

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

8 May 2013

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) David Allam (Labour Lead) Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne Raymond Graham Kuldeep Lakhmana Brian Stead</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Matt Duigan, Planning Services Manager Meghji Hirani, Planning Contracts and Planning Information Manager Nicole Cameron - Legal Services Gill Oswell – Democratic Services</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Andrew Retter Councillor Scott Seaman-Digby</p>	
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Allan Kauffman and Jazz Dhillon with Councillors Brian Stead and Kuldeep Lakhmana substituting.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Gill Oswell</p>
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a pecuniary interest in Item 5 – RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove, Ruislip as he owned one of the apartments in the building and left the meeting whilst the item was discussed. Also a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8 – Land forming part of Oakhurst, Northgate, Northwood, as the Northwood Hills Branch chairman was one of the lead petitioners, he remained in the meeting to discuss and vote on the application.</p> <p>Councillor Ray Graham declared a pecuniary interest in Item 12 – 3 Canterbury Close, Northwood as he lived next door to the application site and left the meeting whilst the application was discussed.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Gill Oswell</p>

3.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no items notified in advance or urgent.</p>	
4.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all business would be heard in public.</p>	
5.	<p><b>FORMER RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP 10189/APP/2013/3143</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>S73 Application to vary the design, internal layout and external appearance of Block C (modifications of conditions 1, 6 and 10 of Reserved Matters approval ref: 10189/APP/2007/3046 dated 13/03/2008: (details of siting, design, external appearance and landscaping), in compliance with conditions 2 and 3 of outline planning permission ref: 10189/APP/2007/3383 dated 21/02/2008: Residential development). (Deferred from North Planning Committee 7/3/13)</b></p> <p>A member raised concerns that the developer had ignored the originally approved plans and he would be unable to support the officer's recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Officers advised the committee that consideration had been given as to whether the amendments being proposed would have been considered favourably if this had been a fresh application. Although officers do not agree with what the applicant had been done, if an appeal was made it was felt that an Inspector would have allowed the amendments. Consideration was also given to whether the amendments being requested as part of this application were so harmful to warrant a refusal.</p> <p>The committee was advised that although they were concerned that the original plans had not been adhered to the officer recommendation for approval was the correct decision.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote there were 5 in favour and 1 abstention against the recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p> <p>Following the conclusion of this application a 10 minute adjournment was agreed.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

6.	<b>WEST LONDON COMPOSTING LAND AND LAND TO THE NORTH &amp; SOUTH OF NEW YEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD</b> <b>12579/APP/2012/2366</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 6</i> )	<b>Action by</b>
	<p><b>The continuation of existing recycling operations at land to the North and South of New Years Green Lane for an organic composting facility operation to handle a maximum throughput of up to 75,000 tonnes per annum of organic waste for a temporary period of five years.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>A member asked why the application was only being given a temporary 5 year permission.</p> <p>Officers advised the committee that as the site was in the Green Belt the 5 year permission would give an opportunity for the site to be monitored.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the re-construction and strengthening of the highway members were informed that this was to take place at the two accesses to the sites only.</p> <p>A member raised a concern about health &amp; safety issues on the site.</p> <p>The committee was informed that the site was regulated by the Environment Agency and there was other legislation that covered this aspect.</p> <p>The recommendation contained in the report with the amended condition 6 was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>1. That the application be referred to the Secretary of State as a departure from the Development Plan.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the application be referred back to the Greater London Authority.</b></p> <p><b>3. That should the Secretary of State not call in the application, or should the Mayor not direct the Council under Article 6 to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application, the Council enter into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) or Section 278 Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and all appropriate legislation to secure:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>(i) highway improvements on Newyears Green Lane, including the strengthening of the carriageway.</b></p> <p><b>4. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreements.</b></p> <p><b>5. The applicants pay a sum to the Council equivalent to 2% of the value of contributions for compliance, administration and monitoring of the completed planning (and/or highways) agreement(s).</b></p>	Matt Duigan Meg Hirani

	<p>6. The applicants pay a sum to the Council of up to 3% of the value of contributions for specified requirements to project manage and oversee implementation of elements of the completed planning (and/or highways) agreement(s).</p> <p>7. If the above Section 106 agreement has not been finalised within 6 months, then the application is to be referred back to the Planning Committee for determination.</p> <p>8. That subject to the above, the application be deferred for the determination by Head of Planning Sport and Green Spaces under delegated powers to approve the application, subject to the completion of legal agreement(s) under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.</p> <p>9. That if the application is approved, the conditions set out in the officer's report new condition 6 and an informative added as follows:-</p> <p><b>New Condition 6</b></p> <p>Unless previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, there shall be no more than 100 vehicular movements (one way), of which there shall be no more than 41 one way HGV (vehicles above 87.5 tonnes) movements in any one working day, involving a cumulative total not exceeding a maximum 75,000 tonnes of waste input each year.</p>	
7.	<p><b>73 SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM      52680/APP/2012/3209</b> (Agenda Item 7)</p>	<b>Action by</b>
	<p><b>Change of use from Use Class A1 (Shops) to Use Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaway).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. The Ward Councillors comments had been omitted from the report but had been included on the addendum sheet.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's Constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main concerns against the application were in relation to the late opening hours and the odours that would come from the premises.</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with the Council's Constitution the agent addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shop was within a core area.</li> <li>• There was an off licence close by, that opened early and closed at midnight.</li> <li>• There were also other off licences in the same parade as the application site.</li> <li>• The shop would have its own bin container at the rear of the shop.</li> <li>• The shop was unlikely to cause traffic issues as it was to be a takeaway.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed unit had been shut for nearly a year not 6 months, as stated.</li> <li>• There were currently no kebab shops in the area and this would provide an alternative food outlet in the neighbourhood.</li> </ul> <p>A member raised concerns about the ventilation flue system that would take the cooking odours away from the residential properties above.</p> <p>Officers advised that there was no proposal for a flue outlet to the rear. The current ventilation was below the balconies of the flats above the premises. As officers felt that it would be difficult to provide a flue system that was visually acceptable in this location.</p> <p>Members felt that a further reason for refusal could be added as officers felt that the layout at the rear, would make it difficult for a suitable flue system to be provided. It was suggested and agreed that an additional reason for refusal be added. The wording of the additional reason for refusal to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to how the application contributed to the Hillingdon Local Plan, officers advised the committee that the application site was outside of the core area. If the application had been considered acceptable officers would have recommended approval.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal contained in the report and an additional reason for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and an additional reason for refusal regarding the ventilation flue for the food outlet.</b></p> <p><b>Additional Reason for Refusal</b></p> <p><b>The proposal fails to provide, and fails to demonstrate that such provision can be made, mitigation measures regarding the control of smell, fumes and other emissions from the site. The proposal would thus be detrimental to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers and contrary to Policies BE19 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012).</b></p>	
8.	<b>LAND FORMING PART OF OAKHURST, NORTHGATE, NORTHWOOD 60712/TRE/2013/17 (Agenda Item 8)</b>	<b>Action by</b>
	<p><b>To fell one Oak tree (T28) on TPO 173.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report advising the committee of the main points and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s Constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p>	<p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was made in the 1970's.</li> <li>• The tree was still alive and home to a range of habitat.</li> <li>• It had not been confirmed whether there were bats nesting in the Oak tree.</li> <li>• Planning permission had been granted to demolish the house, which was locally listed.</li> <li>• If the tree was retained it would prevent the plot from being further developed, which was felt would overcrowd the site.</li> <li>• The developers had contravened a number of conditions on the site.</li> <li>• Should this application succeed it was felt that further planning applications would be put forward.</li> <li>• Would like to see the tree retained for as long as possible.</li> <li>• Asked the committee to not grant permission for the tree to be felled.</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with the Council's Constitution the agent addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The previous planning application was nothing to do with the application the committee were currently considering.</li> <li>• The Oak tree had been monitored for the past 5 years.</li> <li>• The tree was in a moderately poor condition with a marked deterioration over the past 5 years.</li> <li>• The shoots and buds on the tree were substandard.</li> <li>• A fungus had recently been detected on the tree, which could spread to other trees on the site.</li> <li>• The steady decline of the health of the tree indicated that the tree was dying.</li> <li>• A replacement hornbeam tree was being provided for the Oak tree that was to be felled.</li> </ul> <p>The committee felt that as there was evidence that the Oak tree was diseased the felling of the tree was the correct course of action. This would help protect the spread of the disease to surrounding trees.</p> <p>The recommendation contained in the report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application for the felling of Oak T28 on TPO 173 be granted.</b></p>	
9.	<p><b>38 COLERIDGE DRIVE, EASTCOTE 69014/APP/2013/353</b>  <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
	<p><b>Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a front dormer, 4 x rear rooflights and 5 x solar panels to rear with 2 x new gable end windows.</b></p> <p>The committee raised concerns about the amount of amenity space that would be retained, if approval of this application was agreed. If allowed this would set a precedent, as amenity space had always been an issue on this site. It was felt that consideration should be given to refusing the application on insufficient amenity space grounds.</p>	<p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of insufficient amenity space and on being put to the vote was agreed. The wording of the reason for refusal to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused for the following reason:-</b></p> <p><b>The proposal fails to provide amenity space of a sufficient size commensurate to the size of the extended property. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation to the detriment of the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers, contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.</b></p>	
10.	<p><b>BREAKSPEAR ARMS, BREAKSPEAR ROAD SOUTH, HAREFIELD 10615/APP/2013/47</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Conservatory to side and provision of outdoor seating areas to exterior of property.</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to Vote the was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>
11.	<p><b>LAND O/S SORTING OFFICE, EAST WAY AND PARK WAY, RUISLIP 59076/APP/2013/817</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Replacement of existing 12.5m high monopole and 2 no. radio equipment cabinets with a new 12.5m high monopole supporting 3 no. antennas with 3 no. equipment cabinets and ancillary works.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report referring members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That prior approval was required and that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>
12.	<p><b>3 CANTERBURY CLOSE, NORTHWOOD 68984/APP/2013/186</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
	<p><b>Part two storey, part first floor, part single storey side and rear extensions, and porch to front.</b></p> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p>	<p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extension was too big for the plot, as it doubled the size of the property.</li> <li>• The proposal would block the passage of light to neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The current amenity space was not overly practical.</li> <li>• The proposal was an un-neighbourly development.</li> <li>• There would be an access issue in relation to delivery of materials to the site.</li> </ul> <p>The committee felt that the application was overdevelopment of the site and refusal for the reasons set out in the report should be agreed.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	
13.	<p><b>PINOVA, CUCKOO HILL, NORTHWOOD 66027/APP/2013/145</b> (Agenda Item 13)</p> <p><b>Installation of 9 Solar Photovoltaic Panels (Retrospective Application).</b></p> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miseltoe Farm was a Grade 2 listed building, which was in close proximity to the application site.</li> <li>• The installation of the solar panels had a detrimental impact on the street scene.</li> <li>• The area was currently being considered as an area of Special Local Character.</li> <li>• The committee were asked to re-consider the officer’s recommendation for approval. .</li> </ul> <p>Some committee members had concerns about the panels once they had seen the photographs, which formed part of the officers presentation. They felt that the application was detrimental to the street scene and would not be able to support the officer’s recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Other members of the committee were in support of the application, as solar panels were an increasing way of life and the Conservation &amp; Urban Design Officer had no objection to the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved and seconded, there were 3 in favour 2 against and 2 abstentions, the recommendation for approval was therefore agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>



14.	<b>16 FARMLANDS, EASTCOTE 68966/APP/2013/113</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 14</i> )	<b>Action by</b>
	<p><b>Single storey side/rear extension.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report advising the committee of the main points and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s Constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were a number of inaccuracies in the plans and the purpose of the application was flawed.</li> <li>• The measurements on the plans differ from what was actually in place and they should be accurate.</li> <li>• The application site sits on a prominent T junction, which was a turning point for many cars.</li> <li>• It was felt that a 3 bed house would become a 5 bedroom house</li> <li>• A car parked on the drive of the neighbouring property would be unable to open the passenger door of their car if the extension was approved.</li> <li>• There would be a loss of light to the adjoining property.</li> <li>• The proposal to extend the existing garage forward would be over-dominant and out of character with the street scene.</li> <li>• The loss of the garage would result in a reduction of parking in an already heavily parked area.</li> <li>• There were concerns as to how the demolition of the garage party wall would be carried out and how it would be replaced.</li> <li>• The patio of the adjoining property had already been damaged and if the extension was allowed this may cause further damage.</li> <li>• Farmlands was within in a flood plain risk area.</li> <li>• There were currently drainage issues within the area and no details had been provided regarding the soak-away and yard gully to prevent the driveway and garage of the neighbouring property from flooding.</li> <li>• It was felt that the committee did not have sufficient time to consider the concerns raised in the petition to make a decision and asked that the application be deferred.</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with the Council’s Constitution the agent addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive feedback had been received from officers in relation to the proposal.</li> <li>• The proposed design complied with planning guidelines.</li> <li>• There was no basis for the objections raised on loss of amenity.</li> <li>• There would be sufficient amenity space remaining as the garden was the longest in the street.</li> <li>• The garage was dead space and the conversion to a habitable space would make it more useable than what existed currently.</li> <li>• The proposal was not visible from the street and would not affect nearby properties.</li> </ul>	<p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The front extension does not compromise the off street parking situation, as there would still be sufficient space for 2 cars.</li> <li>• The proposed 3 metre extension at the rear was permitted development.</li> <li>• There were legal requirements in regard to noise and disturbance.</li> <li>• The design of the proposal was not detrimental or overdevelopment.</li> <li>• Highlighted the need for the extension due to the expanding family and to enable them to remain and enjoy the property long term.</li> <li>• The committee was asked to agree the officer's recommendation for approval.</li> </ul> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting making the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The petitioner and the applicant had made a number of good points.</li> <li>• The committee was asked that before they made a decision on the application to defer the application for a site visit.</li> </ul> <p>A member asked whether sufficient parking was being provided for the proposal as this had been raised as a concern.</p> <p>Officers advised the committee that as the width of the garage was less than 3 metres, in reality there was only one parking space. The requirement for the proposed extension was for one space, which was shown on the plans. Officers also advised the committee that the proposed single storey extension could be built under permitted development rights.</p> <p>A member stated that he could not see the need for a site visit as the proposed extension was just above what would be able to be built under permitted development rights.</p> <p>In answer to a question raised in relation to the extension not being set in 1 metre the committee was advised that this was only required for 2 storey extensions. The issue in relation to the opening of a passenger door was not a right and could not be taken into consideration.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to enable members to make a site visit. On being put to the vote deferral was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred to enable the Committee members to make a site visit.</b></p>	
15.	<p><b>ARGYLE HOUSE, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD</b>  <b>500/APP/2012/3217</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>Part change of use of ground floor from Use Class A1 and Use Class B1(a) to Use Class D1(a) (Non-Residential Institutions) for use as dentistry.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan  Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>Officers introduced the report referring members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	
16.	<p><b>PATH ADJACENT RECREATION GROUND OPPOSITE FIELD END JUNIOR SCHOOL, FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP</b>  <b>61143/APP/2013/804</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p><b>Replacement of existing 15m high telecom pole holding three shrouded antennae with a replacement 15m pole holding three antenna contained within a 'thickening' shroud located towards the top of pole, and installing two ancillary equipment cabinets at ground level along with the retention of an existing ancillary equipment cabinet at ground level (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended).</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That prior approval was required and that the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>
17.	<p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF 111 PARKFIELD CRESCENT, RUISLIP</b>  <b>68057/APP/2012/3216</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>Use of two storey extension as a self contained dwelling, erection of a porch, provision of associated parking and amenity space and internal and external alterations.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report advising the committee of the main points and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant had disregarded the impact of the works had, had on the adjoining neighbour.</li> <li>• The works had already been carried out.</li> <li>• The hedge at the front of the site had been destroyed.</li> <li>• The rear access was used by Harrow residents and was not for Hillingdon residents, but was being used for parking by the applicant.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matt Duigan Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees at the rear of the site had been taken down leaving large gaps.</li> <li>• A considerable amount of damage had been caused to the neighbouring property.</li> <li>• The applicant had not responded to requests for the damage caused to be rectified.</li> <li>• The area had not been enhanced by the extension built.</li> </ul> <p>Officers advised the committee that the appeal decision in relation to this site had accepted that parking at the front of the site was acceptable. This meant that the Inspector had left no room for manoeuvre on this issue.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the trees that had been removed officers advised that the trees were not protected, so there was no requirement to seek permission to fell them.</p> <p>A member commented that as the plans for the porch was totally out of character with the area, the refusal on this ground was correct.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal contained in the officers report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reason set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 p.m., closed at 9.50 p.m.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Gill Oswell on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.