



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held in the Conference Hall, Brent Civic Centre on Wednesday 19 April 2023
at 6.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Kelcher (Chair), Councillor S Butt (Vice Chair) and Councillors Akram, Begum, Collymore, Dixon, Mahmood and Maurice.

1. Apologies for Absence and Clarification of Alternate Members

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Rajan-Seelan. Councillor Collymore was present as an alternate member.

2. Declarations of interests

None.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 8 February 2023 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

4. Point of Order

At this stage in proceedings the Chair advised that he had agreed to vary the order of business on the agenda. This was to enable the consideration of Agenda Item 5 (Application 22/4030-62 & 62 A-D Salusbury Road, London, NW6) as the first item. The minutes reflect the order in which the items were heard at the meeting.

5. 22/4030 - 62 & 62 A-D Salusbury Road, London, NW6

PROPOSAL

Change of use of ground floor residential unit to commercial (Use Class E) with single storey rear and side extension, rear dormer windows and 3 front rooflights to convert loft into a self contained dwelling, alteration to shop front and provision for cycle storage.

RECOMMENDATION~:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as detailed in the report.

- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee.

Lena Summers, Planning Officer, South Area Planning Team introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the subject property was a two-storey terraced property located on the eastern side of Salusbury Road, bordering the Queens Park Conservation Area and was not a listed building. The existing property was situated within Queens Park Town Centre and contained residential units and Class E use. It was confirmed that 26 objections had been received.

The Chair sought clarification as to whether the small site policy was applicable to the proposed development with officers confirming that the proposed development was in accordance with Brents Local Plan Policy BH4 in relation to small sites and small housing developments in Brent.

As no further questions were raised by members at this point, the Chair invited Ms Deborah Curtiss (objector) to address the Committee (online) in relation to the application. Ms Curtiss introduced herself as a resident of 62 Salusbury Road before proceeding to highlight the following key points:

- Ms Curtiss advised that she did not take issue with the ground floor of the building being altered to commercial use with the proviso that it was not let to a business that would invite excessive noise and disturbance to the area, such as a restaurant or bar.
- It was felt that it was unnecessary for the outside space to the rear of the building to be included in the proposed development, the Committee were advised that part of the outside space had been allocated to Ms Curtiss by the previous landlord which she had utilised as private decked space for approximately 30 years.
- Concerns were shared in relation to the potential noise pollution that could be created by the proposed air source heat pump and air conditioning unit, that would be located underneath Ms Curtiss's bedroom window.
- Ms Curtiss queried the validity of the application to re provide the dwelling space that would be lost, given that the conversion of the loft space to create a dwelling could only be made possible by covering a skylight into Ms Curtiss's apartment which would contravene her lease, therefore the viability of being able to re- provide the dwelling was felt to be questionable.
- In summary, whilst the concerns expressed were not in relation to the proposed revised commercial space on the ground floor, it was felt the proposed extension, skylights and outdoor space would create the potential for noise and light pollution that it was felt would impact local wildlife and could cause a nuisance for existing residents.

- It was felt some of the issues raised could be mitigated by the development not including the outdoor space at the rear and by ensuring there were no opening dormer windows to the side or rear of the property, as well as exploring restricted use of the commercial space and opening hours.

The Chair thanked Ms Curtiss for her contribution to the meeting before asking the Committee if they had any questions or points of clarity to raise with Ms Curtiss in relation to the information heard. The Committee had one point of clarification in relation to the issue of Ms Curtiss's skylight being blocked by the proposed rear loft extension to create a new dwelling. In response, Ms Curtiss confirmed that her landlord was aware that the construction of the dwelling would contravene Ms Curtiss's lease by reducing light into her apartment. As no further questions were raised by the Committee the Chair proceeded to invite Ms Evanthe Blandy (objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Ms Blandy introduced herself as a local resident and thanked Planning Officers for noting the letters of objections provided in relation to the proposed application, before proceeding to highlight the following key points:

- Ms Blandy echoed the concerns raised by the previous objector in relation to the negative impact of the proposed development on wildlife and neighbouring residents due to intrusive light and noise emanating from the rear of the commercial site into the courtyard area.
- Concerns were raised specifically in relation to the level of noise that would be created if the public were able to use the courtyard via the commercial unit. It was noted that there was no precedent along the Salusbury Road for any commercial unit that allowed the public outdoor use of a commercial property bordering residential units. It was felt the Committee should remain cognizant of this setting an unwanted precedent, if approved.
- It was felt that light pollution could be an issue for existing residents and local wildlife and biodiversity, it was noted that it was difficult to ascertain how much of an issue this could be as there was no confirmed business of the commercial unit yet, therefore it was not possible to assess and understand the impacts and how to mitigate them.
- In summarising the concerns raised Ms Blandy requested that conditions to remove direct access to the courtyard space by visiting members of the public were considered to mitigate additional light and noise nuisance, along with the doors and windows that would open to the courtyard area from the commercial unit to be sealed to manage the risk of noise nuisance.

The Chair thanked Ms Blandy for her representation and invited Committee members to raise any queries or clarifying points they may have. Members sought clarity on the business hours of neighbouring commercial units and the location of the windows and skylights of the proposed rear of the development that Ms Blandy suggested should be sealed to manage potential noise nuisance. The following responses were provided:

- In relation to the query raised by the Committee regarding the business hours of nearby commercial units, Ms Blandy advised the Committee that there was a broad range of businesses with varying uses and business hours.

- In response to the query in relation to the location of the proposed windows and skylights to the side and rear of the development the preference would be for these to remain sealed in order to limit their impact. A CGI image of the proposed rear of the development was provided by officers to inform the context of the location. the Committee were able to see from the CGI that the skylights and windows extended into the courtyard area.

The Chair thanked Ms Blandy for responding to the Committee's questions. As there were no further questions for Ms Blandy, the Chair invited Councillor Nerva (Ward Councillor) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Councillor Nerva introduced himself as the local Ward Councillor and declared that he was a member of the Queens Park area Residents Association, before advising that he had been contacted by both resident objectors who had spoken against the application, however he had not been contacted by the developer. Councillor Nerva went on to highlight the following comments:

- It was felt that the Committee should be mindful that whilst the site was not currently located in the recognised Queens Park Conservation Area it had been included for consideration as part of an extension currently being sought to the Conservation Area,
- The frontage of the buildings had not been altered for approximately 130 years; it was felt that if planning permission was given that there should be conditions included to ensure that the frontage was improved and in keeping with the surrounding area.
- Concerns were shared that granting planning permission for the conversion development could set an unwanted precedent.
- Support for the mitigations suggested by the previous objectors which he felt would be effective in managing the concerns raised.
- In closing his comments Councillor Nerva highlighted the borough wide housing shortage and in respect of this urged the Committee to ensure that the conversion of the loft space to become a residential dwelling was completed ahead of the commercial unit, to avoid a situation where the dwelling space was not replaced resulting in a net loss of residential accommodation.

As there were no questions for Councillor Nerva, the Chair invited the final speaker on the item, Mr Lewis Westhoff (agent) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Mr Westhoff introduced himself as the agent for the application on behalf of the applicant, Akoya, before he highlighted the following key points:

- The planning application at 62 Salusbury Road formed part of his client's wider property portfolio in Queens Park that included the NW Works Business campus at the northern end of Salusbury Road.
- Over the past five years, Akoya had significantly invested in Queens Park and regularly supported local community initiatives.

- While 62 Salusbury Road was at the smaller end of the scale, the site had been identified as underutilised and as such presented an opportunity to deliver public benefits to Salusbury Road and the Queens Park Town Centre.
- The scheme would see a new 2 bedroom apartment provided at second floor level to replace the vacant, sub standard residential unit at ground floor. This ground floor unit would be converted into a flexible Class E commercial unit with a new shopfront to complement and enhance the commercial offer on the Salusbury Road primary shopping frontage.
- The new commercial unit had been designed in a flexible way to appeal to a range of high street occupants. It was important to note that the unit would not be used as a bar or a restaurant that served alcohol. Given the concerns highlighted in this respect the Committee were reminded that
- Condition 4 had been designed to. prohibit any drinking establishment or restaurant use and would permit uses appropriate for the high Street including retail, professional services, medical and office use.
- The design of the loft conversion had evolved closely in consultation with officers. It complied with the Council's design guidance for rear dormers and the amenity of nearby properties would be protected. The new unit would exceed minimum internal standards and would deliver a layout that would provide flexible accommodation for a range of users.
- The scheme would also see the rear of the site enhanced with a new soft and hard landscaping strategy, which would assist in achieving biodiversity net gain, improved urban greening and sustainable urban drainage.
- In response to concerns highlighted at the meeting, members were advised that the suggested inclusion of a management plan covering use of the outdoor space to include controlled hours of use and steps to prevent amplified noise was considered to be acceptable. The design of the scheme would also ensure that the windows to the courtyard area would be fixed shut to minimise noise nuisance. These details would be written into the leases of future commercial tenants.
- Mr Westhoff summarised by advising the Committee that it was felt the proposals would deliver a high-quality outcome for the site via the delivery of a new residential unit to a standard that would increase residential accommodation on site, a new flexible commercial unit to the Queens Park town centre as well as biodiversity and sustainability enhancements and on this basis urged the Committee to approve the application.

The Chair thanked Mr Westhoff for addressing the Committee and asked the Committee if they had any questions or points of clarification following the information heard. In response the Committee raised questions regarding the location of the property in terms of the conservation area, noise pollution, loss of light to existing residents, the use of the commercial unit and the re-provision of the 2 bed dwelling unit that would be lost to accommodate the commercial unit. The following responses were provided:

- Mr Westhoff clarified that the entirety of the site was currently outside of the existing Queens Park Conservation Area.

- In response to concerns raised regarding the potential noise nuisance that could be created from the development, Mr Westhoff confirmed that a Noise Impact Assessment had been completed to assess the noise that would be created from the air source heat pump and it was found to be compliant with standards. It had not been possible to test noise levels that would emanate from the commercial unit as the tenants of the commercial unit were not confirmed. However, it was felt that the inclusion of the management plan for the outside space and the sealed windows would provide adequate mitigations against any potential noise arising from the commercial use.
- In response to a query regarding the hours of use of the commercial unit, Mr Westhoff confirmed that it was not possible to advise of exact timings until a let had been secured, however the Committee were reassured that the applicant owned a number of commercial units in the Queens Park area and was sensitive to the concerns of residents. It had been established that the commercial unit was not suitable for a café, bar or restaurant and was more likely to be used as retail or office space, therefore the Committee could be assured that the business hours and category of letting would be within the appropriate context of the local area.
- In response to the issue raised in relation to one of the existing apartments' skylights being covered by the proposed rear extension to create the re-provided dwelling, Mr Westhoff advised that all principal windows serving living spaces would not be affected by the scheme. The affected roof light was linked to a non-habitual room and therefore was not considered in planning terms.
- Mr Westhoff confirmed that the new dwelling proposed would offer 2 double bedrooms and therefore provided a betterment against the current dwelling of 1 single bedroom and 1 double bedroom.

As members had no further questions for Mr Westhoff, the Chair thanked Mr Westhoff for his contributions before inviting members to ask officers any questions or points of clarification they may have in relation to the application. The Committee raised further queries in relation to potential noise nuisance for existing residents and neighbours as a result of noise from the proposed commercial unit and air source heat pump, securing delivery of the re-provided residential accommodation and impact on heritage of the site.

- The Committee queried what conditions could be provided to mitigate the potential noise nuisance from the commercial unit, querying if it was possible to restrict the number of business users operating within the unit, given its close proximity to residential units. Officers advised that through conditions and the management plan it would be possible to apply restrictions on hours of use and prohibit the sub division of the commercial unit.
- In response to a Committee query regarding any potential noise nuisance that may be created from the air source heat pump, particularly given its location adjacent to an existing residents window, the Committee were advised that the pump needed to be placed in close proximity to the area it was heating to remain effective, however officers were satisfied following a Noise Impact Assessment that the pump would not result in causing noise

nuisance and confirmed that the noise assessment would have considered the additional equipment in situ including the mounted unit.

- The Committee felt it was important to note the point made by objectors that there should be no net loss of residential accommodation the development of which needed to be secured alongside the commercial unit. As such the Committee felt it would be reasonable to require an additional condition to ensure that the re-provided residential unit was delivered in line with the commercial unit.
- The Committee noted the possibility that at some point in the future the site could be included as part of an expanded Conservation Area and on this basis the Committee queried if this should be taken into consideration when making their decision on the proposed scheme. Officers advised that the Committee could not take in to account any potential further extension of the Local Conservation Area. The Committee were advised that they should base their decision considering the information received in the report and if this would result in any harm to the existing conservation area.
- Clarification was also provided in relation to the position of the proposed development relating to Community Infrastructure Levy

As there were no further questions from members and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations, including the additional conditions identified during consideration of the application.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report and including the following additional conditions as agreed by the Committee requiring:

- (1) the approval and implementation of a non-residential management plan to mitigate potential noise impact from the non-residential unit and rear outdoor area;
- (2) completion of the second floor residential dwelling prior to the commencement of the use of the new commercial unit to ensure that the proposal does not result in a net loss of residential dwellings;
- (3) the rooflights within the single storey extension to be fixed closed in the interest of the amenities of nearby occupiers

(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous with all 8 members voting in favour of the above decision).

6. 22/2560 - Yates Court Garages, Yates Court, 228 Willesden Lane, London, NW2 5RH

PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing 17 garages and development of land to provide four new dwellinghouses, parking, refuse and cycle storage and associated landscaping..

RECOMMENDATION~:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- (1) That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as detailed in the report.
- (2) That the Head of Planning is delegated to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee.

Lena Summers, Planning Officer, South Area Planning Team, introduced the report and set out the key issues. In introducing the report members were advised that the current site comprised of two rows of single storey garages (17 in total) and adjacent hardstanding to the rear of Yates Court to the northern side of Willesden Lane. The site was not within a conservation area as designated in Brent's Local Plan and did not impact on any Listed Building. The proposal would also see improved landscaping and enhanced amenity space to include a new children's play area. The massing and height of the proposed development aligned with guidance and was not considered to have a negative impact on neighbouring gardens. It was confirmed that 19 objections had been received from neighbouring residents.

Officers drew the Committee's attention to a typo in Section 2.44 of the report that stated a dwelling was a 5 bed, 7 person property, this was incorrect and should have stated a 4 bed, 7 person property.

As no further questions were raised by members at this point, the Chair invited Ms Elaine Moore (objector) to address the Committee (in person) in relation to the application. Ms Moore introduced herself as a local resident before proceeding to highlight the following key points:

- It was felt that the proposed dwellings were not in keeping with the context and character of the existing homes and local environment.
- Concerns were raised that a Constructions Logistics Plan had not been made available at the application stage, therefore residents were unsure about how they may be affected during the construction phase, this had caused heightened concerns for existing residents (particularly those with assisted living requirements) in terms of the potential impacts on health and safety.
- Ms Moore felt that the proposed location of the children's play space was not suitable as it would limit natural surveillance as well as resulting in the loss of trees and light.
- Ms Moore felt that the parking surveys undertaken did not provide a true representation of the demand for parking spaces. She advised the

Committee that the car park was frequently at capacity and suggested that the parking surveys should be repeated to provide a more accurate report of the demand for local parking.

- Concerns were also highlighted at what local residents felt to be inadequate nature of the consultation undertaken with the local community in relation to the proposed development as well as communication from the agent and local authority in responding to specific queries from existing residents. This had reportedly left residents with unanswered questions in relation to the boundary fence and whether existing leaseholders would see an increase in their service charge.

The Chair thanked Ms Moore for her contribution and invited Committee members to ask any questions or points of clarification they had in relation to the issues raised, with further details sought in relation to the concerns highlighted about the proposed location and impact of the children's play area. In response Ms Moore clarified that she felt that the proposed children's play area would be a poor substitute for the large garden area that was currently in use, as well as the issues raised in terms of tree loss, lighting, and loss of natural surveillance. Ms Moore closed her comments by adding that she felt there was an excessive number of new developments being constructed in the area.

In response to the comments raised, the Chair felt it important to clarify that the area in which the site was located fell within a designated Intensification Corridor. The Chair reassured Ms Moore, however, that further queries in relation to the concerns she had raised would be addressed by officers in the latter part of the meeting. The Chair proceeded to invite the final speaker on the item, Ms Lucy Howes (agent) to address the Committee (online) supported by Sean Rafferty (architect, online) in relation to the application. The following key points were shared:

- The proposed development site was situated to the rear of Yates House and comprised of underutilised brownfield land, in a designated Intensification Corridor, this included garages and hardscaping.
- The surrounding area was residential in character, with both Kilburn and Willesden Green stations located within short walking distance to the east alongside shops and services. The site is highly sustainable, benefitting from a PTAL 4.
- The proposals sought to complement the character of the area through providing four high-quality homes – all for London Affordable Rent. The scheme also supported Brent's fundamental objective of directing housing growth to Intensification Corridors, particularly larger family units.
- The applicant had engaged in extensive discussions with officers in evolving the proposals – with all houses designed to meet and exceed key housing design standards, being dual-aspect whilst meeting M4(2) compliance to ensure inclusivity for all. Private amenity space was also provided for all units in the form of patios, planting, and grass lawns. Enhancements to existing open space across the wider site were also proposed, providing community benefits.

- The site was not located within or adjacent to any ecological sites, with the proposals not resulting in any significant impact to on or off-site habitats.
- It was acknowledged that the proposals resulted in the loss of one low-grade tree. 14 new trees would, however, be planted alongside replacement shrubs and hedgerow in enhancing opportunities for biodiversity.
- The scheme had been carefully considered to be respectful of existing context and neighbours – using the Brent Design Guide SPD1 as its founding principles. The facades were designed specifically to reflect the surrounding context, whilst the profile and window placement had been informed by and complied with, the relevant principles within the SPD, regarding overlooking and privacy. The scale and massing of the dwellings had been carefully designed to respect neighbouring properties whilst ensuring no overbearing impacts. This included a set-back from neighbouring gardens with a mixture of flat and pitched roofs in visually complementing existing typologies.
- The applicant had submitted a Daylight and Sunlight assessment in support of the application which confirmed that the proposals were fully compliant with the BRE guidance in terms of impacts on the daylight and sunlight levels received by the surrounding properties.
- In line with the site's PTAL, the proposals were car free in supporting sustainability objectives of the NPFF, Brent Local Plan and London Plan.
- Of the existing 17 garages, eight were currently unused with the remainder not used for car parking. The proposals would reduce the hardstanding parking from 30 to 21 spaces. Day and night-time parking surveys had been undertaken in support of this application, which identified that on average, 10-15 cars were present in the day with a demand for 14-15 cars at night. On this basis, the retention of 21 spaces was considered sufficient to satisfy demand from both the existing flats and the new houses – with overspill also sufficiently mitigated and unlikely to be generated as a result of the proposals.
- The proposal was considered to align with the Development Plan as a whole – particularly according with the overarching objective of delivering new, affordable, family homes at sustainable locations.

The Chair thanked Ms Howes for addressing the Committee and asked the Committee if they had any questions or points of clarification following the information heard. In response the Committee raised queries in relation to car parking EV charging points, rent levels, outdoor amenity space., trees and consultation with existing residents. The following responses were provided:

- It was confirmed that parking around the existing site was underutilised, and parking surveys had demonstrated that there was sufficient capacity to meet any additional demand for parking caused by the development.
- In response to a Committee query regarding the rent levels, the Committee were advised that the rent would be set at London Affordable Rent (LAR).
- The Committee queried what had been considered in terms of providing a betterment to amenity space for existing residents and the quality of amenity space for residents of the new dwellings. In response Sean Rafferty, Architect for the scheme advised that each new dwelling would have a

shrubby border to party walls and private amenity space. Although compact, the homes had good sized gardens that exceeded minimum requirements. Large private windows would provide good levels of light and there were opportunities to use green roofing. It was confirmed that no green space would be lost in providing the new children's play space. The new dedicated play area towards the north of site had been designed to be mindful of issues of overlooking and excessive noise. The Committee were advised that the play area would be shielded by 14 new trees as part of mitigation measures to re-provide the 1 tree that would be lost as part of the scheme.

- In response to a Committee question in relation to potential issues of subsidence as a result of any further trees that could be lost to accommodate the development, the Committee were reassured that there were no concerns regarding potential subsidence, despite the close proximity of the new homes to the trees and confirmed that only 1 low grade category C tree was being lost as part of the development.
- The Committee queried if additional Electric Vehicle Charging (EVC) points (additional to the 4 provided as part of the proposed scheme) had been considered to offer a further benefit to existing residents. In response the Committee were advised that the provision of EVC charging points had been considered in line with the policy requirements of the proposed new dwellings, this had been considered acceptable by officers. It was clarified that the 21 parking spaces would be sufficient to manage the parking needs of the existing residents and the residents of the 4 new units, additionally there was no allocated parking, therefore the spaces and EVC would be available for use by new and existing residents.
- In response to a Committee query in relation to the consultation with local residents, the Committee were advised of the consultation undertaken, which had included a leaflet drop detailing how questions and feedback could be submitted via a dedicated website and email address. There had also been a newsletter sent out to residents to keep them informed of the plans.

As there were no further questions for the agent, the Chair invited the Committee to ask officers any further questions or points of clarification they required. Members raised queries in relation to PV panels, flooding and drainage, the current use of the garages and the concerns raised in relation to the boundary wall and fence height. The following responses were provided:

- The Committee acknowledged the small scale of the proposed scheme, however in respect of Brent's climate targets the Committee queried why PV panels were not included as part of the scheme. In recognition of the Committee concerns officers advised that there were no policy requirements to provide PV panels due to the size of the scheme, additionally the nature of the site and design of the roofs did not support the use of PV panels. The Committee noted that as new builds the homes would be well insulated to support sustainability.
- In response to a Committee query in relation to whether the private surface sewer that served Yates Court would have the capacity to cope with the additional discharge of water from the new homes, officers advised that due

to the limited scale of the scheme the development was unlikely to have a significant impact on sewer capacity. The Committee were assured that if planning permission was approved the Building Regulations team would require permissions to connect the new homes to the sewer network, it would be at this point that any issues around sewer capacity would be addressed if necessary.

- The Committee noted in response to a query in relation to the current use of the garages on site that were to be demolished, that 8 were vacant and the others had mixed uses that included some being used for storage. The Committee heard that the Council were the freeholders of the garages.
- The Committee were advised that the revised refuse location for both existing residents of Yates Court and the new homes would be in one single location. It was noted that following objections received, the refuse area plans had been altered to increase capacity.
- Officers advised that comments received from objectors regarding the boundary wall and fencing in relation to the amenity space and House 4 of the proposed scheme had been responded to and would be secured via condition to ensure privacy was protected for both residents of the new home and residents using the shared amenity space.
- Confirmation was provided that reference to the date for the Arboricultural Impact Assessment referred to in section 9.2 of the report should have been July 2022 and not 2023 as stated.

The Chair thanked officers for responding to the Committee's questions, as there were no further questions and having established that all members had followed the discussions the Chair asked members to vote on the recommendations.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report

(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous with all 8 members voting in favour of the above decision)

7. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 7:35pm.

COUNCILLOR KELCHER
Chair