
PLANNING COMMITTEE 15/10/18

Present: Councillor Elwyn Edwards – Chair

Councillors: Stephen Churchman, Louise Hughes, Anne Lloyd Jones, Berwyn Parry Jones, Eric M Jones, Huw G. Wyn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, Edgar Wyn Owen, Cemlyn Williams, Eirwyn Williams, Catrin Wager, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams.

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), John Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Lowri Haf Evans (Member Support Officer).

Apologies: None to note

1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

(a) The following members declared a personal interest in the following items for the reasons noted:

- Councillor Gruffydd Williams, in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda (planning application number C18/0614/43/LL) as he was the applicant's son.
- Councillor Owain Williams, in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C18/0614/43/LL) as he was the owner of the site.
- Councillor Berwyn Parry Jones, in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda (planning application number C18/0744/23/R3) as he was friends with the landowner.

The Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the items noted.

(b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:

- Councillor Gruffydd Williams, (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.1 on the agenda, (planning application number C18/0614/43/LL);
- Councillor Aled Wyn Jones, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C18/0614/43/LL);
- Councillor Dewi Roberts, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application number C18/0715/39/LL);
- Councillor Gareth Griffith, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.5 on the agenda (planning application number C18/0614/43/LL);

The Members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussion on the applications in question and did not vote on these matters.

2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee, that took place on 24 September 2018, as a true record.

3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development. Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and policy aspects.

RESOLVED**1. Application Number C18/0023/42/LL – TY'N PWLL COTTAGE, LÔN TY'N PISTYLL, NEFYN**

Demolish existing storage unit and build two holiday units (amended application)

Attention was drawn to the additional observations.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background to the application, reminding members that a decision had been made at the Committee meeting on 25 June to defer the decision in order to receive additional information about the cumulative impact of holiday units in the locality. It was reiterated that the application involved demolishing an existing shed and constructing two single-storey holiday units. It was noted that an amended report had been distributed to members.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that Policy TWR 2 of the LDP supported the development of new permanent holiday accommodation with services, or self-serviced ones, to convert existing buildings into such accommodation or to extend existing holiday accommodation establishments.

Reference was made to the additions to the amended report drawing specific attention to paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 that related to additional information submitted by the agent along with information gathered by planning officers that responded to the Committee's concern about the cumulative impact of holiday accommodation developments. It was highlighted that these paragraphs explained that holiday homes and holiday accommodation were not considered to be the same thing in planning terms; therefore, it was very difficult to consider holiday homes when assessing the cumulative impact of holiday accommodation. Reference was made to information in the report that had been provided by the Council's Taxation Unit regarding the number of holiday accommodation units in the Nefyn district (which included Nefyn, Morfa Nefyn and Edern). Members were reminded that matters such as visual and general amenities and transport had already been discussed; therefore, specific attention was only drawn to additional information. The cumulative impact of holiday units in this area was only 3.8%.

- (b) Exercising his right to speak, the Local Member noted the following main points:
- That Councillors of bordering wards shared his concerns
 - There was no clear difference between the meaning of holiday homes and holiday units. The definition was no longer clear following the tax increase (up to 50%).
 - A substantial increase was seen in holiday homes being converted into holiday units in order to avoid paying tax and to take advantage of TWR 2 to construct more holiday units in gardens.
 - A Holiday Home was a Holiday Home, namely a house that was unavailable for local people but associated with increasing market prices that prevented local people from living in their native areas.
 - There were many more than what had been included in the report - Officers had not included an additional 318 holiday homes within the district and they had not considered the relationship of the neighbouring village of Pistyll with Nefyn or the Natural Retreats development.
 - Static caravans had not been considered.
 - This created a detrimental impact on the use of the Welsh language. The number of Welsh speakers had decreased since the previous census.
 - Was there a real need for additional units?
 - What was excess? A clear figure was required before implementing TWR 2.

- An additional two did not seem to be a lot; but two, every so often, would increase the numbers.
- Nothing prevented the applicant from stating that the business units were unviable, and therefore, a condition could be removed and the houses sold on the open market - too easy to remove conditions.
- The broader picture had to be examined.

(c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application on the grounds of excess.

The seconder suggested the use of TWR 2.5 as a reason for refusal - excess. A question was asked whether or not the business was viable. It was highlighted that the Ty'n Pwll business plan referred to other holiday homes nearby, which suggested that the business would take business away from others, which could be evidence of excess. When considering planning guidelines relating to the identified field, it was recommended that a better definition of excess should be obtained following a period of consultation.

(ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- It was a zinc hut - how many were there in our areas that could not be adapted under TWR 2?
- Excess - Demand and need? No need here.
- Playing on words by differentiating between holiday homes and holiday accommodation.
- Lack of clear definition created a very worrying situation.
- Holiday units were being managed.
- Visitors brought benefit to the local economy.
- If refused on grounds of excess, what would the situation be if the application were referred to an appeal?

(d) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Manager noted that he acknowledged the arguments of the Local Member along with the observations of the proposer and the seconder in terms of 'holiday' density - he noted that there was a need to be clear when considering the definition. He emphasised that it was an application for holiday accommodation and not an application for a permanent house. Should the application be approved, a usual condition would be included to restrict use to holiday use only. He referred to the latest submitted statistics which corresponded to the definition of holiday accommodation within the district. In terms of the planning officers, he noted that the definition, the numbers, and the recommendation were accurate and robust. Members were forewarned that refusing would entail a risk of appeal and costs to the Council, and if the decision were to go against the recommendation, the proposer and seconder would have to lead the Council's defence in the appeal with the support of officers.

In response to an observation regarding a robust definition of a holiday home / holiday accommodation, he highlighted that the law defined what a house was; thus, should the definition need to be changed, lobbying would be required to seek an adjustment.

In response to an observation that a robust definition of excess did not exist and that, therefore, it was a matter for the Committee to determine whether or not an application was excessive, the Senior Planning Manager reiterated that the Committee had to consider the statistics presented.

A registered vote was called on the recommendation and over a quarter of the Members present voted in favour of this.

In accordance with the Procedural Rules, the following vote was recorded on the recommendation:-

In favour (7)

Councillors Berwyn Parry Jones, Eric Merfyn Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, Catrin Wager, Eirwyn Williams and Owain Williams

Against (4)

Councillors Stephen Churchman, Anne Lloyd-Jones, Edgar Owen and Cemlyn Williams

Abstaining (1)

Councillor Louise Hughes

RESOLVED to refuse the application.

Reasons - excess - use TWR 2.5 as a reason for refusal

2. Application Number C18/0614/43/LL – GWYNUS CARAVAN PARK AND GOLF COURSE, PISTYLL, PWLLHELI

Extend the surface of the site to site 5 additional holiday caravans on field 470, retain the temporary service access and extend it for the additional units, erect a 1.2m earthen clawdd along the northern and western boundaries of field 410, change the layout of five caravans approved under application number C15/0495/43/LL, and relocate a septic tank

Attention was drawn to the additional observations received

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background to the application, and noted that this was an application to upgrade and extend an existing caravan site. The application included a proposal to upgrade the ten existing static caravans to holiday cabins and to relocate them to a section of the existing golf course. Approval had been given in 2015 to relocate 5 static caravans to the golf course whilst the other 5 would be relocated within existing boundaries. The proposal also included retaining the temporary service road that had received approval as part of application C15/0495/43/LL and extending it to serve the additional units, erecting a 1.2m earthen clawdd along the northern and western boundaries of the site and relocating a septic tank.

It was noted that there was extensive planning history to the site and, when the C15/0495/43/LL application was approved, it had been for the whole site. It was reiterated that this had been of assistance to rationalise all historical applications on the site. The site was situated in the countryside and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It was also within the Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

It was highlighted that a number of policies within the Local Development Plan (LDP) were relevant when determining the application. The main policy to consider when assessing the principle of the development was policy TWR 3. It was noted that the policy permitted small extensions to the site's surface area and /or relocating units from prominent locations to less prominent locations subject to compliance with criteria.

Permission had been granted in application C15/1495/43/LL to extend the current site to 3565 square metres while the existing application requested an extension to the site so that it would take up a total of 7658 square metres. This would be an increase of nearly 43% to the size of the site, based on its size prior to the 2015 permission. Reference was made to the need to relocate a sewerage treatment tank but there was no reason to extend the site in order to locate the sewerage treatment tank.

When considering the reasons, the question was whether to consider the proposal as an extension at all. There was no physical connection between the element of the existing holiday park and the proposed location, and it was proposed to create a wholly separate access and track. It appeared that the relocation would lead to a whole new site. Policy TWR 3 did not support establishing new static caravan sites within the AONB. It was considered that the plan approved in 2015 had been an appropriate compromise to allow the extension of the current site in order to relocate.

It was highlighted that a number of vacant spaces would appear with no explanation for use of the vacant space except as an informal play area.

Concern had been expressed by the AONB Unit in terms of extending the site surface and siting five additional caravans on it. It had been previously noted that the proposed location would be more visible than the existing static caravan site; but, in relation to permission C15/0495/43/LL, it was not considered that relocating five other units to this site would cause substantial harm to the character of the AONB.

The recommendation was to refuse the application.

- (b) Exercising his right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- Work on the 2015 proposal had commenced.
 - NRW had stated the logic for moving the septic tank and had submitted an explanatory note.
 - There was no clear definition of 'small development'.
 - There was no visual impact.
 - The caravan site was now part of the area's character.
 - The applicant's intention was to improve the quality of the site.
 - These were holiday cabins and not caravans.
 - The access permitted in 2015 for touring caravans was unsafe; there was, therefore, a need to move it in order to ensure visitor safety.
 - Policy TWR 3 was irrelevant.
- (c) Exercising his right to speak, the Local Member noted the following main points:
- It was an application to move the static caravans closer together - siting them separately was not ideal for visitors.
 - It was not an application to increase the number of caravans, simply to upgrade facilities so that there was more room for decking areas and visitor car parking.
 - Moving the static caravans closer together would place the children's play area in the centre of the site and such a resource was nowadays expected.
 - There was a need to raise standards to ensure success.
 - The site was not visible - the site could be seen from a small part of a rural road - one would have to look very carefully to identify it.
 - The site should be preserved for future generations - a need to ensure livelihood.
 - Surface area was increased because land would be converted back into green space.
 - The needs of site users would be met.
 - There were no objections to the application.
 - Over 200 trees had been planted.

- It was a major scheme to improve the provision and upgrade facilities for the future.
- There was a need to support local people.

(ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation.

(d) In response to a question about holding discussions if the intention was to improve the site, the Planning Manager noted that the applicant had not requested pre-application advice.

(dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- The applicant was not requesting an extension to the site - he was responding to visitors' demands as raising standards was vitally important.
- More land needed to be used to ensure improvements.
- Accepted that the application in question was for a small extension, but what would the next step / or the next application seek?
- There was no need to destroy the AONB - needed to be protected.
- Improvements could be undertaken by following the 2015 planning permission.

(e) In response to some of the observations, the Senior Planning Manager noted that the development was not a minor extension and, therefore, consistency had to be ensured when making decisions across the County. He reiterated that the application did not comply with policies.

RESOLVED to refuse the application.

Reason: The proposal was not deemed a small extension to the site surface and it would involve relocating all static units from the existing site to the extended site leaving the existing static caravan site empty and, in reality, it was considered that this would do nothing to improve the design, layout or appearance of the site or its position in the landscape; therefore, the proposal was considered to be contrary to part 3i and vi of Policy TWR 3 of the LDP.

3. Application Number C18/0715/39/LL – 68, CAE DU ESTATE, ABERSOCH, PWLLHELI

Two-storey dormer extension, dormer window and balcony to the front and single-storey front extension to existing garage and external alterations to the property.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations received.

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background to the application and noted that it was an application for the erection of a two-storey dormer extension to square off the front of the house, to install a dormer window and balcony to the front along with a single-storey front extension to the area of the existing connecting garage. It was explained that the property stood on a slope in a row of residential houses, in the corner of the fairly modern Cae Du Estate cul de sac and parallel to the traditional Cae Du farmhouse.

The property in question was a dormer bungalow which was of slightly different design to the remaining dormer houses in the row, which already had front balconies above integrated garages. It was noted that the proposal would involve filling the south eastern corner to square off the house with a two-storey gable end dormer extension, and install a dormer window and balcony to the front. Although gables were not a common feature in the row in question, there were elements of glass gables in houses in the cul de sac parallel to

it within the Estate; therefore, it was not an entirely alien feature in the vicinity. It was noted that the rest of the houses in the row had front balconies and were a common and very prominent feature in the design of houses on the estate, therefore, there was no significant concern regarding the addition.

It was accepted that the house was visible from a distance due to its elevated position; however, bearing in mind that the design of the existing house was different from the rest of the row and the fact that there were views of it in a built-up context amongst houses of various designs, it was considered that the appearance would not have a significant impact on the street-scene or on the AONB landscape.

In the context of general and residential matters, it was highlighted that objections had been received from neighbours on the grounds of issues such as overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and loss of light. Due to the angle of the layout of the property, it was considered that the new front windows would not directly face Cae Du Farm. It was noted that the side windows of the proposal would be changed from bedroom windows to small bathroom windows; therefore, in this respect, it was an improvement for objectors on both sides, to what was experienced at present.

Due to differences in the level of the land, the property to the front of the application site, namely the 67 Cae Du bungalow, was on a much lower level and only the building's roof was visible from the application site; therefore, the vastness of the front windows or balcony would not compromise their privacy. Views from the balcony would overlook open gardens and the *cul de sac's* estate road and over the roof of the house to the front. Due to the setting of the house to the north of the Cae Du Farm property, and the sun's path, it was considered that there were no grounds to the assumption that the extension would overshadow their property either.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable for approval in terms of design, visual and general amenities and transport, and that it complied with the requirements of relevant policies.

- (b) Exercising his right to speak, the Local Member, who objected to the application, noted the following main points:
- Historically, local people and visitors had lived alongside each other on the estate but the balance had shifted substantially as a result of market prices. It seemed that there were many holiday homes on the estate now and that many of them carried out modifications in order to add value and generate profit.
 - Parking concerns on the estate due to the number of visitors. Policy TRA 2 had to be considered.
 - A number of visitors in each dwelling throwing parties in the houses and had purchased food and drink in advance - this did not benefit the local economy.
 - Neighbours lost natural lighting.
 - PS19 had not been fully considered.
 - No consideration had been given to PS1 on the impact on the Welsh language.
 - He was already receiving complaints regarding a lack of recycling on the estate.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit.

RESOLVED to arrange a site visit.

4. Application Number C18/0744/23/LL - LAND NEAR CIBYN INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, CAERNARFON

Creation of a new car park, access, street lighting along with associated engineering works.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application and noted that it was a full application to create a park and share facility for the construction work of the Wylfa power station. It was noted that the facility would accommodate approximately 153 vehicles which included parking for the disabled, electric vehicles and motor bikes.

Reference was made to the relevant policies noted in the report. It was reported that the public consultation period had ended and that one objection had been received on the grounds that the proposed bypass and car park would have a detrimental impact on the Fferm Bodrual holiday accommodation business.

In terms of the principle of the development and that the site was located adjacent to, but outside, the Caernarfon development boundary as included in the LDP, policy PCYFF1 along with policies PS12 and PS9 would apply in this instance. Having considered these policies, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in principle given that the Local Development Plan permitted such a development on this parcel of land along with the fact that its location opposite the industrial estate was crucial given its proximity and accessibility to the local roads network that would serve Wylfa.

Although the site was located in the countryside, in the context of visual amenities it was considered that the impact of the bypass would be much greater and broader than the impact of the car park on the local landscape given its design, the landscape plan and the scale of the proposal compared with the design and scale of the bypass.

In the context of residential and general amenities, it had already been noted that an objection had been received from the occupants of Fferm Bodrual which was located approximately 100m from the application site. In the context of the application, it was considered that creating a car park next to an industrial estate and to the west of a new bypass would not create a significant increase in noise disturbance and that it would not lead to loss of privacy given the distance between the application site and the property/holiday accommodation, along with the fact that the bypass would be located between the two sites.

- (b) When considering highway matters, the need to update this consideration was highlighted as Welsh Government had confirmed that they had no objection to the application, subject to including an appropriate condition.

It was reiterated that the recommendation had been modified to delegate the right to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to receiving favourable observations from Natural Resources Wales and imposing additional conditions.

In response to a question, the officer highlighted that the car park would be available to the public should Wylfa not go ahead.

- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- (ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- Concern regarding the security of parking cars in the car park for a long period.
 - On-site management and supervision was required to deter travellers.
 - Park and Share facility was welcomed.
 - There was a local need for the provision.
 - Provision for electric vehicles was welcomed.

- Was there justification for developing outside the boundary?
- There was no certainty that Wylfa would go ahead.
- Who would fund the initiative in light of difficult cuts by the Authority?

(d) In response to a question about the security plan of the site given that it was located in an open area, and whether CCTV was part of that plan, officers noted that it would be possible to add a note for the developer to act upon.

In response to management plans, it was assumed that the Transportation Unit had considered this when submitting the application.

In response to an observation that the development was outside the development boundary, it was noted that there was justification for this as the principle and location were acceptable.

In response to an observation about the Wylfa development, it was noted that Wylfa had sped up the process and, although there was uncertainty regarding the impact of Wylfa on Gwynedd, it was anticipated that this provision would meet local need.

In response to an observation regarding the cost and funding of the initiative, it was highlighted that these were not material considerations for the application.

RESOLVED to delegate the right to the Senior Planning Officer to approve the application subject to receiving favourable observations from Natural Resources Wales.

Conditions:

1. **Five years.**
2. **Comply with the plans.**
3. **Welsh Water condition regarding the disposal of surface water from the site.**
4. **Act in accordance with the recommendations of the Ecological Impacts Assessment.**
5. **The landscaping shall be undertaken in the next planting season following the completion of development and shall be maintained thereafter.**

Note to the applicant to ensure site security.

5. Application Number C18/0780/20/LL – FFERM PLAS LLANFAIR, FFORDD CAERNARFON, Y FELINHELI

(a) Siting of 4 seasonal holiday accommodation units in the form of shepherds' huts together with a shower hut (amended application from that refused under reference C18/0393/20/LL).

Attention was drawn to the additional observations received.

The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application and noted that it was a full application for the siting of four seasonal holiday accommodation units in the form of shepherds' huts together with a shower hut. It was reiterated that the proposal would also entail the planting of trees and shrubs together with the creation of a parking area. It was highlighted that the application was an amendment to the plan refused in June 2018 under delegated rights where the holiday units were sited in a row within the application site. The huts would be sited in a semi-circular formation in the amended plan.

It was explained that the site was on a parcel of land in a corner of an agricultural field, with unobstructed views toward the Menai Strait (a Special Area of Conservation) and Anglesey (with the banks of the Menai Strait within its AONB). Access would be gained to the site from a private roads network. It was noted that agricultural land and the residential dwellings

of Llanfair Hall were located to the north of the site and open agricultural land and the dwelling of Llanfair Old Hall were located to the south.

It was reported that the principle of establishing new, temporary holiday accommodation was included in Policy TWR 5 of the Local Development Plan. It was reiterated that such developments were approved if compliance with a number of criteria could be secured. The proposed development was required to be of high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance, and located in an unobtrusive location. Despite being located in the corner of the field, such a development on a parcel of land, which by its nature and character was open, would be an obtrusive development in the landscape and would create structures that were incompatible with the open landscape.

Historically, it had been noted that this part of the landscape would have been identified as park land with an open character and nature, and although there were other developments locally, these were on a domestic scale rather than within the open landscape.

Having considered the nature and amended layout of the holiday accommodation units, the parking bays, the associated equipment and the introduction of human activities of a tourist nature to the landscape, the cumulative effect of these elements of the development would still be akin to creating an obtrusive development in the local landscape. Any ancillary facility should be located in an existing building or, should this not be possible, that any new facility should be commensurate with the scale of the development. It was considered that adding the washing and toilet structure to the four holiday units would not be commensurate with the scale of the development since it would increase the density of the units on site by 20%.

Policy PS14 of the Local Development Plan also reflected the aims of Policy TWR5 based on the scale and protection of visual amenities. Although the site was located in the corner of an open field on the coast near the banks of the Menai Strait, Members were reminded that although the nearby area had not been recognised or designated as a special landscape and that the development would not have a substantial impact on the Anglesey Coast AONB, it was considered that the proposal would continue to have a detrimental impact on the character and feel of the local landscape/park land as it would create an intrusive development in a rural landscape.

In the context of residential and general amenities, a number of objections had been received to the application many of which included disturbance and noise. It was considered that the site could currently be described as having a rural, quiet and tranquil character and feel. Siting holiday accommodation units on this parcel of land would inevitably disturb the quiet character of this part of the rural landscape and would undermine the residential and general amenities of nearby occupants on the grounds of noise/voice disturbance, outside activities and movement of cars. In the context of visual amenities, concern had been expressed by local residents about the impact of the proposal on visual aspects and amenities of the landscape.

In the context of road safety, it was considered that there would not be a substantial increase in traffic using the private driveways and the entrance to the nearby class III county road. The Transportation Unit had no concern about the impact of the proposal on road safety subject to the creation of an additional passing place near the application site.

Having considered all material planning matters including local and national policies and guidance, together with the objections and observations received, the proposal was considered to be acceptable neither in principle nor based on its detrimental impact on visual amenities nor the detrimental impact of the proposed development on residential and general amenities of nearby residents.

- (b) Exercising his right to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- This was an enterprise to diversify in light of the uncertain future of agriculture

- The shepherds' huts would be of a traditional design.
 - Siting the huts in a semi-circular formation would reduce visual impact.
 - Huts would be on wheels and, therefore, it would be possible to move them during the winter.
 - There would not be any substantial impact on the setting of Llanfair Hall listed buildings and no substantial impact on views from these buildings.
 - Accepted the need to create an additional passing place.
 - A personal enterprise that would secure the farm's future.
- (c) Exercising his right to speak, the Local Member noted that he was supportive of the application and he expressed the following main points:
- The applicant had had an opportunity to re-examine the application following a decision to refuse in June and that the huts had now been relocated.
 - Officers' photographs did not show the site clearly.
 - There were dense trees between the site and Llanfair Hall.
 - The proposal involved seasonal, moveable huts.
 - The applicant lived on site.
 - The proposal was not contrary to policies.
 - The conservation office had not refused.
 - The concerns of Llanfair Hall were accepted but waste management arrangements had been considered.
 - Small development.
- (ch) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Manager noted that the main matters for recommending refusal were concerns regarding the impacts on visual and general amenities. He reiterated that the application had acceptable elements.
- (d) It was proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit.

RESOLVED to arrange a site visit.

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 2.45pm.

CHAIR