

Minutes of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held on THURSDAY 18 JUNE 2020 at 7.00 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Brown (Chair)  
Councillors Alexander, Baines, Bint, Exon, Lancaster, Legg, McLean, Petchey, Trendall and Wallis

**Officers:** T Darke (Director, Growth, Economy and Culture), J Palmer (Head of Planning), E Verdegem (Team Leader – West Team), R Edgington (Senior Planning Officer), L Lycett (Senior Planning Officer), C Chan (Planning Officer), S Peart (Conservation and Archaeology Manager), N Weeks (Highways Consultant) C Gaunt (Principal Lawyer (Property & Housing)) and D Imbimbo (Committee Manager)

**Apologies:** Councillor Bowyer (Registered to speak as an objector)

**DCC07 INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed members of the public and councillors to the meeting and explained that the meeting was being held remotely and would be broadcast live on YouTube he further explained the procedures to be adopted.

**DCC08 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Bint asked that it be noted that in respect of application 20/00893/DISCON for transparency, he would like to clarify that he was a member of the MK Forum but had not taken part in any discussion in respect of the application.

Councillor Petchey asked that it be noted that in respect of application 20/00893/DISCON: Without taking a predetermined view, he had recognised that there was a great deal of public interest in the matter and so requested that the application be considered by DCC

Councillor Petchey further asked that it be noted that in respect of application 20/00709/FUL: This application was by the charity 'The Bus Shelter MK', which was his mayor's charity last year. As was agreed with their previous planning application, a sympathy for the aims of the charity does not predetermine him in favour of a particular application.

Councillor Petchey also asked that it be noted that in respect of application 20/00635/FUL: At the invitation of Great Linford Parish Council, he had been a member of the project board for this development. He stated that he was accordingly predetermined and

would(virtually) withdraw from the committee during the discussion of the application and take no part in the debate or vote.

## **DCC09**

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

#### **Questions**

Councillor Hosking:

‘My question relates to the Mounts Farm application in Emberton:

DCC asked officers to provide a ‘case history’ for this application when it was granted in April. What progress has been made in drafting this report and when will a final version be available for members?’

The Head of Planning told the Committee that the work had commenced however the Officer conducting the review was currently on leave, and he was therefore unable to confirm the timescale for completing the review, The Head of Planning further confirmed that as soon as it was available it would be scheduled for inclusion on an agenda for the Committee.

## **DCC10**

### **REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS**

Mr. C Wardle, Parish Councillor N Richards (Moulsoe Parish Council) and Councillors Hosking and P Geary (Ward Councillors) spoke in objection to application 19/02402/FUL, Full planning application for the erection of two storage and distribution units (use class B8), with associated access, car parking, servicing, landscaping, earthworks, on and off-site drainage and off-site highway works at Land at Caldecote Farm, East of The M1 Motorway, Adjacent To Willen Road.

The Applicant declined the right of reply.

Mr. T Skelton and Mr D Stabler spoke in objection to application 20/00893/DISCON, Details submitted pursuant of conditions 6 (Ecological Management Plan), 19 and 20 (Bicycle Mural Method Statement for dismantling and storage) attached to planning application 18/01469/FUL at 22 - 24 Stantonbury Centre Purbeck Stantonbury.

Parish Councillor G Davison (Stantonbury Parish Council) and Councillor Walker (Ward Councillor) spoke in support of the application.

The Applicant’s Agent, Mr D Templeton, exercised the right of reply.

Mr S Dent and Mrs Noon (Objections read by Committee Manager) spoke in objection to application 20/00653/FUL, Construction of new community hall and sports changing rooms using modular

construction adjacent to existing pavilion at Great Linford Sports Pavilion, Marsh Drive, Great Linford.

Councillors Petchey and Walker spoke in support of the application.

The Applicant's agent, Mr A. Morphet, exercised the right of reply.

Councillor Walker (Ward Councillor) spoke in objection (seeking a deferral) to application 20/00709/FUL, Conversion of redundant landscape depot to amenity building and extension of the existing site to locate temporary accommodation in the form of the bus shelter, office, communal building, kennels and a bike shelter plus parking for 5 cars at Milton Keynes Council Landscape Depot, Crosslands, Stantonbury, Milton Keynes.

The Applicant, Mrs P Williams, exercised the right of reply.

## **DCC11**

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**19/02402/FUL FULL PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF TWO STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION UNITS (USE CLASS B8), WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, CAR PARKING, SERVICING, LANDSCAPING, EARTHWORKS, ON AND OFF-SITE DRAINAGE AND OFF-SITE HIGHWAY WORKS AT LAND AT CALDECOTE FARM, EAST OF THE M1 MOTORWAY, ADJACENT TO WILLEN ROAD FOR SEGRO (NEWPORT PAGNELL) LIMITED.**

The Team Leader introduced the application with a presentation. The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to refuse the application for the reasons stated in the Committee report.

The Committee heard that an additional reason for refusal was recommended as detailed in the published update report, this had come about following late comments from the Landscaping Officer which were also detailed within that report.

The Team Leader told the Committee that the site was adjacent to houses at Glen Fields and the 'Travellers' site to the east of Willen Road. It was further commented that the Indicative Development Framework Plan from the MK East SPD shows the aspirations for Willen Road to be upgraded to a grid road and that the delivery of jobs and employment was through how much land

would be dedicated to employment uses. The allocation was proposed to deliver 105 hectares of employment land and at 19.3 hectares this site forms about a fifth of that proposed employment use. When referring to employment land that was B1/B2/B8 use, which was offices, light industry, general industry, and storage and distribution development. This is an application was for B8 storage and distribution warehouse space with ancillary office facilities.

The Committee heard from Objectors who, in summary, raised the following concerns;

- The Development will have a significant negative impact on Newport Pagnell as a Town, creating serious traffic problems.
- The residents on the Green Park estate in Newport Pagnell will experience significant increased road network congestion as a result of the development as the infrastructure, for the anticipated vehicle movements of 526 HGV's daily, will not have been provided.
- The noise and light pollution from the site will have an adverse impact on the amenity of local residents.
- The 'green buffer zones' proposed are not adequate to protect residential properties proposed for development in the area.
- The probable reduction of speed limits to accommodate the site will further increase congestion as traffic will no longer be able to run smoothly in the area.
- The application is premature as the infrastructure funding has not yet been granted from central Government, and therefore contrary to the Council's policy.
- Infrastructure must be delivered prior to any development on the MK East Area. This to

include either a bridge or underpass across the A422.

- There is no urgent need for Warehouse facilities on this site, with alternative sites available within a reasonable distance.
- Should the Committee decide to refuse the application on the grounds of Policy SD12 of Plan MK it should be fully reflected in the decision notice, taking particular notice of the wording 'necessary strategic infrastructure required to make the site deliverable is funded and is being delivered'.
- The inclusion of Policy DS2 of Plan MK as a reason for refusal would strengthen the decision should it be appealed.
- The level of employment that the developed warehouse would provide is low for the size of the site overall.
- The visual intrusion that the development would cause to residents of Newport Pagnell is so great that even if the infrastructure had been put in place the proposals would not be policy compliant in other respects.

Councillor Hosking requested that the Committee have a recorded vote due to the significant importance of the decision in respect of potential undermining of Plan MK.

The Committee heard that the applicant had declined the right of reply, however a written submission had been circulated with the published update papers.

The Team Leader confirmed that the reasons for refusal as recommended in the Committee report and published update report took account of the various objections that had been heard.

The Team Leader explained that policy DS2 was in respect of Housing Strategy rather than the site as a whole and Officers did not at this time recommend that it be considered as a reason for refusal.

It was further confirmed that at the present time no information was available to indicate the number of jobs the site would accommodate, As detailed above the MK East SPD calculated on the basis of Hectares of employment land, the site represented approximately 20% of the overall available land for employment and could be seen to be an area that should create approximately 1200 job opportunities. It was confirmed that the Council's Economic Development Team had sought the information in respect of potential job creation, but the applicant had not supplied it.

Councillor Brown proposed that the Officer recommendation that the application be refused for the reasons relating to 'Principle', 'Highway's', 'Residential Amenity', 'Planning Obligations' and 'Landscaping' be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Exon.

Members of the Committee raised the following points;

- The Application was contrary to the recently adopted PlanMk in many respects,
- There is significant concern in respect of the negative impacts of the number of Heavy Goods Vehicle movements the site will generate and the lack of a road infrastructure to support them,
- The site represents 20% of the available employment land in the East Development Area and no figures are available to suggest what the levels of employment that will be generated are,
- If the site did generate the number of jobs that it should then the road infrastructure as it stands would be further compromised and create even more congestion,
- Noise and light pollution concerns.

The Director, Growth, Economy and Culture asked that it be noted that the applicant had written to the

Leader of the Council, a copy of the letter had been published in the update papers, and that it was the policy of the Council to support Growth and Employment Opportunities, however in this instance the proposals were too soon and did not have any of the necessary infrastructure or assurances required to deliver that growth in a manageable way.

On being put to the vote the proposal to refuse the application for the reasons given was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons;

#### 1. Principle

The application site forms part of the Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Extension, which is allocated for the long-term needs of Milton Keynes. Plan:MK Policy SD12 requires that the allocation can only come forwards once the funding for strategic infrastructure required to make the site deliverable has been secured and once this infrastructure is being delivered. The funding for this strategic infrastructure has not yet been secured and there is no planning application or permission in place for the delivery of the strategic infrastructure. The requirements of Policy SD12 have therefore not been met, and the site effectively remains in Open Countryside under Policy DS5, until the allocation is able to be brought forward. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SD12 and DS5 of Plan:MK (2019) and the Milton Keynes East Development Framework SPD (2020).

#### 2. Highways

Highway improvement works have been proposed as part of this application which do not meet the requirements of the Milton Keynes East Development Framework SPD (paragraph 4.3.7) and could prejudice forthcoming highway infrastructure and improvements proposed strategically as part of

the wider allocation, as required by Policy SD12 of Plan:MK and the Milton Keynes East Development Framework SPD, such as a bridge or underpass crossing of H3 Monks Way (A422) and the improvements required to Willen Road to upgrade it to a 'grid road'. In addition, it is considered that the applicants have not fully considered the cumulative impact of this development with the rest of the Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Expansion, on the existing highway network. This means that the highway improvements proposed have not been fully considered in light of the future amount of traffic that will use these junctions, the result of which is likely to be excess stress on the highway network with impacts on accessibility, movement and highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SD12 and CT2 of Plan:MK (2019) and the Milton Keynes East Development Framework SPD (2020).

### 3. Residential Amenity

There are existing dwellings to the east of the application site at risk of a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity as a result of visual impact and overbearing nature of the development. The height and position of the proposed buildings, the lack of landscaping and the lack of set-back between the buildings and Willen Road will contribute to an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the existing residents. In the absence of supporting information to show otherwise, it is considered that the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D5 (A.5.) and Policy D3, in Plan:MK (2019).

### 4. Planning Obligations

In the absence of the necessary planning obligations being secured by a s106 agreement, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not lead to a burden on or have an adverse impact on existing local infrastructure. The location of the site as part of the Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Expansion requires the

establishment of a Tariff Framework Agreement to ensure equitable contributions by developers across the site, and in the absence of this Framework the necessary contributions cannot be agreed. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SD12 and INF1 of Plan:MK (2019), and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

#### 5. Landscape and Character of the Area

Given the size and scale of the proposed buildings, the layout of the site provides insufficient space and depth for a sufficient landscape buffer to provide effective visual mitigation for the site. The set-back of the buildings from the boundary around the site do not provide sufficient depth to create high enough bunds, nor are the bunds consistent around the boundary. The setbacks are also populated with areas that cannot be planted (drainage ponds), which further reduces the amount and depth of planting, and reduces the effectiveness of the landscape buffers for visual mitigation proposed. Without effective landscaped buffers around the site, it is considered that the visual impact of the proposals has not been successfully mitigated and will have a harmful impact on the character of the area. Concerns are also raised with the accuracy and lack of recommended mitigation proposed via the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, and therefore there is doubt as to whether this document can be relied upon to fully assess the impact on the character of the area from both close to the site and from a distance. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies NE6, D1, D2 and D3 of Plan:MK (2019).

**20/00893/DISCON DETAILS SUBMITTED PURSUANT OF CONDITIONS 6 (ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN), 19 AND 20 (BICYCLE MURAL METHOD STATEMENT FOR DISMANTLING AND STORAGE) ATTACHED TO PLANNING APPLICATION 18/01469/FUL AT 22 - 24 STANTONBURY CENTRE PURBECK STANTONBURY FOR ALDI STORES LIMITED.**

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application and discharge the conditions.

It was further commented that there had been references from objectors to condition 21, for clarity it was confirmed that condition 21 was not for consideration as part of this application.

The Committee also heard that a revised method statement had been received and published as a part of the update papers, this had been revised following discussion with objectors. References to late submissions and questions received had also been addressed in the published update papers.

The Committee heard from objectors who restated concerns in respect of the failure to secure a new site for the mural prior to its removal, and the methodology of its removal and storage which they believed could potentially result in damage to it.

The Committee also heard from a representative of the Parish Council who stated that the delivery of the store was of high importance to residents, and that any delay was not welcome, it was also commented that no objectors were from the local community and that the Parish Council, whilst cognizant of its local historical nature, as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan, did not see the mural as of significant artistic or cultural merit, though it did support its retention and relocation and the method statement as revised, which the Parish Council was satisfied was adequate for the purpose.

The Ward Councillor also expressed concern about delays to the delivery of a much needed facility for the estate and the potential loss of the economic benefits and employment opportunities it would deliver. It was also of concern that the area, without the investment and regeneration, was becoming a serious crime 'hotspot', it was also a concern that if action was not taken the mural was at risk of damage.

The Applicant's agent told the Committee that

extensive research and consultation on the methodology to be used and the proposed method was the best available. The Committee heard that the proposed method would allow the developer to start work on the site sooner rather than later, it was commented that further delay would mean that the applicant could not deliver the development and would seek an alternative site and the investment in Stantonbury would not continue.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the proposals were not wholly compliant with the original conditions as set out, however, it was Officers' view that the proposals were the best achievable and would deliver the desired retention of the mural.

It was further confirmed that the applicants financial considerations were matters that the Committee should take account of, however, it was a matter for members of the Committee to determine how much weight to give them.

Councillor Brown proposed that the Officer recommendation to approve the discharge of conditions 6, 19 and 20 be agreed. This was seconded by Councillor Exon.

Some members of the Committee expressed concern that there was no information to judge whether the storage and re-erection would be adequate, Councillor Petchey proposed determination of the application be deferred to allow for a report to provide details of the re-erection proposals, to thereby consider discharging condition 21 at the same time, this was seconded by Councillor Exon.

The Principal Lawyer advised the Committee that the Committee should note that the Council could not force the applicant to submit an application in respect of the discharge of condition 21.

Councillor Bint stated that he believed that there were some breaches of planning control at the site which members were not able to consider, he

further commented that he was disappointed that conditions 20 and 21 had not been conflated at the time the application was granted following Officer advice. He stated that in hindsight he did not believe that to have been good advice, he was further concerned that advice had been given that the number of jobs that the development may or may not provide was not a matter for consideration when discharging the conditions and asked that the Chair seek to establish how advice is given that later proves to make further decisions difficult for the Committee. Councillor Bint further stated that he was disappointed that condition 20 when issued had required that no demolition be undertaken prior to the removal of the mural, however the applicant was seeking to discharge the condition having started demolition.

The Director, Growth, Economy and Culture confirmed that the Committee could discharge some or all of the conditions before them. She further told the Committee that breaches of planning control were not matters for consideration by the Committee in respect of this application at this moment in time. They will be picked up separately. It was also confirmed that whilst the issue of numbers of jobs was not a consideration it was reasonable to consider the fact that the development may not come forward if the conditions are not approved. The Director further reminded the Committee that when the conditions had been imposed, she had been instructed by the Committee to agree with the Applicant's Agent certain conditions during a recess of the committee, despite her having advised at the time that there was no need to do so. The conditions were then put to the committee and agreed. These were considered reasonable in balancing the desire of the Committee to want to approve the development, but at the same time provide protection for the mural.

Councillor Petchey confirmed his motion to defer only related to conditions 19 and 20, not condition

6.

The Committee heard from the Conservation and Archaeology Manager that the method statement submitted had been drawn up following significant discussion and was in his view satisfactory in the circumstances, the increased number of Panels proposed would allow for greater ability to move the pieces without the added risk of attempting to move larger pieces. He further told the Committee that his experience both as a Conservation Officer and as having worked with tiles and bricks was that, within the constraints of Condition 20, the method statement was reasonable and likely the best option. The Conservation and Archaeology Manager also told the Committee that he believed that whether the re-erection took place in the short term or long term there would be a need for the sections of tile to be put into some form of storage and therefore the risks of damage existed whichever option in terms of timescale was available.

On being put to the vote the motion to defer conditions 19 and 20 was lost with Councillors Exon, Petchey, Trendall and Wallis voting in Favour, Councillors Alexander, Baines, Brown, Lancaster and McLean Against and Councillors Bint and Legg abstaining from the vote.

Councillor McLean told the Committee that he did not welcome, what he perceived as a threat to halt the development by the applicant.

On being put to the vote the proposal to discharge conditions 6, 19 and 20 was carried with Councillors Alexander, Baines, Bint, Brown, Lancaster, Legg, McLean and Wallis voting in favour, Councillors Exon and Trendall Against and Councillor Petchey abstaining from the vote.

RESOLVED: -

That details pursuant to Conditions 6, 19 and 20 be approved.

**20/00653/FUL**

**CONSTRUCTION OF NEW COMMUNITY HALL AND SPORTS CHANGING ROOMS USING MODULAR CONSTRUCTION ADJACENT TO EXISTING PAVILION AT GREAT LINFORD SPORTS PAVILION, MARSH DRIVE, GREAT LINFORD FOR MR. ANDREW MORPHET, GREAT LINFORD PARISH COUNCIL.**

Councillor Petchey stood down from the Committee during consideration of this application.

The Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report.

The Committee heard from objectors who made the following points:

- A Bar or Café on the site is unnecessary and unwanted and will potentially result in noise and/or disorder.
- The permitted use until 11pm, as proposed in the conditions, will result in disturbance for residents and may result in Anti-Social behavior.
- Increased traffic and no mitigation such as traffic calming.
- The development should be on Redhouse Park where the funding is coming from.
- The average age of residents in the locality is 70 years who live in this area as it is quiet and peaceful.
- Whilst there has been consultation with residents on Redhouse Park there has been none with the residents of Great Linford.

- When Local consultation did take place in 2016 (Neighbourhood Development Plan), 83% of residents responded to say there was adequate outdoor sports facilities available and no more was required.
- There are Great Crested Newts in the Area and no mitigation has been made.
- Current use is limited to Sports the increased hours of use will mean other uses and associated disturbance for residents.
- The s106 funding being used should be directed at improving other facilities in the area rather than extending the Pavillion as proposed.

The Committee heard from the Ward Councillors who told the Committee that the facility was needed and represented an opportunity to give the wider Community facilities that are modern and fit for purpose.

There is no evidence of noise or disturbance from similar facilities in Milton Keynes, furthermore the conditions require the facility to close at 11:00pm therefore to meet that condition activities will have to cease at 10:30pm, this is something that the management team will strictly enforce.

It was also commented that it was the responsibility of the Parish Council to provide such facilities and should be supported.

The Applicant's Agent told the Committee that Milton Keynes Council had first identified the need for the facilities and had provided the s106 money. The proposal had been drawn up following exhaustive consultation with residents over 6 years.

The existing Pavillion cannot be extended or adapted and therefore the new build is required. It

has been confirmed by an independent Ecologist that there are no Great Crested Newts on the site.

The Committee heard that the proposed development was a substantial building with good insulation, the nearest residence was in excess of 40 meters away from it and buffered by landscaping. The only windows are to be located away from the residential area thus further protecting the amenity of residents. It was further confirmed that the proposal did not include either a café or a Bar.

The Planning Officer confirmed that all required consultation had been undertaken and 2 site notices placed. It was further confirmed that use of s106 funding was not a material planning consideration in these circumstances.

Councillor Brown Proposed that the Officer recommendation to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report be agreed. This was seconded by Councillor Exon.

Members of the Committee expressed support for the application recognising that the Parish Council was providing facilities that they are required to.

It was also commented that the distances from the residential area were such that it was unlikely that there would be any disturbance for residents in nearby properties.

Some concern was raised in respect of the lack of facilities on Redhouse Park which arose as a result of the phased development of the estate, and was a matter the Committee needed to be mindful of in the future.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application was carried with participating Councillors voting in favour of the application.

RESOLVED: -

That the application be granted subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report.

**20/00709/FUL**

**CONVERSION OF REDUNDANT LANDSCAPE DEPOT TO AMENITY BUILDING AND EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING SITE TO LOCATE TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION IN THE FORM OF THE BUS SHELTER, OFFICE, COMMUNAL BUILDING, KENNELS AND A BIKE SHELTER PLUS PARKING FOR 5 CARS AT MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL LANDSCAPE DEPOT, CROSSLANDS, STANTONBURY, MILTON KEYNES FOR THE BUS SHELTER MK.**

Councillor Petchey rejoined the Committee

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report.

The Committee was told that comments had been received from Environmental Health Officers since publication of the Agenda and Published update report, it was confirmed that the Environmental Health Officers had no concerns or objections in respect of noise nuisance proposals.

The Ward Councillor told the Committee that whilst in principle he supported the project he had some concern that there had not been adequate consultation with local residents to allay fears of anti-social behavior. He therefore asked that the Committee consider deferring a decision on the application until that had been undertaken.

The Applicant told the Committee that the Charity had been operating various sites for a number of years and residents were under no illusion as to what was expected of them, there had been no incidents of anti-social behaviour and a strict vetting

process was undertaken before residents were accepted.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that in addition to the statutory consultees, letters had been sent to 20 local neighbours and site notices had been posted.

The Committee heard that should the Committee feel it appropriate a personal permission could be granted to the applicant (The Bus Shelter Charity) by way of Condition.

Councillor Lancaster, responding to the request from Councillor Walker to defer the determination of the application proposed that a deferral be agreed to allow for further consultation with residents, the proposal failed to get a seconder.

Councillor Brown proposed that the Officer recommendation to grant the application subject to the conditions as detailed in the Committee report be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Exon.

Councillor Baines stated that the Bus Shelter had previously been located on his Ward and the experience was that there was no problem, this application represented the good use of a redundant site that was in a poor state.

Members of the Committee shared the views expressed.

Councillor Bint recognising that the Bus Shelter Charity had a good track record of running similar operations, proposed that an additional condition to grant the application on the basis of a 'Personal Permission' be added, this was seconded by Councillor Exon, The Chair accepted the amendment and asked that the Head of Planning be delegated to finalise the exact wording of the condition.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application subject to the conditions detailed in the Committee report together with the additional condition was carried with Councillor Lancaster abstaining from the vote and all other members of the Committee voting in favour.

RESOLVED:-

That the application be granted subject to the conditions detailed within the Committee report, together with the additional condition to require it to be a personal permission for the Bus Shelter Charity.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 21:06 PM