

Minutes



CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 March 2016

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, John Morse and Brian Stead.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Johanna Hart (Principal Planning Officer), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer), Tim Brown (Legal Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
48.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Manjit Khatra, with Cllr John Morse substituting.</p>
49.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Ahmad-Wallana declared a non pecuniary interest in agenda item number 5 (27A and B Daleham Drive). Cllr Ahmad-Wallana left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
50.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>No matters had been notified in advance or were urgent.</p>
51.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were Part I and would be heard in public.</p>
52.	<p>27A & B DALEHAM DRIVE 67783/APP/2015/4003 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Retention of 2 semi-detached dwelling houses (Retrospective Application).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which sought retrospective planning permission for the retention of two semi-detached residential properties. These had not been constructed in accordance with previously approved plans.</p>

Members were referred to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. This confirmed receipt of an additional petition in opposition to the scheme.

The Chairman requested that officers explain how the scheme as built differed from the plans that had previously been approved. Members were shown the floor plans of what had been built in comparison to what had been approved. These showed that the roof form and the elevations were different. The key changes related to an increase in the number of bedrooms, from two to three, alterations to the roof form and height, with provision of a gable instead of a hip roof. There had also been alterations to roof lights, to the design of rear elements and use of different materials. In addition, there had been alterations to the doors and omission of landscaping at the front of the site.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The officer's introduction had stated that the houses had changed from having two bedrooms to having three. The minutes of the meeting from 6 January 2016 showed that the agent for the builder had stated that each unit had three bedrooms with a study and not four bedrooms as claimed by the petitioner.
- Publicity material produced by the Letting Agent, Turbervilles advertised brand new luxury four bedroom houses.
- The petitioner read the officer's summary from page 1 of the agenda pack. This information had been available to the Committee prior to Members going on a site visit. The summary stated the following:

"This application seeks retrospective consent for the retention of two semi detached dwellings at 27A and 27B Daleham Drive. During the construction of the dwellings, a number of alterations were made to the approved scheme, which included alterations to the roof form, changes to the fenestration locations, materials used in the construction of the buildings, location of the entrances and a reduction in the amount of soft landscaping to the front. The alterations to the approved scheme have been considered in the context of the site and surrounding street scene, and are considered unacceptable. The addition of gable end roofs to each of the dwellings and all of the elevation alterations combined, result in a development that appears visually at odds and incongruous to the established character and pattern of development within Daleham Drive. The scheme thereby fails to comply with the adopted policies and guidance. Refusal is therefore recommended."

- The petitioner said that the Officer's summary condemned the construction that had taken place at the site and the publicity material produced by Tubervilles was evidence that two four bedroom properties had been constructed.
- Section 7.07 of the officer report made reference to the red/orange colour of bricks, which contrasted to the natural palette of the road. It therefore failed to match any property in the surrounding area. The building constructed looked horrible and was not liked by the petitioner or by the signatories of the petition. They did not like the

way in which they felt that the Council had been misled.

- The size of the bedrooms had been doubled, the main bedroom was a large loft room and what had been built was completely at odds with the approved plans.
- The Committee should not approve a development that had so many deviations compared to the approved plans.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the application, making the following points:

- Following the previous Committee meeting, the agent had submitted a document, which he had requested be provided to Members ahead of the site visit. The document addressed some of the concerns raised by the officer's report and by the petitioner.
- It was not an offence to build premises without planning permission or premises that did not accord with approved plans. Government guidance stated the local authorities should have regard to the development plan and should consider whether the development carried out resulted in serious harm to local public amenity.
- The Officer's report stated that the plans differed in height compared to the approved plans. The agent felt that this was incorrect. He stated the building constructed was 8.51 metres tall, rather than the previously approved 9.38 metres. Therefore, the building that had been constructed was lower than that permitted by the plans. The internal height was approximately 2.4 metres, floor to ceiling and was lower than stated, possibly because the roof slope was at a lower angle than shown on the approved drawings.
- One reason for the officer recommendation of refusal was that the development was uncharacteristic of the area and that it added unacceptable bulk. The Committee was asked to consider whether, if it had a new application for the premises as they had been built, whether they would be approved. The Committee should consider whether the development had caused demonstrable harm to any of the adjoining properties and whether it was out of character when compared to the surrounding area. It was noted that a number of gabled properties were already present in the area.
- The key finding of the officer report in 2011, when plans had been approved, was that the principle issue was whether the development would cause adverse impact with regards to the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. Officers had considered the layout to be sensitive to the street scene. The houses would be set back 9.5 metres. When viewed from Daleham Drive, the impact would be minimal. They would not be visible from Dickens Avenue. It was noted that there were other properties in Daleham Drive that had central doorways.
- The applicant had inherited the property with the building materials already on site. It was accepted that these were not the approved materials, but there was a mixture of materials used elsewhere in the area.
- The reduction in landscaping could be solved by requesting that an amended plan be submitted. Much of the hard surfaced area could be dug up to enable landscaping to take place.
- The agent felt that the bulk of the building had no adverse affect on the amenity of adjoining occupiers, distances remained the same and

the floor plan also remained the same. The type of material and the hip to gable roof were the key changes and the agent did not believe that the gabling had an adverse affect on the amenity of the neighbours.

A Member asked the applicant's agent to comment on the number of bedrooms within the houses that had been built. The agent explained that the plans showed three bedrooms with an office and that this was what had been built. The study had not been measured to determine whether it would accord with the London Plan standards for the size of a habitable room if it was a bedroom. It would not be a surprise if estate agents were marketing the house as having four bedrooms.

The Committee asked at what point the decision had been made to increase the capacity of the building, compared to the approved plans and why this had happened. The agent explained that their client had made reference to the National House Building Council (NHBC). NHBC had made reference to moving stairways. Relocation of the stairway had made it possible for the capacity to be increased. The agent did not know why their client had not referred to the approved plans at this stage, stating that he would always advise a client to build what they had planning permission for.

The Chairman asked for confirmation of the measured roof heights. The height was 8.51 metres to ridge level and 5.17 metres to eaves level, which was higher than stated in the approved plans. The height to ridge level was a metre lower than shown on the approved 2014 plans and slightly less than that when compared to the 2011 plans.

Officers were asked to clarify the ridge height level as information before the Committee suggested that this was 9.72 metres, with an eaves height of 5.31 metres. There was a discrepancy between this and the heights stated by the applicant's agent. It was confirmed that the measurements contained in the officer's report related to the plans that were before the Committee for consideration, rather than the agent's figures, which were on site measurements. It was noted that if the Committee decided to approve the application, it would be approving the heights of 9.72 and 5.31 metres.

A Member questioned what impact the fact that the property was being advertised as having four bedrooms would have on parking and amenity space. The Member also noted that the suggestion that the property contained four bedrooms would have come directly from the agent. Officers advised that it was important to differentiate between what the Committee was deciding in terms of planning and what an estate agent might advertise it as. The application had been assessed against current planning policy. Based upon London Plan guidance, the dwellings were considered to have three bedrooms and a study, rather than four bedrooms.

The Chairman confirmed that the Committee needed to consider the plans before them, the development built and the impact that this had on the neighbourhood. The planning framework mentioned quality of design and the key was whether the changes before the Committee amounted to an enhancement, were neutral or were detrimental. Detriment could arise as a consequence of the changes made compared to the approved plans.

A Member asked what the amenity space standards were if the property was

considered to have four bedrooms. Officers advised that the requirement was 100 square metres and that the properties had 197 and 104 square metres respectively of amenity space. The Member noted that what had been built differed from the approved plans but that there was already mixed development in the area. It was not an area that was noted for great uniformity.

The Member did not find anything during the site visit that was strongly objectionable to her. She doubted that the inspector would find issues of demonstrable harm with development in the event that it went to appeal. The Member was concerned about the lack of planting in the front garden to mitigate drainage and flood issues. This could potentially be an issue of demonstrable harm and it was questioned what accommodation had been made for those issues. No issues or objections had been raised by the flood officer. A condition had been attached to the approved consent that required details of sustainable drainage to be submitted and agreed. It was not considered that there were any new issues had been raised, but an additional requirement for landscaping would be supported by officers.

Another Committee Member was against approving the application on the basis that the development did not resemble what the Committee had previously approved. Approval of the application would set a dangerous precedent as it would encourage others to construct buildings that were not in accordance with approved plans.

A Member requested clarity in relation to how an application was required to enhance the character of the area. Officers advised that the reasons for refusal had referenced policy 7.4 of the London Plan, which related to local character. This stated that buildings, streets and open spaces should provide high quality design response with regard to the pattern of existing spaces. They should also contribute to a positive relationship between the urban structure and natural landscape features, including the underlying landform and topography. Developments should also make a positive contribution to the future character of the area.

A Member concluded that the mass of the roof form was too high, the materials used were not of acceptable quality and the development was not in keeping with the character of the area. For these reasons, he was minded to refuse the application.

The Committee asked whether the plans that had been approved had Permitted Development (PD) rights as this would have enabled the hip roof to have been changed to a gable roof. This would have enabled sufficient space for there to be a room in the roof, the result of which being that the dwellings now had three bedrooms plus a study or four bedrooms.

Officers advised that conditions had been attached that removed some of the PD rights. One of these had removed PD rights in relation to doors, windows and other openings within the walls or roof slopes. There was also a condition that restricted the provision of any additional extensions. It was confirmed that the PD rights had not been removed in relation to the roof. A Member said that this would have enabled the applicant to create a room in the roof under PD, subject to the obtainment of a Certificate of Lawful Development. The Chairman clarified that there was nothing within the PD rights that permitted the height of the roof to be raised, which, according to

the officer's report, it had been. A Member stated that any PD rights that created a loft conversion would need windows. The removal of these windows and maintenance of the roof form would make the room non habitable.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to a vote was approved by 6 votes for refusal to 1 vote against.

The Chairman requested that officers strengthen the reasons for refusal in relation to the height of the ridge and of the eaves, as well as including additional comment about the quality of the design. The reasons should also include comment in relation to the drainage.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report and that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to work with the Chairman and Labour Lead to strengthen the reasons given for refusal.

53. **HEATHROW MEDICAL CENTRE 1 ST PETER'S WAY HARLINGTON
55700/APP/2015/3554 (Agenda Item 6)**

Single storey side/rear extension, Heathrow Medical Centre, 1 St Peter's Way, Harlington.

Officers introduced the application which sought approval for the erection of a single storey extension to provide enhanced facilities for the Heathrow Medical Centre. The application site was within Harlington Village Conservation area. The proposed extension would be sizeable and would extend across the width of the rear garden area of the property.

Taking into account the need for the facility and subject to changes to enhance the visual impact, as recommended by the Council's Conservation Officer, which would be secured prior to the granting of planning permission, the development was considered to be visually acceptable in the location. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

Members were referred to the addendum sheet circulated, which reflected comments received from the Director of Public Health in support of the scheme.

A petition had been submitted by the applicant in support of the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The petitioner wished to highlight some key points that he felt may not have been considered as part of the original proposal.
- Primary Care services dealt with over 90% of NHS encounters with patients.
- The practice had previously had 3,000 patients, which had now grown to 6,000 patients. This increase had been due to the merger of the practice with a neighbouring practice in May 2015. The practice currently had three consulting rooms on site, but the requirement was now for six rooms due to the increased number of patients.
- The practice had qualified for the Primary Care Infrastructure Grant.

This suggested that the Government was in favour of the development.

- The proposal had four main aims:
 1. To provide essential primary care services from a single fit for purpose premises.
 2. To bring together health and social care provision.
 3. To reduce emergency hospital admissions.
 4. To provide a wider range of services in the community.
- The elderly and most vulnerable patient groups would benefit the most from the development. The practice had almost 600 patients over the age of 65, 75 of which were at the highest risk of emergency hospital admission. This was defined as them having a one in three chance of an emergency admission within the next 12 months.
- The practice did not currently have the capacity to be able to offer additional services provided by Health and Social Care Co-ordinators or by Primary Care Navigators. The practice wished to provide these professionals with rooms to enable them to consult patients at the practice.
- Age UK supported the scheme and had commented that the services that the practice was looking to provide worked best when Primary Care Navigators and office space within surgeries were attached as this enabled patients to be seen in a surgery setting. Hillingdon CCG, NHS England and the surgery's own Patient Participation Group were all supportive of the plans. No objections had been received from any of the surgery's neighbours, with many of these neighbours having signed the petition in support of the application.
- The applicant believed that the advantages of the development outweighed any disadvantages in relation to the conservation area.

A Member asked the petitioner how quickly the practice was growing. The petitioner advised that the number of patients had been between 3,000 and 3,500 for the last 15 years. The increase to 6,000 patients had been due to the recent merger with a nearby practice.

The Chairman said that the medical facility was much needed in the south of the Borough and that it was under enormous pressure. Another Committee Member agreed that there was a significant need for medical facilities within the Borough and would be minded to approve such an application as long as the design was sensitive to the surrounding area.

A Member asked for clarification of whether the existing walls to be retained were between the existing property and an adjoining property. Officers confirmed that this was the case and that the extension would form a new wall to the rear of the property. The extension would be between 8 and 10 metres in front of the neighbouring property. Officers considered that this was acceptable due to screening provided by existing trees present between the rear wall of the property and the front of the neighbouring property.

The Member asked whether an existing tree would be lost due to the development. Officers advised that any removal of the tree would require separate approval due to the site being within a conservation area. In this eventuality, the Council's Landscape Team would consider whether the planting of a replacement tree was required. A tree report had been submitted with the application. This indicated that the applicant had given

due regard to trees and it was anticipated that some screening would remain between the premises and the adjoining property.

The Member was concerned that the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring property could be considerably reduced. Officers advised that a planning condition required the applicant to submit details of tree protection prior to commencement of development. This would include evidencing that no undue harm had been caused. In the hypothetical event that trees were removed, a three metre high brick wall would remain. On balance, officers considered the application to be acceptable. The Member was satisfied with the advice given by officers that the conditions attached to the application would not permit work to commence until tree protection measures had been provided to the satisfaction of the Council. The protection of trees outside the boundary of the site would be subject to separate applications. These would be assessed by the Council's tree preservation officers. The Member felt that there should be a duty to replace trees in the event that it was not possible to protect them during construction. Officers advised that it was not possible to add planning conditions in relation to trees that were outside the red line of the application site. In relation to the application site, because it fell within a conservation area, any removal of trees required specific consent.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to a vote was approved unanimously.

RESOLVED: That: the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

54. **132 UXBRIDGE ROAD HAYES 3125/APP/2015/4029** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to a mixed use comprising drinking establishment and single storey rear extension for use as a shisha lounge (Use Class A4/Sui Generis).

Officers introduced the report which sought permission for the change of use of the ground floor of the premises from retail use to a mixed use, comprising a drinking establishment and a shisha lounge. This would be provided in a single storey rear extension. There were no specific constraints or designations in relation to the application site.

Members were referred to the addendum sheet circulated in advance of the meeting. This highlighted the receipt of a 121 signature petition in support of the proposals.

Taking into account the nature of the shopping parade, no objections were raised to the principle of the development or to the provision of the rear extension. However, the site lay within close proximity to residential properties and concern was raised over the potential impact that noise disturbance and odour could have on local residents. There were also concerns that the application had the potential to result in additional traffic and parking demand, which could be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety. No Transport Statement had been provided and in the absence of this or any details of how the potential for noise disturbance and odour could be controlled, refusal of the application was recommended.

Two petitions had been submitted in objection to the application. One of the petitioners declined the opportunity to address the Committee with regards to their petition. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a representative of the petitioner responsible for the second petition in objection addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The proposal would have a significant impact on the living conditions of local residents, especially those who lived above the parade of shops and others who lived in close proximity to the proposed development.
- The proposed use was considered to be inappropriate for the location and would result in noise and disturbance, especially late in the evening. The use as a shisha lounge would also cause smoke and smells.
- Local residents already suffered from late night noise due to restaurants in the parade of shops. There was also considerable anti-social behaviour taking place in the area, including people relieving themselves on the streets. Any additional drinking or smoking would add to the existing problems.
- Brookside Road and other neighbouring roads were already heavily congested due to customers using the restaurants in the parade. The hotel that would soon open in the area would also exacerbate the problem. The proposed use provided no off street parking for staff or customers. This would lead to additional congestion on nearby roads.
- The officer's report recommended that the application be refused. Local residents fully support the recommendation and this was demonstrated by the high turnout at the meeting.
- The petitioners felt that the applicant's submission was poor as no transport assessment or noise report had been provided. It had also not indicated the proposed opening hours of the shisha lounge. This indicated that the proposal was speculative in nature. The petitioner suggested that the Members of the Committee should not take the application seriously as there had been no attempt to demonstrate that the proposal would not cause additional harm to local residents or to parking and highway safety.
- There were two schools close to the premises. The use of the site as a shisha lounge would, therefore, not be appropriate as young children would observe people smoking and drinking in the area.
- The petitioners felt that the application should not have been considered by Committee due to the lack of information provided by the applicant. It was requested that the Committee support the officer recommendation and refuse the proposal.
- The petitioner provided statistics that they said had been taken from the British Heart Foundation website. These stated that the average shisha smoking session lasted one hour. In this time it was possible to inhale the same amount of smoke as that contained in 100 cigarettes.

A Member asked the petitioner to confirm whether there were existing parking problems in the vicinity of the premises. The petitioner confirmed that there were existing parking problems in the area. These were particularly noticeable on Fridays and Saturdays due to the presence of two restaurants in the parade of shops. There were no parking restrictions in the

area. Residents sometimes found that access to their driveways was blocked.

A petition had been submitted by the applicant in support of their application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner's representative addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The premises were currently empty and had already had an approval as a 'desert bar.' The owners had been approached by the owners of the Hyatt Hotel, which was opposite the premises, to ask if it would be possible to provide facilities for hotel guests. Following discussion, the applicant had decided to submit a further application in order to provide a shisha bar.
- The petitioner's representative clarified that a 'shisha' involved the smoking of flavoured tobacco. This would be smoked in a classy establishment with background music. There would also be a small bar, subject to the granting of a suitable licence.
- It was envisaged that the clientele would be the guests of the Hyatt Hotel. The plans would cause a minimum of noise and there would be a zero tolerance to drugs.
- The 121 signatures in favour of the application included that of the representative who had just addressed the Committee in objection to the proposals. All the signatures of the petition in support of the application were legitimate. The petitioner's representative stated that the petitions in objection to the application had been tainted by the collection of fraudulent signatures and signatures obtained by misrepresentation in the context of a neighbour dispute between the petitioner and the applicant.
- The cover sheet of one of the petitions in objection was referenced by the speaker. This stated that approval of the application would make worse rat infestations, other health problems, robberies and vandalism in the area. The speaker stated that this would not be the case and suggested that the petitioner's own establishment would be more likely to contribute to such problems. There would be no reason for people to relieve themselves in alleyways as the premises would have toilets and there would be no illegal drug use at the premises.
- The petitioner's representative said that the objections raised were sensationalist and he encouraged the Committee to undertake a more rational, reasonable risk assessment.
- Some of the same residents that had expressed concerns about noise that might be emitted from the premises had signed the petition in support of the application. Noise surveys carried out in relation to similar establishments within Hillingdon and neighbouring boroughs had concluded that they did not cause as much noise as other drinking establishments. The applicant was willing to install a filtration system that would filter smoke.

A Member asked the petitioners whether all the clients of the shisha lounge would be clients of the Hyatt Hotel. It was confirmed that anyone would be able to use the facility, but not everyone would be welcome. It was anticipated that the premises would attract a high calibre clientele who were predominantly hotel guests. These customers would have already parked at the hotel and so would not be contributing to any parking problems in the local area.

The Member questioned whether the shop area shown on the plans would remain at the front of the premises. It was confirmed that the shop area would remain in the form of a desert lounge. The bar / shisha lounge area to the rear of the premises would be accessed via sliding doors. In response to a question from another Member, it was confirmed that under 18's would be admitted to the desert lounge, but not to the bar / shisha area.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, ward councillors for Yeading addressed the Committee.

Councillor Mohinder Birah made the following points:

- There were parking issues in the area, both day and night. The residents of Delamere Court, Cerne Close, Brookside Road, Longford Close, Longford Gardens and surrounding areas often contacted the ward Councillors and Council regarding obstructions to driveways and roads and footpaths.
- There were issues in relation to fly-tipping, litter and anti-social activities. By permitting a further bar and shisha lounge, it was possible that further anti-social activities would be encouraged in the area.
- The ward Member had reviewed the petitions for and against the application. 39 people had signed the petition in objection. 35 of the signatories were registered voters of the Borough. In relation to one of the petitions in support of the application, 22 of the signatories did not appear to be on the electoral register. Only 18 signatories of 42 had been confirmed as appearing on the electoral roll.
- The ward Councillors supported the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Councillor Jagit Singh made the following points:

- He supported the local residents who opposed the construction of a shisha lounge. This was on the basis that no parking provision had been made for staff or customers, there was fly tipping in the area and that complaints had been received from local residents about anti-social behaviour in the area at night. The ward Councillors had previously met with the Police to discuss this issue. The location was also felt to be unsuitable due to its close proximity to schools.
- One of the signatures in favour was from a resident who lived a significant distance from the application site.

The Chairman advised that the petitions had been accepted as being valid by Democratic Services. Signatories did not have to be registered to vote in the Borough in order to be eligible to sign a petition and did not necessarily have to live in the Borough if they were eligible to sign it via other criteria. Anyone who either lived, worked or studied in the Borough was eligible to sign a petition. There was also no requirement for a signatory to live close to the premises in question.

The Chairman confirmed that the Committee was only able to consider issues that were relevant planning matters when determining the application. Many of the issues raised were legitimate concerns, but these were covered

by other guidance and legislation and could not be considered by the Committee. The key planning issues related to parking and traffic, noise and the management of smells and odours.

A Member stated that the odour issue could be managed through filtration but that the area lacked sufficient parking. It was difficult to find a space to park on Brookside Road, which was one of the few roads in the area that it was possible to park on. Levels of noise when people left bars and restaurants late at night were also a concern. It was also likely that some people did relieve themselves in the area around Brookside Road. For those reasons, the Member supported the officer recommendation.

Another Member felt that they could not make a decision to overturn the officer recommendation as insufficient information had been submitted by the applicant. They had not provided any noise surveys and they had not indicated how they would eliminate the smell. The applicant had also failed to provide details of proposed hours of operation. Therefore, it would not be possible for the Committee to approve the application.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to a vote was approved unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 PM, closed at 8:25 PM.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.