

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning
Applications Committee held at
Council Chamber, Surrey Heath House
on 22 September 2014**

+ Cllr Edward Hawkins (Chairman)
+ Cllr Glyn Carpenter (Vice Chairman)

+ Cllr David Allen	+ Cllr Ken Pedder
+ Cllr Richard Brooks	+ Cllr Audrey Roxburgh
+ Cllr Mrs Vivienne Chapman	+ Cllr Ian Sams
- Cllr Colin Dougan	+ Cllr Pat Tedder
+ Cllr Surinder Gandhum	+ Cllr Judi Trow
+ Cllr David Hamilton	+ Cllr Valerie White
+ Cllr David Mansfield	+ Cllr John Winterton

+ Present
- Apologies for absence presented

In Attendance: Cllr Paul Deach, Cllr John May and Cllr Charlotte Morley

Officers in attendance: Lee Brewin, Duncan Carty, Michelle Fielder, Jessica Harris-Hooton, Gareth John, Aneta Mantio, Jonathan Partington, Paul Sherman

42/P Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 26 August 2014 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

43/P Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers - Development Functions

The Committee received a report on a revised Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of the Development Functions of the Council. It was noted that the current scheme had been in existence for a number of years and required a review to provide a flexible generic and user friendly scheme to meet the needs of a modern local authority.

Resolved that the Governance Working Group be advised that the amended Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers in respect of the Development Functions be recommended to Council.

44/P Application Number: 14/0396 1 Heatherdale Road, Camberley Surrey GU15 2LR - Watchetts Ward

The application was for the erection of additional detached dwelling on land to the rear of 1 Heatherdale Road that would be retained on reduced curtilage. (Additional plan rec'd 07/07/14). (Amended plans rec'd 22/08/2014).

The application would normally be delegated to officers in accordance with the scheme of delegation. A ward member had, however, called it in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Following a re-consultation, further 33 letters from 21 households were received, 2 of which are in support of the application and the remainder in objection. The letters raise the same issues as previously, with the view that the amended scheme did not go far enough to overcome their concerns. Material considerations are addressed in the report.'

Some Members felt that the proposal constituted 'garden grabbing', and would result in an increase in traffic in a wooded hill area. Other Members could see no reason to refuse the proposal as the amendments had satisfied previous reasons for refusal.

Resolved that application 14/0396 be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Bond and Mr Grundy spoke in objection and Mr Wentworth the applicant spoke in support.

Note 2

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Ken Pedder and seconded by Councillor Richard Brooks.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:

Councillors Glyn Carpenter, David Mansfield, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow and Valerie White.

45/P Application Number: 14/0630 22 Windsor Road, Chobham, Surrey GU24 8LA - Chobham Ward

The application was for the change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a mixed use comprising a dentist (D1) at ground floor and a residential (C3) flat at first floor level with creation of a rear dormer window and associated alterations (part retrospective).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'There have been a further 24 letters of support (36 in total) and a further 2 objections (5 in total) have been received. No new material planning considerations have been raised.

Amended County Highway Authority response:

The County Highway Authority now advise that no restoration works to the northern access are required as there is no dropped kerb in this location. The any works on site can be controlled by the landscaping condition and therefore condition 5 can be deleted.

The recommendation remains as set out in the report, subject to the removal of condition 5.'

Some Members sought clarification on the number of parking spaces at the site in relation to the proposed number of treatment rooms and the dwelling. Members were advised that six spaces were allocated to the treatment 4 rooms and one space for the residential unit. This was slightly above the required County Highways Agency standards and there was also a public car park close by.

Some Members were concerned about the existing parking issues and were keen for condition 5 to be retained, particularly with reference to the retention of the gate on the northern access. Members were informed that there would be no access via this entrance and therefore condition 5 was not needed as suggested by the County Highway Authority.

There was also concern about the appearance of a soil pipe on the outside wall where the lounge area was proposed. It was explained that this was put in place when the proposal made previously was for two flats and this would not be used.

Resolved that application 14/0630 be approved as amended subject to:

- i) Conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the completion of a suitable planning obligation to secure the following:**
 - a financial contribution of £10,446.06 to mitigate the impact of the development on local infrastructure, in accordance with the Developer Contributions SPD.**

In the event that a satisfactory planning obligation has not been completed by the 3 October 2014, the Executive Head of Regulatory be authorised to refuse the application for the following reason:

- 1. In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP12 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 in relation to the provision of**

infrastructure contributions towards transport, libraries and indoor sports in accordance with the requirements of Surrey Heath Borough Councils Developer Contributions SPD.

Note 1

For the record it was noted that Councillor Pat Tedder declared that she was registered at the applicant's surgery and that the application was discussed at a Chobham Parish Council meeting but she had not been present.

Note 2

As the application triggered the Council's public speaking scheme, Mr Young and Mrs Young spoke in objection and Dr Patel the applicant spoke in support.

Note 3

The recommendation as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor Pat Tedder.

Note 4

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve:
Councillor Judi Trow.

46/P Application Number: 14/0598 1 Kings Road, West End, Woking GU24 9LN - West End Ward

The application was for the erection of a pair of semi-detached properties following demolition of the existing dwelling.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'The legal agreement in terms of the proposal's mitigation towards the TBH SPA and the infrastructure has been received.

Further comments from the agent have been received that relate to inaccuracies within the committee report and their disagreement with the conclusions reached. In inaccuracies relate to the dimensions that were not annotated on the submitted drawings and were therefore scaled off the submitted plans. The correct dimensions are:

- *Para 4.2 – the lower eaves height 4.65m rather than 5.9m stated in the report;*

- *Para 7.3.3 – the maximum separation distance between the proposed dwellings and the front boundary would be approximately 14m rather than 9m stated in the report.'*

Resolved that application 14/0598 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members of the Committee had received emails from the applicant.

Note 2

The recommendation to refuse was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Judi Trow.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

47/P Application Number: 14/0567 Land rear of 48-50 Guildford Road, Lightwater GU18 5SD - Lightwater Ward

The application was for the erection of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings on land rear of 48-50 Guildford Road with new access off Broadway Road, car parking and landscaping with associated works.

Members were advised of the following:

'No legal agreement to mitigate the impact of the proposal in terms of Thames Basin Heath SPA and the infrastructure has been received and therefore the reasons for refusal remain as outlined in the agenda.'

Some Members felt that the proposal would only result in loss of amenities to the immediate neighbours.

Resolved that application 14/0567 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse was proposed by Councillor Valerie White and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

48/P Application Number: 14/0608 Larkfield, School Road, Windlesham GU20 6PB - Windlesham Ward

The application was for the erection of 2 two storey detached dwellings, both with rooms in the roof space with double integral or attached garages following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of two pairs of 2.25m high entrance gates with 1.8m high front fence.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'No unilateral undertaking to mitigate the impact of the development on Thames Basin Heath SPA or infrastructure has been submitted and therefore these have to be added as additional reasons for refusal:

- The Planning Authority, following an Appropriate Assessment and in the light of available information and the representations of Natural England, is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal (in combination with other projects) would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the relevant Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat and the protection of protected species within the protected areas. Accordingly, since the planning authority is not satisfied that Regulation 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010 (The Habitats Regulation) applies in this case, it must refuse permission in accordance with Regulation 61 (5) of the Habitats Regulations and Article 6 (3) of Directive 92/43/EE. For the same reasons the proposal conflicts with guidance contained in the NPPF and Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012, Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted January 2012).*
- In the absence of a completed legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP12 Infrastructure Delivery and Implementation of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 in relation to the provision of infrastructure contributions towards transport, libraries, community facilities and recycling, in accordance with the requirements of the Surrey Heath Borough Council's 'Planning Obligations and Infrastructure Provision Tariff Scheme. The proposal would therefore contribute to unacceptable additional pressure on local infrastructure to the detriment of the locality.'*

Resolved that application 14/0608 be refused as amended for the reasons as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn Carpenter and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, , Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to refuse as amended: Councillor Ken Pedder.

Councillor Richard Brooks abstained.

49/P Application Number: 14/0616 Saddlers Halt, 86 High Street, Chobham, Woking GU24 8LZ - Chobham Ward

The Committee was advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

50/P Application Number: 14/0439 18 Park Street, Camberley Surrey GU15 3PL - St Michaels Ward

The application was for the erection of a four storey building to provide ground floor retail (Class A1) with 8 serviced (Hotel) apartments (Class C1) and boundary wall to rear following the demolition of existing building.

Members were advised of the following updates:

'Clarification:

Policy TC1 of the Camberley Town Centre Action Area Plan 2014 indicates that: "Contributions will be sought from all developments towards the cost of delivering infrastructure which contributes towards achieving the strategy and objectives for the Town Centre. Contributions will also be sought towards the cost of environmental improvements within the town centre."

It is considered that for the scale of the proposed development (which is a minor development), with the amount of floorspace and number of Class C1 units, it is not considered contributions towards environmental improvements in the town

*centre can be secured. This type of contribution would only be secured for major development.
The Developer Contributions SPD 2011 requires contributions towards a range of infrastructure.*

This has been calculated to include:

Transport: £3,875

Libraries: £151

Indoor sports: £537

Total: £4,563

A unilateral undertaking has been completed to provide infrastructure contributions, as set out above, to meet the requirements of the Developers SPD 2011.

Members were advised that as a unilateral agreement had been signed the recommendation had been changed to approve.

Resolved that application 14/0439 be approved as amended subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Audrey Roxburgh.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

51/P Application Number: 14/0036 26 Portsmouth Road, Camberley GU15 1JX - St Pauls Ward

The application was for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with surgery and associated parking following the demolition of existing dwelling and surgery. (Amended plan rec'd 19/03/14 & amended tree report rec'd 07/04/14). (Amended & additional plans rec'd 27/05/14).

This application would normally be delegated to officers in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers. A ward member had called it in for determination by the Planning Applications Committee.

Some Members were concerned about the bulk of the proposal and felt that a condition would be necessary for the retention of the trees and particularly the

Yew. Some Members also felt that informative 4 should be amended to read '*the applicant is required to contact the owner/occupier.....*'.

The Members were advised that the trees were poor and replacements would be required. Condition 5 allowed flexibility in respect of landscaping at the site. Members were also advised that enforcement could not be included in an informative.

Resolved that application 14/0036 be approved subject to:

- i) Conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the completion of a suitable obligation to secure the following:**
 - A satisfactory legal obligation to secure contributions in accordance with the Council's Tariff Scheme and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2011), by the application expiry date of 22 October 2014 and at no cost to the Council.**

In the event that a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed to mitigate the impact of the development in line with the Council's Tariff Scheme by the 22 October 2014, the Executive Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to refuse this application for the following reason:

- In the absence of a completed legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the applicant has failed to comply with Policy CP11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the Developer Contributions SPD (Oct 2011) and Circular 05/2005. The proposal would therefore contribute to unacceptable additional pressure on local infrastructure to the detriment of the locality.**

Note 1

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor David Hamilton and seconded by Councillor David Allen.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

52/P Application Number: 14/0745 Unit 1A Watchmoor Road, Camberley GU15 3AQ - St Michaels Ward

The application was for the change of use from car sales (Sui Generis) to an Acrobatics Centre (Use class D2).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'There have now been 2 letters of support received and a further supporting statement has been received from the applicant advising of the benefits of the scheme and identifying other vacant commercial floor space in the area. Officers accept that there are benefits associated with the scheme and these are summarised in the committee report. While the applicant has provided details of other vacant properties there is no information of the circumstance, how long these properties have been vacant or whether any are subject to offers. The applicant has also not considered whether there are other sites, outside the Core Employment Area, which would be suitable for their use.

For these reasons the recommendation remains as set out in the report.'

The officers had recommended that the application be refused on the grounds that it would result in the loss of the existing employment use and would introduce a leisure use which would not support the integrity or the function of the Core Employment Area.

Members were of the opinion that the proposal would increase employment in the area, would bring benefit to the community and promote health and wellbeing. The reasons to approve the application outweighed the reason to refuse under the Policy CP8 of the Council's Core Strategy.

Members suggested standard conditions for the approval to include those related to hours of operation, types of materials, restricting the use to gymnastics/acrobatics, built to the approved plans, building to take place within three years and include highway conditions.

Resolved that application 14/0475 be approved subject to standard conditions, as summarised above, the wording to be finalised by the Executive Head – Regulatory, after consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Ward Members.

Note 1

It was noted for the record that Members of the Committee had received an email from the applicant.

Note 2

The revised recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Vivienne Chapman.

Note 3

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the revised recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David

Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

53/P Application Number: 14/0621 21 -25 Tekels Park, Camberley Surrey GU15 2LE - Town Ward

The application was for the erection of 3 two storey detached dwellings with accommodation in the roof space and a two storey detached building to comprise 4 duplex apartments following the demolition of the existing building. (Amended plans rec'd 12/08/14).

Members were advised of the following updates:

'One additional letter of objection has been raised; the material considerations are addressed in the committee report.

A consultation response has been received from West Surrey Badger Group. This raises an objection to the proposal as detailed below:

'The applicant has not considered the impact of the development on badgers which are known to be present in the Tekels Park area and accordingly permission should be refused'

Accordingly it is recommended that an additional reason for refusal is included:

It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not impact on protected species, in particular badgers, which are likely to be present on the application and the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to the objectives of Policy CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

The recommendation remains as set out in the report subject to the additional reason for refusal.'

Some Members sought clarification as to whether Tekels Park was a development area. It was confirmed that it was a settlement area.

Resolved that application 14/0621 be refused for the reasons as amended as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to refuse as amended was proposed by Councillor David Mansfield and seconded by Councillor Valerie White.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the revised recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David

Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

54/P Application Number: 14/0757 71a High Street, Chobham, Woking Surrey GU24 8AF - Chobham Ward

The application was for erection of a part two storey side extension, a detached car port and change of use of site from office to a single dwelling house.

Members were advised of the following update:

'Report correction - Recommendation 2 should read 9th October not 9th June.'

Clarification was sought on the use of the workshop and it was confirmed that it would only be for personal use. Planning permission would be required for any commercial usage.

Some Members were concerned about the impact of the loss of office units on the High Street.

Resolved that application 14/0757 be approved as amended subject to:

- i) Conditions as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory;**
- ii) the completion of a suitable planning obligation to secure the following:**
 - a financial contribution of £5,297 to mitigate the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, in accordance with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD**

In the event that a satisfactory planning obligation has not been completed by the 9 October 2014, the Executive Head - Regulatory be authorised to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- 1. The Planning Authority, following an Appropriate Assessment and in the light of available information and the representations of Natural England, is unable to satisfy itself that the proposal (in combination with other projects) would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the relevant Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI). In this respect, significant concerns remain with regard to adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area in that there is likely to be an increase in dog walking, general recreational use and damage to the habitat and the protection of protected species within the protected areas. Accordingly, since the planning authority is not satisfied that Regulation 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010 (The Habitats Regulation) applies in this case, it must refuse permission in accordance with Regulation 61 (5) of the Habitats**

Regulations and Article 6 (3) of Directive 92/43/EE. For the same reasons the proposal conflicts with guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation).

Note 1

The recommendation to approve as amended was proposed by Councillor Glyn carpenter and seconded by Councillor Ken Pedder.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve as amended:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Voting against the recommendation to approve as amended: Councillors Pat Tedder and Judi Trow.

55/P Application Number: 13/0639 25 High Street, Bagshot Surrey GU19 5AF - Bagshot Ward

The application was for the Listed Building Consent for the replacement of a ground floor wood framed window.

Resolved that application 14/0639 be approved as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor Richard Brooks and seconded by Councillor Glyn Carpenter.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:
Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

56/P Application Number: 14/0651 12 Dean Parade, Camberley Surrey GU15 4DQ - Old Dean Ward

This application was for the change of use of premises from Class B1 (Business) to Class A1 (Barbers Shop).

Resolved that application 14/0651 be approved as set out in the report of the Executive Head – Regulatory.

Note 1

The recommendation to approve was proposed by Councillor David Allen and seconded by Councillor David Mansfield.

Note 2

In accordance with Part 4 Section D paragraph 18 of the Constitution, the voting in relation to the application was as follows:

Voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Councillors David Allen, Richard Brooks, Glyn Carpenter, Vivienne Chapman, Surinder Gandhum, David Hamilton, Edward Hawkins, David Mansfield, Ken Pedder, Audrey Roxburgh, Ian Sams, Pat Tedder, Judi Trow, Valerie White and John Winterton.

Chairman