

Cabinet

14 May 2018

Present: N Redfearn (Elected Mayor) (in the Chair)
Councillors G Bell, C Burdis, S Cox, S Day, P Earley,
R Glindon, M Hall, C Johnson and CB Pickard.

In Attendance: K Goldfinch (Business Sector)
R Layton (North Tyneside Joint Trade Union Committee)

CAB169/05/18 Apologies

Apologies were received from A Caldwell (Age UK) and P Arnold (Young Mayor).

CAB170/05/18 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

There were no declarations of interest or dispensations reported.

CAB171/05/18 Minutes

Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2018 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

CAB172/05/18 Report of the Young Mayor

In the absence of the Young Mayor who was unwell and unable to attend the meeting, it was agreed that her report would be circulated to all parties for information.

CAB173/05/18 The Gambling Act 2005 – Draft Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling) 2019-2022 (All Wards)

Cabinet received a report seeking approval for the initial proposals of the Draft Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling) 2019-2022.

Each local authority was required by the Gambling Act 2005 to publish a Statement of Licensing Policy and to revise the Policy at least every three years. The report detailed the revision process and provided guidance as to how the Authority would exercise its functions under the Act.

The Authority's initial Policy had come into force on 31 January 2007 and had been reviewed and, where necessary, amended every three years thereafter.

The revised Policy had to be in force by 31 January 2019 when the existing Policy would expire. Under the Act, the Authority as a licensing authority was responsible for issuing Premises Licences and Permits.

Cabinet

Premises Licences were specific to the type of premises offering gambling to the public and included Casino Premises; Bingo Premises; Adult Gaming Centre Premises; Family Entertainment Centre Premises; and Betting Premises.

The Authority did not have the authority from the Secretary of State to issue Casino Premises Licences. Section 175 of the Act limited the overall numbers of types of casinos that would be permitted in Great Britain and, until such time as the current limit on the number of casinos was increased, no further Casino Premises Licences would be issued.

In terms of Permits, the Authority as a licensing authority could issue Unlicensed Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permits; Club Gaming Permits; Club Gaming Machine Permits; Alcohol Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits; and Prize Gaming Permits.

Section 153 of the Act set out the principles to be applied by the Authority when considering an application for a Premises Licence; and emphasised the importance of the Authority's Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling) in determining any application for a Premises Licence made to the Authority as a licensing authority.

The draft revised Policy, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, contained the information that the Gambling Act 2005 (Licensing Authority Policy Statement) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 had prescribed should be included in the Policy document, as referred to in the report.

Council on 19 November 2015 had passed a 'no casino' resolution which meant that the Authority would not grant any Casino Premises Licences in the Borough if it was given the power to do so. This resolution remained in place for the duration of the Policy, even if the number of national Casino licences increased as indicated in the report.

The decision whether or not to pass a further 'no casino' resolution would form part of the consultation process concerning the revision of the Licensing Policy. If Council passed a 'no casino' resolution, then it would bind the Authority for a further three years (unless another resolution was passed in the interim) and would prohibit the Authority from issuing Casino Premises Licences in that period.

In preparing the draft revised Policy document, regard had been given to the Gambling Commission's statutory guidance and the Regulations issued in order to assist licensing authorities in the preparation of their Policy statements. The draft revised Policy statement included a number of new additions including reference to the Council Plan, a section on Child Sexual Exploitation awareness and information on safeguarding policies, responsible authority added for vessels, local Risk Assessment template as attached to the report, and updated website information.

The draft revised Policy statement would be subject to a six week period of public consultation that would commence on 1 June 2018. This was considered an appropriate period of time to consult on this Policy document. A list of consultees would appear in the Policy document. All consultees would be given the opportunity of providing feedback and comments on the draft Policy. The draft revised Policy

Cabinet

statement, once approved, must be published at least 4 weeks before it came into effect (31 January 2019) and be available for inspection on the Authority's website, public libraries and Quadrant.

Before the Policy came into effect the Authority also had to advertise the publication of the Policy statement by publishing a public notice on the North Tyneside Council website and in a local newspaper indicating when the Policy would be published and when it would come into effect.

Cabinet considered the following decision options: either to endorse the initial proposals for the draft revised policy statement in its current form, subject to any further amendments following consultation, or alternatively not endorse the initial proposals for the draft revised Policy statement.

Resolved that the initial proposals for the draft Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling) 2019-2022, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

(Reason for decision – The revised draft Policy has been developed by an Officer Working Group. The Policy contains the information required by legislation and the Gambling Commission. It will be subject to extensive consultation involving, in addition to members of the public, those involved in the gambling trade, all North Tyneside MPs, MEPs and Councillors).

CAB174/05/18 Planning Contributions (All Wards)

Cabinet considered a report seeking approval of the new governance arrangements designed to ensure Planning Contributions were handled in an appropriate policy context and also to bring Planning Contributions in line with arrangements already in place to manage the Investment Plan.

Following adoption of the North Tyneside Local Plan in July 2017 the Authority had continued to develop and update its policy framework to ensure the infrastructure required to support the expected growth in North Tyneside was delivered. The Authority's requirements were set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which described the infrastructure that might be required in North Tyneside to support the delivery of the Local Plan to 2032.

Developer contributions were an important source of funding to support investment in infrastructure and were secured through Planning Obligations, also known as Section 106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 278 highway agreements. Their use was subject to legislative controls designed to ensure they were used appropriately.

In March 2018, Cabinet had adopted an update to the Authority's Planning Obligations Supplementary Obligations Document (SPD). The Planning Obligations SPD provided guidance for planning applicants in North Tyneside on the circumstances in which planning obligations might be sought from developments across a range of different infrastructure needs.

Cabinet

In April 2018, the Authority had submitted a CIL Draft Charging Schedule to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. Should the Planning Inspectorate recommend adoption of the CIL charging schedule it would be considered by Cabinet later this year and presented for adoption to full Council. Once adopted CIL would provide a source of funding from developer contributions to support the delivery of strategic infrastructure requirements.

Cabinet considered the following decision options: to either approve the recommendations as set out in section 1.2 of the report, or alternatively to decline the recommendations and request the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure in consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member and the Head of Law and Governance to review the proposed delegations.

Resolved that (1) the relevant Chief Officer or Head of Service be authorised to make representations to the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure on contributions that they consider necessary to mitigate the impact of proposed developments in line with the policy objectives of the Elected Mayor and Cabinet;

(2) the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, the Deputy Mayor, other relevant Cabinet Members and the Head of Law and Governance be authorised to agree appropriate contributions for consideration by Planning Committee to mitigate the impact of proposed developments;

(3) the Head of Commissioning and Investment, in consultation with the Head of Finance, be authorised to commission formal site viability assessments, such cost to be met by developers, where developers challenge the level of contributions sought by the Authority under a s106 agreement;

(4) the relevant Head of Service, in consultation with the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure, the Head of Finance, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, the Deputy Mayor and other relevant Cabinet Members, be authorised to deliver proposed infrastructure projects; and

(5) the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure, in consultation with Head of Finance, Head of Law and Governance, the Deputy Mayor and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, be authorised to make any minor amendments to the process as set out in Appendix 1 to the report as necessary.

(Reason for decision: The introduction of the arrangements will give transparency and oversight to the affordability of sites and the level of affordable housing within the borough. This approach is in accordance with the Local Plan).

CAB175/05/18 Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document (All Wards)

Cabinet considered a report seeking approval to adopt the proposed Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document.

On 12 February 2018, Cabinet had approved a draft Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for engagement. The engagement on the draft SPD had been undertaken from 26 February to 9 April 2018. This involved publication of the draft online supported by a press release and direct notification to key stakeholders involved in the development industry and public sector. The draft documents had also been made available at main Libraries across North Tyneside.

Cabinet

Six stakeholders had made representations relating to designing out crime, flood risk and water management, and highway design. Overall respondents were supportive of the draft SPD and some minor changes had been suggested. Amendments had been made to the document to reflect the comments received. The schedule of all representations made and officer response was set out in the Engagement Statement.

An updated SPD was required to replace the existing SPD adopted by Cabinet in September 2010. This update reflected the up-to-date local and national planning policy context, including adoption of the Local Plan, and supported the design quality of a wider range of development types. The programme for revision of the SPD had been agreed by Cabinet at its meeting on 17 October 2016.

The proposed SPD presented in the report included additional general design advice for all developments and new detailed guidance for specific development types. The proposed SPD also set out the links between good design and health and wellbeing.

Adoption of the proposed SPD would provide guidance for applicants to understand the Authority's requirements for good design in development based on recognised best practice, and explained the details that the Authority would take into consideration when assessing planning proposals.

If adopted, the proposed SPD would be a material consideration when determining planning applications.

Cabinet considered the following decision options: either to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 1.2 of the report, or alternatively not to approve the recommendations.

Resolved that (1) the responses received to the engagement on the draft Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document authorised by Cabinet in February 2018 be noted; and
(2) the adoption of the proposed Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document, attached as Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.

(Reason for decision: The proposed SDP would allow for the Authority to fulfil the requirements of the local and national policy, ensuring that new development was of high quality design).

CAB176/05/18 Swans CFI Phase 2 Office refurbishment and Swans Plot 6 Basement and South Block buildings asbestos removal and demolition; and acceptance of funding and appointment of contractors (Wallsend Ward)

The Elected Mayor and the Chair of the Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee had agreed to this report seeking approval to accept Local Growth Fund (LGF) grant from the North East Local Enterprise Partnership (NELEP) for three projects at the Swans site and to award contracts following a procurement exercise being considered as a matter of urgency in accordance with the Constitution for the following reason:

Cabinet

To enable contracts to be let and work to commence as soon as practicably possible to ensure the development progresses on site, the funders' grant is spent expediently and provide confidence to proposed tenants that occupancy in the autumn of 2019 is deliverable.

The projects were as follows:

- i) the Swans Centre for Innovation (CFI) Phase 2 Office Refurbishment;
- ii) the demolition of the Swans Plot 6 basement; and
- iii) the demolition of the South Block Buildings (CFI Phase 3 Enabling).

The Authority had secured funding of £8 million LGF grant from the NELEP in 2015 to infill the wet berth at the Swans site to provide additional development land.

The Cabinet report of 9 October 2017 detailed how discussions had taken place with NELEP in 2016 to refocus £7.843 million of this allocation (£0.157 million, had funded site investigations and a feasibility study) to invest the remaining LGF allocation in to quay infrastructure, demolitions and CFI Phase 2. This had resulted in the LGF grant approvals as detailed at section 1.5.5 of the report (Table 1).

The NELEP Board had also resolved "*That a final business case be submitted for Stage 2 funding when robust cost plans are available and Council matched budgets are approved*" and also that a site investment plan is provided showing how "*...all essential infrastructure requirements over the next 3-4 years are to be delivered and funded, including any indicative future EZ Business Rate Growth Investment funding requests*"

Following the Stage 1 LGF Grant approvals feasibility work on CFI Phase 2, CFI Phase 3 Enabling and Quay Infrastructure works had progressed. The Quay Infrastructure survey and feasibility work was continuing which would enable an LGF Business Case to be submitted later this year.

The final version of the CFI Phase 2 Business Case had been submitted on 8 February 2018 seeking £1,670,000 of LGF matched with £250,000 funding provided by the Authority. The Business Case had been approved by NELEP in March 2018. The Grant Funding Agreement was being prepared and NELEP had advised it should be issued by 11 May 2018.

The final version of the CFI Phase 3 Enabling Business Case had been submitted on 27 February 2018 seeking £732,740 of LGF. It was anticipated that the Business Case would be considered at the NELEP Investment Board to be held on 15 July 2018.

The procurement of the projects that were the subject to this report had been considered by Cabinet on 9 October 2017. At that meeting the Head of Business and Economic Development had been authorised in consultation with the Head of Finance and Head of Law and Governance to use appropriate existing procurement frameworks to identify a contractor to complete the works on CFI Phase 2 and CFI Phase 3 Enabling.

Cabinet

Two North East Procurement Organisation (NEPO) frameworks had been identified as appropriate frameworks for the works to deliver CFI Phase 2 Design & Build, CFI Phase 3 Enabling as well as Plot 6 Basement Demolition as outlined in the report.

The successful Contractors would be selected from the NEPO frameworks following a mini competition.

Cabinet considered the following decision options: to either to agree the recommendations as set out in section 1.2 of the report, or alternatively to agree and/or decline some or all of the recommendations; or to decline the recommendations and request officers to consider options.

Resolved that (1) Cabinet accepts from the North East Local Enterprise Partnership the Local Growth Fund grants of:

- a. £1,670,000 for the CFI Phase 2 Refurbishment;
- b. £500,000 for the Swans Plot 6 Basement Demolition;
- c. £732,740 for the Swans CFI Phase 3 Enabling;

(2) the Chief Executive in consultation with the Elected Mayor, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, the Head of Finance and the Head of Law and Governance, be authorised to:

(a) take all necessary steps to complete the grant funding agreement pursuant to the above; and

(b) award contracts to the successful bidders, for the works as set out in the report, who represent the most economically advantageous tender to the Authority.

(Reason for decision: The CFI Phase 2 refurbishment will enable the Authority to build on the success of CFI Phase 1, which is now fully let. There is interest from existing tenants to expand in to Phase 2 and from other businesses to move to the CFI. In order to capitalise on this interest there is a need to make early progress and demonstrate that the new space will be available in autumn 2019.

The Plot 6 Basement and CFI Phase 3 asbestos removal and demolition work will create sites for development enabling new businesses to be attracted to Plot 6 and interim car parking uses on the site of the South Block buildings.

If Cabinet decline to approve the recommendations in the report, there is a risk that later appointment of the CFI Phase 2 contractor will mean that existing and potential tenants decide to pursue alternative locations to expand or locate their businesses. Earlier appointment of contractors for asbestos removal and demolition of Plot 6 and the South Block will also give confidence to NELEP that Swans is being progressed expediently; furthermore it will enable emerging interest from potential site occupiers to be responded to positively with fully cleared sites).

CAB177/05/18 Report of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (All Wards)

Cabinet considered a report of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) dated 16 February 2018, which had found maladministration causing injustice.

Cabinet

The complaint and the findings of the LGSCO investigator were set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report. The findings were summarised as follows:

- The Authority had correctly assessed the noise nuisance and the planning enforcement issue, but accepted it delayed responding to Mr B's initial concerns. The Authority should have provided the result of the noise monitoring within ten working days, but instead it had taken around two months. The Authority had also delayed giving the result of the planning enforcement enquiry. The Authority had apologised which the LGSCO had confirmed was appropriate.
- Mr B had complained further as he did not feel the noise nuisance had been adequately assessed. Mr B had felt the Authority had only concentrated on the volume of the noise. The stage two complaint response letter had not addressed Mr B's concerns.
- The LGSCO investigator had considered the Authority's responses to Mr B and did not feel they had given sufficient information for him to understand the various factors it considered when establishing there was not a statutory nuisance. Therefore, the Authority had failed to address Mr B's specific concerns in its complaint correspondence. This had caused Mr B the time and trouble of progressing his complaint to the Ombudsman, when the Authority could have resolved it internally had it given more detail and responded to these specific concerns.

The LGSCO investigator had found maladministration and injustice against the Authority and had made the following recommendation, as set out under paragraph 29 of Appendix 1:

"Apologise to Mr B, within two weeks of the Ombudsman's final decision, for the time and trouble it caused him having to pursue his complaint. And for the frustration caused by its delay, and lack of thorough explanation of the outcome of Mr B's noise nuisance complaint."

As recommended by the LGSCO, the Authority had sent a letter of apology on 21 February 2018 to Mr B to acknowledge the frustration and time and trouble the failure to explain its reasoning had caused.

Cabinet considered the following decision option: to note the findings of the report (Appendix 1), its recommendations and agree the actions taken to address the LGSCO's recommendations.

Resolved that (1) the findings and recommendation of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO), as described in the report and as set out in the LGSCO's report at Appendix 1, be noted; and
(2) the actions taken by the Authority to comply with the recommendations of the LGSCO's report, as set out in paragraphs 1.53 and 1.5.4 of the report, be noted.

(Reason for decision: To comply with the recommendations of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.)

CAB178/05/18 Report of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (All Wards)

The Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) has issued a report finding maladministration causing injustice. The LGSCO found that there was a delay in serving a Breach of Condition Notice (BCN) in relation to a development site near to the home of the complainant, Mr C and some poor communication with him. The LGSCO acknowledged that the Authority had already provided a satisfactory remedy for the injustice caused including an apology, training and ensuring planning conditions were met.

The complaint and the findings of the LGSCO investigator were set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report. The findings were summarised as follows:

- Mr C referred to the Authority's Highways Team 'ignoring' the Planning Committee's acceptance that a particular crossing point needed a pedestrian-controlled crossing and instead allowed a pedestrian refuge. The Authority had provided a copy of the agreed Committee meeting minutes. These included an account of Mr C's detailed submission to the Committee and the Committee's resolution which did not record such a request.
- Mr C had sought information about the proposed crossing in November 2015 and had chased the Authority in December and January 2016. The Authority had provided a reply in January and apologised for the delay in responding.
- The Authority had provided detailed reasons for its decision about the type of crossing at this location which were accepted by the LGSCO.
- Mr C had raised several issues in February 2016, including concerns about hedgerow removal and mud on the road. Mr C had also sought the timescale for the required highway improvement works. The Authority had advised Mr C that it was considering an application to discharge certain conditions and had provided a link to the application. The Authority had advised the timescale was outstanding.
- Mr C had reported in March that work was starting on site at 7.30am instead of the permitted 8am and had provided photographs of mud on the road. The Authority had reminded the developer about the permitted hours of construction and sought a timescale for providing a suitable wheel wash. Mr C had reported in April the developer was still breaching the permitted hours of work. The Authority had visited the site and had written to the developer about this requirement. The developer had agreed to a traffic survey to monitor the arrival time of deliveries to site and advised it may seek an amendment to the relevant condition to amend the start time from 8am to 7.30am.
- The Authority during its complaint correspondence with Mr C had acknowledged times when there were delays or inaccurate information in its responses to him and had apologised. It had also confirmed the following in April:
 - it would provide customer service training and monitor customer service performance;

Cabinet

- it would take appropriate action about performance issues; and
 - there were wheel wash facilities, water bowsers and road sweepers on site as required as well as a fully operational eco bath.
-
- Authorities had no duty to monitor development. They were dependent on members of the public, harmed by unauthorised development, complaining to them about it. They then had a duty to investigate. The Authority had provided evidence it had responded to Mr C's reports of planning breaches, visited the site and corresponded with the developer. The Authority had also been in regular communication with Mr C.
 - Authorities had power to enforce but they had no duty to do so. If an Authority decided that enforcement action was appropriate it must follow government guidance which says that any action should be proportionate and commensurate with the breach of control to which it related. The LGSO had found that the Authority had not acted with fault in its approach of working with the developer to achieve compliance. There had been some delay in serving the Building Compliance Notice and some poor communication with Mr C. The LGSCO considered the Authority's apology and actions above were enough to remedy Mr C's injustice.

The LGSCO had found fault and injustice against the Authority. The LGSCO had not made any recommendations, as the investigator had been satisfied the action the Authority had already taken was enough to provide a satisfactory remedy as set out under paragraph 32 of Appendix 1 of the report.

Cabinet considered the following decision option: to note the findings of the report (Appendix 1), its recommendations and agree the actions taken to address the LGSCO's recommendations.

Resolved that (1) the findings and recommendations of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman, as described in the report and as set out in the LGSCO's report at Appendix 1, be noted; and
(2) the actions taken already taken by the Authority to provide a satisfactory remedy to this complaint as set out in the LGSCO's report at Appendix 1, be noted.

(Reason for decision: To comply with the recommendations of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.)

CAB179/05 Appointments to Outside Bodies Exercising Executive Functions 2018/19 (All Wards)

Cabinet received a report regarding proposed arrangements for the appointment of representatives to serve on outside bodies that had executive decision-making powers for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

Appendix A to the report set out those outside bodies which had executive functions and required appointments to be made by Cabinet for 2018/19.

Cabinet

Cabinet considered the following decision options: either to agree the recommendations as set out in section 1.2 of the report, or alternatively to disagree with the proposals.

Resolved that the Elected Mayor be authorised to determine: (1) the appointment of representatives to serve on those executive outside bodies set out in Appendix A to the report for the 2018/19 Municipal Year;
(2) any changes to the appointment of representatives to serve on those executive bodies which might arise during 2018/19; and
(3) the appointment of representatives to serve on any new executive outside bodies that may arise during the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

(Reason for decision: It would ensure that the Authority is properly represented on external bodies that exercise executive functions.)

CAB180/05/18 Exclusion Resolution

Resolved that under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and having applied a public interest test as defined in Part 2 of Schedule 12A of the Act, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

CAB181/05/18 Report of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (All Wards)

Cabinet considered a report of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) dated 27 February 2018, which had found maladministration causing injustice to Mrs X, the Complainant who was a Special Guardian. The finding related to the Authority's previous policy in relation to the calculation of Special Guardianship Allowances which was incorrect. Cabinet had previously been made aware of issues with the payment of Special Guardianship allowances. This matter had been a complex area for local authorities to address. Other Special Guardians in the same position as Mrs X had also been adversely affected and as a result of this the finding of maladministration with injustice had been extended to include those individuals.

The complaint and the findings of the LGSCO investigator were set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report.

The Authority had agreed to carry out the LGSCO recommendations and the LGSCO had welcomed the Authority's positive response to their report.

Resolved that (1) the findings and recommendations of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO), as described in the report and as set out in the LGSCO's report at Appendix 1, be noted; and
(2) the actions taken by the Authority to comply with the recommendations of the LGSCO's report, as set out in paragraphs 1.5.3 and 1.5.4, be noted.

(Reason for decision: To comply with the recommendations of the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.)

CAB182/05/18 Corporate Risk Management Summary (All Wards)

Cabinet considered a report which detailed the corporate risks that had been identified for monitoring and management by the Authority's Senior Leadership Team and relevant Cabinet members. The report also provided detailed information on each risk and how it was being managed.

Cabinet considered the following decision options: To consider the information provided for each of the corporate risks and endorse the outcome of the latest review by the Authority's Senior Leadership Team; and after consideration of the detailed information provided for the corporate risks, suggest changes to the corporate risks and their controls.

Resolved that the latest review of key corporate risks undertaken by the Senior Leadership Team be endorsed.

(Reason for decision – Each of the corporate risks has undergone substantial review and challenge as part of the corporate risk management process. This is designed to provide assurance that corporate risks and opportunities are being identified and appropriately managed.)

CAB183/05/18 Date and Time of Next Meetings

Tuesday 29 May 2018 at 6.00pm (Extraordinary Meeting)
Monday 25 June 2018 at 6.00pm (Ordinary Meeting).

Minutes published on Thursday 17 May 2018.

The decisions contained within these Minutes may be implemented (unless called in by 3 Non-Executive Members for consideration by the Overview, Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee) immediately following the expiry of the call-in period; i.e. 5.00pm on Thursday 24 May 2018.