

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 2013

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,
M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,
T Leadley, J McKenna, N Walshaw,
J Hardy and T Murray

63 Chair's opening remarks

Whilst the intention was to hold the meeting in committee rooms 6/7, in view of the number of people in attendance for this meeting, the Chair announced that the Council Chamber would be used for the meeting and there was a short delay to enable the move to take place

The Chair then announced the sad news of the death of Councillor Suzi Armitage who had died the previous evening after a difficult illness. Councillor Taggart stated that he had known Councillor Armitage for over 30 years and that she would be greatly missed. Although not a member of Plans Panel, as this was the first meeting since her death, the Chair asked everyone to stand and to observe a minute's silence in her memory

64 Late Items

Although there were no formal late items, the Panel was in receipt of the following additional information which had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting:

- colour copies of illustrations included in the submitted reports (minutes 69, 70, 71 and 72 refer)
- a paper produced by the Director of Public Health and dated 5th February 2013, on the health impact of energy from waste plants in Leeds, in response to requests from Members that the Director of Public Health be consulted on this matter (minutes 70, 71 and 72 refer)

65 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests

66 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Blackburn. The Chair announced that although Councillor Nash had arrived for the meeting, she was not well and due to moving the meeting to the unheated Council Chamber, she had had to withdraw, with regret

67 Preliminary procedural matter

The Chair referred to a late representation which had been received from the registered speakers against both of the applications, which he read out. Concerns related to pre-determination of the applications and that the Council had a financial interest in one of the applications and therefore the Plans Panel should be dissolved

The Panel's legal adviser was asked to respond and the Head of Development and Regulatory referred to a report of the City Solicitor which had been included as an appendix to the Officer's report on application 12/02668/FU, relating to determining planning applications where the Council has a financial interest, which addressed this aspect. The report confirmed that the Council has a statutory responsibility to determine planning applications submitted to it and therefore it was appropriate for the Council and this Panel to consider the applications on the agenda. Members were also informed that the Secretary of State expected Local Planning Authorities to undertake this role. Reference was made to paragraph 3.18 of this appendix which related to the clear separation of responsibilities and matters which Panel had to have regard to

Concerning pre-determination, that was for individual Members to take a view on and that pre-determination occurred where someone has a closed mind to the matters being considered. The Panel's legal adviser stated that if any Member felt they had a disclosable pecuniary interest in the matters being considered, they should declare such an interest and take no part in the meeting, otherwise, the advice was that it was appropriate for the Panel to consider these applications

Clarity was sought that having expressed a view in the past, this did not preclude a Member from participating in the meeting, with the Head of Regulatory and Development confirming that was correct

68 Order of the meeting

The Chair stated that in view of there being two applications for similar facilities which raised some issues common to both schemes, a possible way to deal with the applications was following the Minerals, Waste and Contaminated Land Manager's report (minute 69 refers) that each of the Officer reports on the applications would be presented, followed by questions from the Panel and discussion of general issues in respect of both applications. There would then be public speaking on application 11/03705/FU, deliberations and determination of the application, with this being repeated for application 12/02668/FU

The Panel was content to proceed in this way

69 Background report to support the Strategic Waste Applications

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer which provided context for the two applications being considered at the meeting

The Minerals, Waste and Contaminated Land Manager presented the report

Members were informed that the policy context for the applications was the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (NR&WDPD) which had been adopted in January 2013

Residual waste, this being commercial, industrial and municipal waste, including mixed, damp and rotting waste was currently sent to landfill sites. As these sites were approaching capacity and due to landfill tax, alternatives had to be considered

In drafting the NR&WDPD, the amount of land needed had been considered with potential sites over 6 acres being identified and scored for their suitability. Three sites were identified as being suitable, with these being located around the Cross Green area of the city

The NR&WDPD had been examined by a Planning Inspector who confirmed that the Council's approach to this was sound, with the plan being adopted in January 2013

In terms of concerns which had been raised in respect of these two applications, the following information was provided to Members:

- regarding overprovision through there being two applications, that the Veolia site had been scaled appropriately and that the application from Biffa was for a lower tonnage
- concerning possible health impacts due to air quality, that these issues were covered in the two Officer reports and that a representative of Leeds PCT was in attendance. It was stated that an objection to the proposals on health/air quality grounds had cited paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which in fact related to noise nuisance
- on the view that incineration was not the right technology, that technology was not a planning matter but as an observation, that this method was widely used
- the implication that both decisions were needed and the justification for this given future changes in behaviour and practice – however, the Inspector agreed with the approach taken to the long term planning for residual waste
- that self-sufficiency in this matter was an insular option and ignored the sub-regional context, - however Leeds has always been self-sufficient and the Council has consulted with adjoining authorities on their proposals and that there had been support for Leeds' approach which had also been endorsed by the Inspector

In response to a question from the Panel regarding the capacity figures, Members were informed that as part of the NR&WDPD, work on existing and future levels of waste arisings was included, with a range of figures being produced. In terms of Veolia's application, the figures were scaled for the amount of waste over the period of the contract and that if the Council

achieved recycling levels of 60%, Veolia would expand its commercial and industrial collections in Leeds

RESOLVED – To note the report

70 Applications 11/03705/FU and 12/02668/FU - Energy from Waste applications - Presentation of Officer reports and discussion

In line with the procedure adopted by Panel, Planning Officers presented their reports

Application 11/03705/FU – Energy Recovery Facility (incineration of waste and energy generation, associated infrastructure and improvements to access and bridge on site of the former Skelton Grange Power Station

Further to minute 36 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 22nd November 2012, where Panel considered the latest position statement on proposals for an Energy Recovery Facility for the incineration of up to 300,000 tonnes per annum of commercial and industrial waste, with associated infrastructure and landscaping on the site of the former Skelton Grange Power Station the Principal Minerals Planner, Mr Saul, presented a further report of the Chief Planning Officer seeking determination of the application

Appended to the report were the following documents:

- a summary of the proposed conditions
- minutes relating to discussions of the proposals from Plans Panel East of 23rd February 2012; Plans Panel East of 9th August 2012 and City Plans Panel of 22nd November 2012
- information on the regulation and monitoring roles of the Environment Agency in respect of EfW facilities

Plans, graphics, historic images of the site, drawings, photographs and photo-montages from key locations were displayed at the meeting

Mr Saul presented the report and referred to the Members site visit which had taken place in November 2012 and the visits undertaken by Members to view similar facilities to that proposed and to previous deliberations on the proposals by this Panel and the former Plans Panel East

The proposal would redevelop the currently cleared site, provide a ERF, ancillary accommodation, landscaping and improvements works to the access bridge and to the Trans-Pennine trail

In terms of highways issues, there would be a separate staff/visitor entrance from that being used by the HGVs. Members' comments about the access bridge and the need to ensure the remainder of the site was not compromised had been given further consideration and the applicant had now agreed to accept a condition in respect of full widening of the bridge, strengthening works and dual access together with cycle/footpath improvements, with these works being required before occupation of the site

In respect of landscaping treatment, a formal scheme was proposed within the site, although an area of scrub land was being retained to provide a habitat for birds. An attenuation pond was also being provided and more informal planting around the periphery of the site

The design of the facility had undergone a series of revisions since the original drawings. A glass block for the offices and visitor centre provided a better balance with the main facility and was considered to be more visually appealing

Concerns were raised about the colour of the building as it appeared to Members and that it was important that the visuals presented to Panel accurately depicted how a scheme would appear on site

The view was expressed that all of the daylight images should also have been produced showing night time views to illustrate how the building, and especially the stack, would be visible at night. Officers stated that some night time images had been provided from the most prominent locations and that warning lights on the flue could be seen on these

The Panel then heard the presentation of the Officer's report on the second application on the agenda

Application 12/02668/FU – Energy Recovery Facility (with mechanical pre-treatment) for the incineration of residual municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste and associated infrastructure at land at the former Wholesale Market Site, Newmarket Approach, Cross Green Industrial Estate, LS9

Further to minute 9 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 27th September 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for an Energy Recovery Facility (with mechanical pre-treatment) for the incineration of residual municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste, with associated infrastructure on land at the former Wholesale Market site, Pontefract Lane, Cross Green, Leeds 9, the Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer seeking determination of the application

Appended to the report were the following documents:

- a summary of proposed conditions
- minutes relating to discussions of the proposals from the Plans Panel East meeting of 26th January 2012 and City Plans Panel of 27th September 2012
- a letter of representation submitted by Friends of the Earth
- a report of the City Solicitor entitled '*Determining Planning Applications where the Council has a financial interest*', which had been considered by Joint Plans Panel at its meeting held on 5th December 2012

Plans, graphics, artist's impressions, a photomontage showing the facility from key views and a model were displayed at the meeting

Ms White, Senior Minerals Planner, presented the report and stated that this application differed from the application on the former Skelton Grange site as it included front-end recycling; would cater for up to 214,000 tonnes of municipal waste per annum and a small quantity of commercial and industrial waste.

As up to a maximum of 20% of the waste would be for recycling, mechanical pre-treatment of the waste would occur to sort and separate out

waste for recycling off site, with the remaining 164,000 tonnes of residual waste going into the ERF, with electricity and energy being generated from that. Members were informed about the further information submitted by the applicant in late October 2012 pursuant to Regulation 22 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 as set out in paragraphs 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 of the submitted report

The main issues of the application were stated as being siting; potential health impacts; vehicle movements/routing and the junction arrangement on the East Leeds Link Road (ELLR), with these being detailed in the submitted report

The following key points were made:

- in terms of proximity of the facility to residential properties, the closest property would be sited 200 metres from it
- mechanical pre-treatment process and that the residual waste would be transported internally and following incineration, this waste would be transported off the site
- the landscaping being provided on the site and that a condition was proposed for a biodiversity and landscape management plan for the site
- the design of the facility and that although it would be visible great care had been taken in its design
- highways, with the applicant being asked to consider providing an all moves junction. On this matter, the Panel was informed that this had been considered but the amount of land required to achieve this, some of it being in third party ownership, was prohibitive. An alternative solution of providing traffic lights was also considered but this too would prove problematic due to the amount of land required
- that the ELLR had been designed for large scale vehicles; that further highways measures were not considered necessary and could increase the amount of carbon emissions from the road. Vehicles could be accommodated around the tight bend into the site and Highways Officers were satisfied with the proposals

The level of representations received to the application was updated and now stood at 673 individual representations. In terms of the content of these, they were largely as reported, with no new matters to comment on

Whilst some representations referred to the procurement process, this was outside of the planning remit

An error on the condition relating to hours of construction was reported with Members being informed this would be 07:00 – 19:00 hours – Monday to Friday, 07:00 – 16:00 hours – Saturday and not at any other time, with these construction hours mirroring those on the application at the former Skelton Grange site

Ms White referred to the additional information received from the PCT which had been circulated to Panel

In response to questions about the absence of night views of the facility and how possible light pollution could affect the environment, Ms White stated that the facility would be operating 24 hours a day and whilst it would give off a glow at night time due to the construction materials being used, this would

obscure glare. Unlike the other application being considered, there would not be a warning light on the stack as this would not be over 90 metres in height. It was noted that a condition was included to cover these issues

The Chief Planning Officer referred to the issues of health and emissions which were relevant to both of the applications and stated that there was more than one regime which operated at such facilities and that alongside planning controls there were controls by the Environment Agency through their licensing permits

The Panel then heard from Dr Balmer, a Public Health Consultant at Leeds PCT; Mr Bond from the Health Protection Agency (HPA) and Mr Shaw from the Environment Agency (EA) who were in attendance to provide information and to respond to questions and comments from the Panel

Dr Balmer referred to the paper produced by the Director of Public Health on the health impact of ERFs

Members were informed that air pollution in the UK was a significant issue and although there had been improvements, air pollution continued to create problems and contributed greatly to lung and heart disease and mortality rates, with air quality indicators being included in the report

Data on the air quality in Leeds was included in the additional information which had been circulated to Panel

In respect of EFW facilities, the evidence from the HPA had been examined and modelling work carried out, with the conclusion being that in terms of pollutants produced by the plant would, in the majority of cases be considered as 'non-significant' and would add very little. If approved, Leeds PCT consider that the facilities will add little to the overall burden of pollution provided they are well managed and maintained

Members commented on the following matters:

- the wording used, i.e. 'very little' or 'non significant'; that these were different and which was the correct term to be applied. Dr Balmer stated it was felt the impact would not be significant and that it could be said to be very small, i.e. not measurable
- the data in the PCT report which showed a sharp decline in pollutants in Bradford and the reasons for this. Mr Bond of the HPA stated that the graph was intended to indicate trends
- the inspection regime and whether there was confidence that any problems would be reported and enforcement action taken and how the public would be aware of what was happening at the plant

The Panel then heard from Mr Shaw, from the Environment Agency who provided the following information:

- that all data received from ERFs was on a public register, was available for public inspection and that many operators published annual reports regarding performance with some choosing to publish live data on the internet. Statistical information was available on the public register which was provided by the EA and this was also held by the Council

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether the EA would participate in a liaison committee
- the accuracy of the data being provided, whether this was tested and in terms of enforcement, the length of time taken to react to potential enforcement issues and whether possible concerns would be raised with the EA
- the need to ensure all the information was clear so people could understand the data being provided

Mr Shaw provided the following responses:

- that the EA would be willing to participate in a liaison committee
- that all of the data held by the EA was audited by specialist colleagues who were experts in monitoring and who scrutinised the methods used to ensure the data was robust and to required standards and that all operators were required to conform to that quality standard. It was also possible to send a member of the EA to collect the data, as this was a power the EA possessed
- in terms of enforcement, the response would be appropriate to the risk. If a major incident occurred, there would be an immediate response. If emissions were not complying, the EA would also respond quickly and if necessary the EA could prohibit the operation of the process by issuing a Notice
- that different limits would exist in an Environmental Permit, e.g. half hourly and daily limits together with different limits for different materials. In the event of a very short breach of, for example a carbon monoxide limit, with a very minor consequence, such a matter was more likely to be dealt with over the telephone, whereas a similar breach of a more serious chemical or a failure of equipment would be followed up immediately and that the swiftness of the response would depend on the risk to the public and the environment
- that experience showed that operators took their Environmental Permits very seriously and that it was part of their procedures to notify the EA on their 24 hour a day, 7 days a week helpline
- that the data on the public register showed the emission limits so it could be clearly seen how the actual levels compared to these

In response to a question about the poor air quality of the area around the motorway and how this compared to air quality around ERF facilities, Mr Bond of the HPA stated that as the emissions were of a different type there could be not direct comparison

The question of whether, if the applications were granted planning permission and Environmental Permits, that any future report on air quality in Leeds, - assuming there was no change in traffic pollution, - would make reference to these two facilities. The HPA representative stated that air quality was covered in the submitted reports and the Chair reiterated the comments made about the public health impacts of ERFs. It was stated that the terms 'significant' and 'non significant' were technical terms used in relation to air quality from such plants

In drawing this part of the discussion to a close, Mr Shaw stated that in some parts of the city, air quality issues were due solely to road traffic emissions; that air quality was considered by the EA and if the EA had concerns about the impact to public health and the environment, then a permit could be refused. In response to whether the facilities would be properly operated and maintained, Mr Shaw stated that whilst this was a difficult generalisation to make as there were a number of different operators and technologies, generally speaking these were well maintained and monitored; that ERFs did receive a high level of scrutiny and if there were problems, the EA could take action to address this

RESOLVED - To note the contents of the reports and discussions and to move on to consider further submissions in respect of each of the applications in order to determine them

The Panel then went on to consider the public representations in respect of application 11/03705/FU

71 Application 11/03705/FU - Energy Recovery Facility (incineration of waste and energy generation), associated infrastructure and improvements to access and bridge - Site of former Skelton Grange Power Station, Skelton Grange Road Stourton

The Chair stated his intention that for both of the applications being considered, to allow a period of up to six minutes per side to enable the speakers to make their representations to Panel

The Panel then heard representations from two objectors, Mr Rudge and Mr Fanaroff, and from Mr Harty, on behalf of the applicant who attended the meeting

Members commented on the following matters:

- the concerns raised about the lack of public consultation on this application and the lack of any legal obligation to carry out public consultation
- the design of the ERF, that some local concerns remained about this and whether this could be given further consideration in view of its visibility from a wide area
- the possibility of local people benefitting from the energy which could be generated through lower fuel bills
- the possibility of the applicant publishing statistical data on its website
- the community benefit fund. On this point the Chief Planning Officer stated that this offer was voluntary and could not be considered when reaching a decision on the application
- the possibilities of reduced costs to Leeds businesses through the £80 landfill gate fee not being passed to customers
- highways costs associated with the development
- the lack of a response to the proposals from the West Yorkshire Fire Authority and the explanation for this

- the colour of the building
- the extent of the benefits for the local community and that more could have been expected from the applicant
- the reasons for identifying three sites for possible waste management facilities
- the commitment to local employment and whether the phrase 'best endeavours' could be strengthened
- that rather than the standard approach whereby if the S106 Agreement was not completed within 3 months, the final determination of the application be deferred to the Chief Planning Officer, that in this case the application should be returned to Panel for determination

The following responses were provided:

- that further consideration could be given to the design and colour of the building
- that the point of gate fees was to discourage landfill and that the ERF would lead to reduced waste removal costs for Leeds businesses
- that data from the ERF could be published on the applicant's website
- that Officers had consulted West Yorkshire Fire Service several times on both of the applications. On this point, Mr Shaw, of the EA stated that there was a requirement for operators to have an emergency plan, although due to the nature of the proposed operation, the risk of an fire incident escalating on the site was low
- that some off-site improvements were being delivered as part of the scheme and that there would also be the closure of the existing landfill site, which was another significant benefit
- that several sites had been considered in order to provide choice, rather than settling on one site which might not have proved to be available, therefore three sites had been selected as being suitable
- that a commitment to use 'best endeavours' was the strongest term which could be used in the S106 agreement

The Chair stated that in the event of a significant changes arising with the application, Section 106 Agreement and conditions, then it would be returned to Panel

Having regard to the contents of the discussions detailed in minutes 69 and 70 above, and the additional paper submitted by the Director of Public Health; the reports and presentations, the Panel

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate the application to the Chief Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions outlined in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (which may also include other conditions as deemed necessary), further consideration of the design and colour of the ERF and an agreement to provide statistical data from the ERF on the internet and following completing of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

Transport

- travel plan fees and monitoring
- routing of HGVs between Gelderd Road MRF and Skelton Grange ERF
- routing management plan for other HGVs including Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) vehicles
- contribution towards bus stop improvements on Pontefract Road, including real-time information
- contribution towards pedestrian crossing equipment and an 'all-red' phase of the signals at junction of Skelton Grange Road and Pontefract Road

Public Rights of Way

- cycle path and footpath provision linking the Trans Pennine Trail – across bridge and along edge of access road to a point level with the site access
- Trans Pennine Trail improvements (and maintenance) including first phase of alternative route along northern river bank and re-engineered ramp access

Biodiversity

- Integrated landscape and ecological management plan
- off site ecological works at Lagoon 21 of Skelton Grange Landfill
- off site planting and maintenance – planting between site boundary and river and within ramp loop linking Trans Pennine Trail and the bridge

Closure of Skelton Landfill

- cessation of importation of waste to Skelton Grange Landfill within six months of first acceptance of waste at Skelton ERF

Local employment

- applicants to use best endeavours to employ people from application wards and those adjoining

Community Liaison

- the formation of a community liaison group comprising representatives of the local community, local Councillors. Environment Agency and Local Planning Authority

Community Fund

- a voluntary community/environmental project fund equivalent to £0.30 per tonne of waste received at the site. Submission of scheme required to detail administering of fund – to relate to Burmantofts and Richmond Hill, City and Hunslet, Beeston and Holbeck, Temple Newsam, Rothwell and Garforth and Swillington wards. Fund to be index linked (Panel Members were advised that this was not material to the determination of the application)

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission the final determination

of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer unless a significant issue arises, whereby the application be returned to Panel for determination

72 Application 12/02668/FU - Energy Recovery Facility (with mechanical pre-treatment) for the incineration of residual municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste and associated infrastructure at land at the former Wholesale Market Site, Newmarket Approach, Cross Green Industrial Estate LS9

Prior to hearing the public representations on this application, Councillor P Gruen withdrew from the meeting

The Panel then heard representations from two objectors, Mr Rudge and Mr Fanaroff, and from Mr Hollands on behalf of the applicant who attended the meeting

Members commented on the following matters:

- the research on the health effects of waste incinerators, referred to by an objector and that this information had not been seen by Panel. On this point Members were directed to page 155 of the submitted report, paragraphs 10.6.10 – 10.6.11, which made reference to this information and provided the HPA's evaluation of it. The Chair questioned Dr Balmer on whether the research referred to by the objector had extracted all other possible causes and attributed the findings to incinerators. Dr Balmer stated that the HPA, having considered the report, maintained its position that well regulated and well maintained incinerators contributed little
- the pollutants which were alleged to exist in the area and what action would be taken. Mr Shaw of the EA stated that as part of the permitting process, all pollutants in the area would be examined. If it was felt the proposed facility would be harmful to the environment or human health, a permit would not be issued. In respect of the issue raised at the meeting about the presence of Chromium, this would be investigated without delay
- the commitment to local jobs
- local concerns about air quality and whether comparisons of this were made before and after a plant opened
- the absence of solar panels on the building and the reason for this
- the need to consider the role of the EA in the regulation of these facilities; that standards were in place and monitoring undertaken and that therefore Members should have a degree of reassurance, although there was an issue about the tipping point and that if high level of pollutants were in existence in the area and that the emissions from the ERF added to that, this could be problematic but that a degree of trust was needed in

the agencies which had responsibility for monitoring such matters

- that Panel had considered the application in detail; that in other European countries, incineration was not controversial and that doing nothing was not an option

The following responses were provided:

- regarding local employment, that a range of approaches, including working with the Council was being used to target the local community and devise the best ways in which to train people in different roles, for example waste management and HGV driving
- air quality issues; that the applicant had a complaints register so if concerns were raised they could be addressed and ERFs had to satisfy Environmental Health and the EA. The applicant also published data and retained video footage of what was expelled from the stack
- in respect of the provision of solar panels on the building, this had been considered but in terms of pay back, solar panels did not deliver in this case and therefore they would not be cost effective for the city

The Panel considered how to proceed

In view of the alleged existence of a pollutant in the area, it was suggested that the EA report on this before final determination of the application. The Chief Planning Officer stated that these were two separate issues; the EA would investigate the matter which had been raised but the LPA had to deal with the application on its merits

Having regard to the contents of the discussions detailed in minutes 69 and 70 above and the additional paper submitted by the Director of Public Health, the reports and presentations, the Panel

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate the application to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions outlined in Appendix A of the submitted report (which may also include other conditions as deemed necessary) and following completing on a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

1. highway improvements to Newmarket Approach to include resurfacing and improved layout
2. cycle path to be provided on Newmarket Approach linking Pontefract Lane with existing cycle path to north
3. HGV Lorry Routing Strategy to be provided
4. Travel Plan Fees to be paid and monitoring required
5. Green Corridor Landscaping Scheme to be provided along western boundary of Newmarket Lane
6. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be provided to ensure extended aftercare to site
7. Local Employment – applicants to use best endeavours to employ people from application ward and those adjoining
8. Formation of a Community Liaison Group comprising representatives of local community, local Councillors, Environment Agency and Local Planning Authority

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer unless a significant issue arises, whereby the application be returned to Panel for determination

73 Date and Time of Next Meeting

14th March 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds