would still be 2m short of the 148m visibility splay proposed. In that regard, Mr Robinson questioned why the visibility splay guidance of 160m is so much longer than the stopping distance pertaining to the speed limit in the area. The Traffic and Road Safety Engineer advised that the visibility splay requirements come from long-standing national guidance, which when reviewed had not been changed. He explained that a stopping distance has to take a number of additional factors into consideration, including different types of vehicles, the weather condition and to allow time for manoeuvring, and similarly different factors have to be taken into account when setting the minimum visibility splay distances.

A request was made for advice on the legal position on the Council, should the LRB not impose the 160m visibility splay and uphold the appeal, should there be a road traffic accident in the future. The Solicitor said that he did not consider there would be any legal comeback on the Council, or on individual Members, for any responsibility in respect of a particular accident on that basis. He said also that as the visibility splay distances are guidelines, presumably other matters can be taken into account in deciding to oppose that exact figure.

Reference was made to the pre-application guidance given by the Roads Service, where Mr Sandison sought clarity on whether the applicant's agent had provided the applicant with the correct information needed to make sure the drawings submitted to the Planning Service were accurate. Mr Hay said that at the pre-application stage there was no concerns raised about the visibility splay to the West, plans were drawn up, the application was submitted and the Planning Service had no concerns. However, after receiving the representation from the Road Service new plans had to be drawn up.

Mr Ratter put a question to the Traffic and Road Safety Engineer, in terms of why the shortfall in the visibility splay had not been realised during the pre-application discussion between the applicant and the Roads Engineer. The Traffic and Road Safety Engineer advised that pre-planning application advice is provided by the Roads Service on an unofficial basis, and at no cost to the applicant. In this case, the advice given was to use the existing access and share the side road. However this was not possible due to a land ownership issue. A suggestion was then made to create a service lay-by between the two access points, as this is an approach that has been used before in similar circumstances, and was offered to the applicant as a solution. In this scenario the visibility splay was from a point that measured 2.5m back from the existing road edge and the shed was not included in the visibility splay.

The Traffic and Road Safety Engineer advised that when the applicant submitted his plan, it had not been possible to get the accesses close together, and they were some 20m apart and created a lay-by that was larger than the standard size for passing places on roads. The applicant was then advised that he could maintain that arrangement if the existing passing place on the opposite side was removed, to be replaced by the new lay-by incorporating the two accesses. However, with that arrangement the point from which the visibility splay is measured moves back from the existing road edge as the new road edge is the rear of the passing place. This brought the shed into the equation as it was now within the visibility splay. The Traffic and Road Safety Engineer advised that as the shed had not been shown on the draft plans submitted by the applicant for comment prior to lodging a planning application this point was not identified at that time.

The Traffic and Road Safety Engineer questioned whether the agent to the applicant had measured the visibility splay at the site. The application had stated that the required 160m visibility splay was available, but that was clearly not the case. The Traffic and Road Safety Engineer confirmed that a visibility splay of 160m cannot be achieved at any point along the stretch of road.

In response to a question, the Traffic and Road Safety Engineer advised that the access road through the side road was the preferred option and would be an achievable access point. He said that the distance from the chalet would be approximately 100m and that the ground was boggy and wet.

In response to a question from the Chair, Mr Hay advised that the access point as illustrated to Members at the site visit yesterday, was their preferred option, but it was 12m short on the visibility splay.

The Chair referred to pre-application discussions, where advice is given to applicants, however he said that until drawings are submitted it can be difficult to determine a site line and how the proposals will work. The Chair stated that he supported the Traffic and Road Safety Engineer in that respect, and in particular if the agent was not clear on details it can get more difficult to determine what site line would be achievable. The Chair referred to his attendance at the site visit yesterday, where the visibility splay had been paced out, so he confirmed he was aware of the current proposals.

During debate, Mr Robinson said he had some sympathy with the Roads Engineer, but also with the applicant. He said however that there is a need to remember that the Roads Engineer can only provide advice as far as they have been given delegation. Mr Robinson said that there is a sufficiently large visibility splay, where

he referred again to the UK driving test stopping distance of 73m and to the legal advice given. He said that any accident would be the responsibility of the driver, rather than on the Local Review Body for approving the application. Mr Robinson said he was also aware of junctions in Shetland with shorter visibility splays, and that in this case the visibility splay of 148m, although 6m short on each side, is still within the stopping distance in the Highway Code. Mr Robinson moved that the application be approved and that the appeal be upheld. Mr Sandison seconded.

Mr Fox commented that he had a great deal of sympathy with applicants of tourism projects. However, he said guidelines are in place for a purpose and common sense can always be applied, but there has to be a consistent approach. Mr Fox referred to the information provided by the applicant that it would cost £6,000 to put in an access from the side road that would be acceptable. He said that £6,000 was not a great deal of money in this context and in terms of road safety. Mr Fox said that as this project is for tourist accommodation, people renting the chalet would be unfamiliar with the road, and that this can be a particularly fast stretch of road. Mr Fox said that he had witnessed a lot of traffic, and different types of vehicles on the road during the site visit. He said that given this is a route to the Vidlin ferry terminal and people may be late for the ferry and driving fast along the road, that all adds to the road safety case. Mr Fox said that he was very sympathetic to the applicant, but that in terms of road safety the access needs to be taken from the side road. Mr Fox moved as an amendment, to accept the recommendation of the Planning Service in this case, to refuse permission. Mr Campbell seconded.

The Chair referred to the comments made by Mr Fox, for the access to be gained from the side road. It was confirmed however, on the need for a separate planning application to be submitted, and the Local Review Board is to either grant or refuse the application as presented.

Following summing up, voting took place by a show of hands and the result was as follows:

Amendment (Mr Fox) 3  
Motion (Mr Robinson) 3

The Chair used his casting vote in favour of the amendment. The amendment therefore was the decision of the Local Review Board.

### **Decision:**

The Local Review Body agreed to uphold the decision made to **REFUSE** planning permission for the development.

19/16 **Shetland Islands Council 45 St. Olaf Street, Lerwick (2<sup>nd</sup> Modification of Planning Permission 2011/114/PCD) Order 2016; and Shetland Islands Council 45 St. Olaf Street, Lerwick (2<sup>nd</sup> Modification of Planning Permission 2013/070/PPF) Order 2016**

The Committee considered a report by the Team Leader – Development Management [RECORD Appendix 2 PL-11-16-F].

In introducing the report, the Chair referred to Section 2.1, where he outlined to Members the decision required, “that the Committee is asked to decide whether to make the new modification orders and authorise officers to submit the orders to the

Scottish Ministers for confirmation in accordance with the procedures that are set down in the 1997 Planning Act.”

The Team Leader – Development Management gave a slide presentation, which included a Location and Site Plan, a Site Plan, floor plans and elevation drawings approved by the two planning permissions the report concerned, and a number of photographs of the property at No. 45 St. Olaf Street.

During the presentation, the Team Leader advised on the following: “This report concerns the Planning Authority’s exercise of the power to make an Order to revoke or modify planning permission. Planning Permission 2011/114/PPF is for development described as: “Extension and alteration to convert garage to bedroom: 45 St. Olaf Street, Lerwick”, and was granted on 21 July 2011. On 23 July 2013, as part of a response to a complaint received about the Planning Authority’s handling of planning application Refs. 2011/114/PCD and 2013/070/PPF, it was acknowledged to the complainant that there had been mistakes made in the handling and assessment of the 2011 application insofar as no evidence could be found to confirm that the complainant had been neighbour notified, and also there had been no regard had to the introduction of a proposed window into the south facing gable end of the existing dwelling at 45 St. Olaf Street, Lerwick. That said, the matter of the same window proposed for the south facing gable end of the existing dwelling at 45 St. Olaf Street was separately considered with regard being had to the full provisions of the development plan in the Planning Authority’s determination of a subsequent planning application Ref. 2013/070/PPF for development described as: “Extend dwelling house ...” was granted on 30 April 2013. The Team Leader confirmed to the Committee as part of the slide presentation what the floor plans and elevation drawings approved under each permission showed was development approved to take place, and also how it had been presented on submission. The Team Leader went on, using photographs of the property at No. 45 in the slide presentation at the same, to advise: “It is evidenced by the Report of Handling for the 2013 application that overlooking from the proposed south facing windows was the main issue of concern regarding the development it concerned. It was determined that the development proposed could be made to accord with the provisions of the Development plan through the imposition of a condition that had the effect of not allowing work to begin until details of an alternative window design or of opaque glass to be used in the glazing of the proposed south facing windows had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

In the July 2013 response to the complaint it was confirmed that advice would be sought on the matter of the Planning Authority exercising powers available under section 65 of the 1997 Planning Act relating to the revocation or modification of Planning Permission 2011/114/PCD as the appropriate means of remedy.

In September 2014, the applicant for the proposed developments granted made a submission of details pursuant to condition 3 of the 2013 permission, but these concerned only the proposed south facing window set in the sunroom extension. During the assessment of the submission the opportunity was taken to check the status of the other permissions that had been granted for the site, including the 2011 permission, it was concluded that development under the 2011 permission had in fact commenced.

During the assessment of the submission of details that had been made pursuant to condition 3 of the 2013 permission, examination of the wording to the condition

found that it did not ensure that the privacy and amenity of the adjacent property is protected in the future, beyond the date of the initial installation of the windows. It was therefore identified that as well as the 2011 permission having been confirmed as needing to be modified to remedy the mistakes made in the handling and assessment of the 2011 application, so to now should be the 2013 permission to require that the windows proposed remain to accord with the details approved under its condition 3 for the lifetime of the development.

In September 2015, the applicant for the proposed developments made a submission of the remaining details pursuant to condition 3 of the 2013 permission, the alternative details for the proposed window to be installed in the south facing gable end of the existing dwelling at 45 St Olaf Street. On 23 December 2015, in accordance with the Planning Scheme of Delegations, details were confirmed as being approved and the condition 3 of the 2013 permission fully discharged.

In the handling of the submission for the window in the south facing gable end of the existing dwelling at 45 St. Olaf Street it was determined that overlooking of the window of the adjacent property at 43 St. Olaf Street from the proposed additional window to be installed in the gable end of the existing dwelling would be addressed by the installation of a top hung window having obscure glazing (using glass called satin). The Team Leader added at this point that the glass sample that the applicant had provided as part of the submission had come from Garriock Brothers Building Centre.

The Team Leader went on to advise that, “on 20 January 2016, in accordance with the Planning Scheme of Delegations, the 2011/114/PCD Order, as made authorised the modification of Planning Permission 2011/114/PCD, whilst the 2013/070/PPF Order, as made authorised the modification of Planning Permission 2013/070/PPF.

The 2011/114/PCD Order requires the proposed window in the south gable end of the existing dwelling at 45 St. Olaf Street to be installed in accordance with the details approved under condition 3 of the 2013 permission, and for the said window to thereafter remain to accord with the approved details for the lifetime of the development approved by the 2011 permission.

The 2013/070/PPF Order requires the proposed windows on the south facing elevation of the proposed extension to 45 St. Olaf Street, and the proposed window in the south gable end of the existing dwelling at the same address, installed in accordance with the details approved under condition 3 of the 2013 permission, to thereafter remain to accord with the approved details for the lifetime of the development approved by the 2013 permission”.

The Team Leader further advised, and in so doing informed the Committee of a correction that was needed to the published report, that “the stated reason for making both modification orders of 20 January 2016 was: *The modification to this planning permission is necessary to enable development to be carried out in a manner that ensures that overlooking does not occur and to protect the privacy and amenity of the adjacent property in compliance with Shetland Local Development Plan (2014) policies GP2 and GP3.*

Policy GP2 of the Shetland Local Development Plan (2014) (SLDP) which concerns itself with the general requirements for all developments requires that, amongst other matters, development should not have a significant adverse effect on existing



uses, nor should it compromise acceptable health and safety standards or levels. Policy GP3 of the SLDP which relates to layout and design of all development states that all new development should be sited and designed to respect the character and local distinctiveness of the site and its surroundings. The policy goes on to state that proposed development should make a positive contribution to: maintaining identity and character; ensuring a safe and pleasant space; ensuring ease of movement and access for all; a sense of welcome; long term adaptability; and good use of resources.

In accordance with the procedures that are set down in the 1997 Planning Act, notice of the making of the Orders was given. One 'notice of opposition' dated 9 February 2016 i.e. an objection, was received from a party at the next door property, 43 St. Olaf Street, to both modification Orders made on 20 January 2016. In response to a request, a meeting was held with the objector and Councillor Wills on 17 March 2016, at the objector's property. There was at this meeting the inconsistency identified within the details shown on the drawing approved under condition 3 of the 2013 permission in respect of the gable end window. This is between the annotation to the "Detail through window Scale 1:20" which states "New double glazed hardwood top hung fully reversible window", and the notation shown for the same window on the "Side Elevation as proposed Scale 1:100". Subsequent to the meeting the inconsistency was queried and the applicant has confirmed that he is content that there is no requirement for the window to be reversible under Building Standards and that the gable end window as a consequence will not be fully reversible.

On 29 March 2016 a visit to 45 St. Olaf Street was made by the Planning Enforcement Officer. Drill holes had been made through the external wall from the bedroom, which was a difference from when Officers viewed the gable end from the objector's property on 17 March 2016. On 24 April 2016 the objector sent information to the Planning Authority that external drilling commenced on 22 April 2016, and on 25 April 2016 the applicant provided information relating to the work to start the window, and in doing so advised this applied to the 2013 permission. There was therefore evidence that development authorised by Planning Permission 2013/070/PPF had commenced. In the context of the development of the sunroom extension granted, the new gable end window is required for natural light, ventilation, and means of escape, since the sunroom extension also at upper floor level entails the blocking of the existing west facing window of the same room.

Historically the Council has sought with new development to safeguard amenity by using window to window distance standards, with what are considered to be acceptable distances (18 metres in urban areas and 25 metres in rural areas) able to be reduced depending on the angle of view between habitable rooms in neighbouring dwellings or the design of the windows being such as to allow privacy to be maintained. It has also identified that the distance of 18 metres may not be possible in densely built areas".

The Key Issues slide, which formed part of the Team Leader's slide presentation, was as set out below:

- *Mistakes were made in the handling and assessment of 2011/114/PCD.*
- *Overlooking from the south facing windows proposed to 45 St. Olaf Street was the main issue of concern when 2013/070/PPF was determined, and conditions were imposed to enable the development proposed to accord with the development plan.*

- *Historically the Council has used window to window distances to safeguard amenity, and allowed reductions depending on angle of view and window design.*
- *The developments approved by the 2011 and 2013 permissions are regarded as having commenced.*
- *Modification Orders made on 20 January 2016 have been objected to, and an inconsistency between requirements of approved drawings has been identified.*
- *The objector to the orders made on 20 January 2016 would wish for revocation of the 2011 and 2013 permissions.*

The Recommendation slide, which also formed part of the Team Leader's slide presentation, was as follows:

*The Council makes new modification orders as are attached as Appendices 9 and 10 to the Report, to ensure that overlooking does not occur and that the privacy and amenity of the adjacent property is protected, in compliance with Shetland Local Development Plan (2014) policies GP2 and GP3.*

*In respect of the gable end window to the existing dwelling at 45 St. Olaf Street, these new orders provide for the following:*

- *The removal from the drawing approved under condition 3 of 2013/070/PPF of approval of the annotation that states it is top hung fully reversible;*
- *Installation to be carried out so it is not possible for the window to be opened greater than 30 degrees from the vertical; and*
- *That following installation the window accords with the modified approved details i.e. has obscure glass called "satin"; is not fully reversible; and is not able to be opened greater than an angle of 30 degrees from the vertical, for the lifetime of the development.*

In concluding his presentation, the Team Leader advised that, "taking into account the objection received to the modification Orders made on 20 January 2016, the presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development, the provisions of the Development Plan and material considerations, and specifically to deal with the inconsistency that has been identified with the drawing that has been approved under condition 3 of the 2013 permission in respect of the gable end window to the existing dwelling at 45 St Olaf Street, it is recommended that new modification Orders, that deal with the matters that are detailed, are made. The new modification Orders being recommended to the Planning Committee are proposed so as to enable the developments to be carried out in a manner that ensures that overlooking does not occur and to protect the privacy and amenity of the adjacent property in compliance with Shetland Local Development Plan (2014) policies GP2 and GP3".

*(In noting the reference to the glass being supplied by Garriock Brothers Building Centre, Mr Robinson declared an interest as his wife is an employee. Mr Robinson left the meeting).*

In referring to the decision required at Section 2.1 of the report, the Chair advised on the process that would be followed, where the Scottish Ministers would carry out an examination of the Orders and would come forward with a recommendation in due course. In response to a question, the Chair confirmed the procedures in place provided the opportunity for representations from the objector and applicant to be made.

Mr Fox commented on the very lengthy presentation, which he said confirms that the whole planning process became unnecessarily complicated. He referred to the miss handling of the applications as outlined during the presentation, and took some reassurance that these have been recognised and for lessons to be learned. Mr Fox said that while he was content to move the recommendation in the report, it was with a degree of concern in terms of the circumstances with the applications.

Mr Fox moved that the Committee approve the recommendation in the report, to authorise Officers to submit the Orders to the Scottish Ministers for confirmation in accordance with the procedures that are set down in the 1997 Planning Act. Mr Bell seconded. There was no one otherwise minded.

**Decision:**

The Committee agreed the new Modification Orders and to authorise Officers to submit the Orders to the Scottish Ministers for confirmation in accordance with the procedures that are set down in the 1997 Planning Act.

The meeting concluded at 3.10pm.

.....  
Chair