

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2007 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Kansagra (Chair), and Councillors Anwar, Cummins, Dunwell, Hashmi, Hirani, J Long, R Moher and H M Patel.

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Singh (Vice-Chair)

Councillors Chavda, Malik, Moloney and Shaw also attended the meeting.

**1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

Lonsdale House, 43-47 Lonsdale Road NW6 6RA (Reference 06/2932)  
Councillor Cummins declared a personal interest left the meeting room and did not take part in the discussion and voting on this application.

12 Littleton Road, Harrow, HA1 3SU (Reference 06/2528)  
Councillor Anwar declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting room and did not take part in the discussion and voting on this application.

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2006**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2006 be received and approved as an accurate record

**4. Planning Applications**

RESOLVED:-

that the Committee's decisions/observations on the following applications for planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as set out in the decisions below, be adopted. The conditions for approval, the reasons for imposing them and the grounds for refusal are contained in the report from the Director of Planning and in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

<b>ITEM NO</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>APPLICATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>
	(1)	(2)

**APPLICATIONS DEFERRED FROM THE LAST MEETING**

0/01    06/2597    591 Harrow Road, Wembley, HA0 2EF

Outline application for proposed demolition of rear part of existing building and erection of second floor and three-storey rear extension to form three-storey building comprising 3 one-bedroom flats and 3 studio flats, with provision of 2 disabled car-parking bays, landscaping, recycling area and 2 cycle stores (matters for determination: siting, design and means of access)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

At its last meeting, the Committee deferred this application and the application for 593A-D Harrow Road for a site visit and to receive clarity on design and the involvement of the Registered Social Landlord (RSL). In reference to the supplementary information circulated at the meeting, the Head of Area Planning noted that the proposed additional storey to both buildings would create a more vertical emphasis and alter their scale and character, while also having a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building. He referred to comments by the Chairman of Fairview Club questioning the need for a development which he claimed would not increase the habitable rooms but rather would produce a substandard accommodation and cause problems with the closest neighbours. The Head of Area Planning submitted that as the scheme would result in the demolition of family sized dwelling house without a similar replacement, there would be loss of dwelling house contrary to policy BE23 of the Unitary Development plan (UDP). He added that by its increased height and the number of windows, the proposal would exacerbate problems of poor outlook and potential overlooking between the respective sites. He therefore reiterated the recommendation for refusal of both applications.

Mr Peacock, Chairman of the adjoining Fairview Club objected to the proposed development on grounds of inadequate parking facilities and over-development of the site. He added that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the value of the Club.

Mr Mahmut Hilmi, the applicant's architect submitted that the amenity spaces for No 593A-D were acceptable as were for No 591 as there would be only 9 people in the flats, each of which would have either its own private garden area or balcony. He added that the space between No 593 and Fairview Club would be 3 metres at first and second storeys. The architect referred to the original features of the buildings which he said would be retained in the proposals. He added that the proposed development which complied with scale and density standards would address sustainability issues of energy and the environment. He also submitted a letter from Shepherds Bush Housing Association, an RSL, in which the latter confirmed their interest to lease both properties on completion.

In response to members' questions, Mr Hilmi stated that as these were outline planning applications, security aspects of the proposals would be dealt with at the detail stage. He added that the problems with parking would be addressed through properly laid out facilities, controls on fly-tipping and relatively low rate of car ownership among social housing occupants.

**In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice** Councillor Moloney said that he had been approached by the applicants. He stated that most of the concerns expressed at the last meeting in connection with both applications including the RSL had been addressed. He added that the current applications, which were an improvement on the previous applications, would assist the Council in providing residential accommodation for its residents.

During debate, Councillor Cummins stated that aesthetically he had no objection in principle to height of the buildings being increased provided all appropriate

features and design details were retained or reinstated. Additionally, the proposals would provide much needed accommodation in the Borough especially for young people and key workers. He therefore urged Members for approval. Councillor Dunwell expressed concerns about the amenity space in the rear garden area.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

0/02 06/2594 593A-D, Harrow Road, Wembley, HA0

Outline planning application for the demolition of the rear part of the building and side extension and erection of a second-floor and three-storey rear and side extension building to form a three-storey building comprising 6 one-bedroom flats and 3 studio flats, with the provision of 4 car-parking spaces (2 disabled), refuse and recycling area and cycle stores to the rear (matters for determination: siting, design and means of access)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

(See above for preamble)

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

0/03 06/2932 Lonsdale House, 43-47 Lonsdale Road, London, NW6 6RA  
Change of use of premises from printing press to delicatessen food shop (Use Class A1) including alterations to elevations and provision of 4 car-parking spaces to the front of premises (as revised by plans received on 22 November 2006 and clarified by letter received on 2 January 2007)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

In reference to the supplementary information circulated at the meeting, the Assistant Planning Manager (Southern Area) submitted that Lonsdale Road had not been pursued for adoption due to possible adverse impact on local businesses and practical difficulties about the cost of works involved. He added that of the 3 accidents that had occurred since 2003 none involved personal injury or related to the conditions in Lonsdale Road. He confirmed that Lonsdale Road already had road humps and therefore there was limited scope for additional traffic calming measures.

In the discussion that followed, Councillor Dunwell expressed his concern about loss of light industrial sites in the area.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

Councillor Dunwell asked that his dissent against the decision be recorded.

Single-storey side and rear extension, conversion of garage to form habitable room and conversion of dwellinghouse to form 4 self-contained flats

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission, but if Members are minded to approve the application, it should be subject to conditions as set out in the report.

This application was considered at the last meeting at which members were minded to grant planning permission contrary to officers' recommendation for refusal. In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, the Head of Area Planning was asked to submit a report setting out conditions for approval. The Assistant Planning Manager (Southern Area) also referred to additional letters of objection including one from the Chatsworth Area Residents' Association which raised the following additional points;

- Concerned that Committee were minded to overturn Officers' recommendations for refusal, although the application breached adopted UDP policy, as set out in the report.
- The building would not be suitable for use as a care home as claimed by the applicants.
- Even if the building were to be used for sheltered accommodation, it could cause other problems for the area contrary to the UDP policies.
- The applicants needed to work within the rules just like everyone else.
- Concern about overlooking, lack of security, impact on drainage and flooding.

Mr N Winton in objection to the application stated that the proposed development which contravened several clauses of the unitary Development Plan (UDP) would result in an inadequate standard of accommodation for its occupants and set a precedent for similar undesirable developments within the area

Mr Binney representing Chatsworth Area Residents' Association in a similar vein submitted that the proposed development flagrantly flouted the UDP policies. He urged members to be minded to refuse the application in accordance with the officers' recommendation but to ask the applicant to resubmit a scheme that respected the UDP

Mr Patel the applicant's agent stated that revised plans that addressed previous problems with design, cycle and bin stores had been submitted with the application which complied with SPG5 and SPG17. In reference to objectors' claims that it would set an undesirable precedent, Mr Patel submitted that other developments carried out in the area had already changed the character of Deerpurst Road and that the proposed communal use of the building would not unduly add to that. In respect of noise nuisance he stated that a management scheme would be implemented by the Temple management that would control possible noise nuisance and respect residential amenities. In response to a Member's query about stacking, Mr Patel said that as the rooms had high

ceilings, the applicants would be able to overcome that through Building Regulations

**In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice** Councillor Shaw a ward member stated that she had been approached by the applicants and the objectors. Councillor Shaw referred to a residents' meeting that she had convened to discuss this application at which concerns were expressed about the application in particular on amenity and privacy issues. She urged the Committee to ask for a further review of the proposal and consultation before being granted approval subject to conditions which would seek to address residents' concerns.

**In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice** Councillor Chavda stated that he had been approached by the applicants and that he wished to speak as most of his constituents worshipped at the Temple. Councillor Chavda submitted that the Temple, a charitable organisation, was seeking to carry out an aspect of social services that should have been provided by the Council. He expressed his support adding that the applicants had indicated a willingness to address any outstanding concerns that officers might have about the application.

In the debate that ensued, Councillor Dunwell although applauding the social service aspect of the Temple expressed that the proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site. Councillor R Moher expressed a view that the applicant be requested to submit a suitable proposal that complied with standards and policies. This view was also shared by Councillor Cummins.

The Chair was of the view that the rear and side extensions were within the required footprints of the building which would receive adequate lighting to the ground floor and additional lighting to the property in general, through the roof lights. He noted that issues regarding the scale of the extension, lighting, stacking, landscaping, bin and cycle storage had either been addressed or were surmountable through Building Regulations. He submitted that the sizes of the flats complied with the UDP policies and indicated his support for the application. The Committee concurred with the Chair's reasons for approving the application set out above subject to conditions as set out in the main report.

In response to the issues raised, the Assistant Planning Manager (Southern Area) stated that the problems with the scheme including over development of the site had not been addressed. He reiterated the recommendation for refusal.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice paragraph 29 (i) voting on the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission was recorded as follows;

FOR: Councillors Cummins, Dunwell, J Long and R Moher (4)

AGAINST: Councillors Anwar, Kansagra, Hashmi. Hirani and H M Patel (5)

**DECISION:** Planning permission granted subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

## NORTHERN AREA

1/01 04/0219 TENNIS COURTS N/T SYNAGOGUE, Preston Road, Harrow, HA3

Details pursuant to condition 9 (management scheme for events) of full planning permission 02/1167 dated 17/01/2003 for erection of a two-storey synagogue building including associated car-parking, landscaping and removal/lopping of trees (accompanied by amended Management Scheme and letter dated 29/12/2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (Northern Area) stated that as a result of discussions on the rear fire escape and disabled access at lower ground floor level, the Synagogue representatives had proposed a series of amendments to the existing procedures as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting. These included amongst others, prominent signage at the entrance, the use of the doors by disabled persons only except in an emergency, amended management scheme and the employment of a caretaker who would have authority to take all appropriate steps necessary to comply with the terms of the management scheme. In providing an update to Members the Planning Manager stated that the risk of flooding to adjoining gardens from this site remained a persistent and complex problem which remained unresolved despite the involvement of the Council's Building Surveyor, Land Drainage Engineer and Environmental Health officers. He added that although the problem with surface water drainage appeared to have been resolved, continued water flow remained a problem in the area. He also added that at a recent meeting between the applicants, the enforcement and landscape officers, the need to comply with the approved plans in terms of positioning, quantities and varieties of plants was highlighted. Accordingly, the applicants had been given until 1<sup>st</sup> February 2007 to address those matters.

Mr M Dale in objecting to the applications reiterated his concerns about drainage, use of the rear access doors and the resulting noise nuisance all of which the Synagogue had done very little in addressing them. He expressed scepticism about the applicant's ability to adhere to the terms of their management plan. Mr Dale urged the Committee to refuse the applications until the doors were relocated in accordance with the plans. In response to Members' questions, Mr Dale submitted that he would require more information on how the Synagogue planned to address the concerns he had raised and pending which planning permission should be withheld.

Mr N Pandya speaking in similar vein raised concerns about the rear door, noise nuisance and illegal parking to the detriment of residential amenity. He added that other issues including sound insulation had not been resolved and urged Members to defer the application until those matters had been resolved beforehand. He was not satisfied by the Chair's assurance that extra conditions were being recommended which if not adhered to would lead to enforcement action.

Mr A Solomon, the applicant stated that the Synagogue was conscious of the concerns expressed by the local residents and gave an undertaking to adhere to the terms of the management scheme including signage and the use of the access doors for disabled persons except in an emergency. Furthermore, the height of the door had been lowered and an undertaking had been given to comply with landscaping by 1<sup>st</sup> February 2007. He added that the Synagogue would engage a caretaker with a strong character who would ensure that hirers adhered to the restrictions in force. In response to a Members' enquiry about the time scale for the completion of the acoustic screen, Mr Solomon said that it would take approximately 3 months although the Synagogue was currently obtaining estimates of the cost involved

In response to Councillor Dunwell's request for an update on the acoustic screen and the possibility of incorporating changes to the management plan into conditions, the Planning Manager stated that the acoustic screen was not part of the application but had come about as a result of an enforcement issue. He added that if members' desired, the signage and other changes to the management scheme could be made into conditions. The Planning Manager drew attention to the applicant's undertakings and added that the relationship of the application with the back garden fence complied with Brent's policy. He added that whereas there were no controls on the old synagogue, the new structure had allowed officers to introduce controls that would benefit local residents. The Head of Area Planning added that on balance, the management scheme and the acoustic screen which could be added to condition 3 would address residents' concerns on noise nuisance.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/02 05/2392 Tennis Courts N/T Synagogue, Preston Road, Harrow, HA3

Retention of the fire-escape & disabled-access doors in a different location from the one approved by the original planning consent ref. no. 02/1167 (for erection of a two-storey synagogue building including associated car-parking, landscaping and removal/lopping of trees, dated 17/01/2003)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

See above for preamble.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in condition 3 to incorporate acoustic screening.

1/03 06/3045 9 Highcroft, London, NW9 0SE

Single-storey side and rear extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/04 06/3225 6 Lodore Gardens, London, NW9 0DR

Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/05 05/0644 The Green Man, Slough Lane, London, NW9 8YG

Proposed erection of 2-/3-storey building comprising 2 x 1-bedroom, 24 x 2-bedroom and 2 x 3-bedroom, self-contained flats, together with 26 associated underground car-parking spaces to the rear of the Green Man public house and a further 19 spaces for use by patrons and public (as accompanied by a Design Statement). (As revised by letters dated 6/11/06; 9/11/06; 10/11/06; 23/11/06).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

In giving the background to this application, the Planning Manager informed Members that although planning permission was originally granted in July 2005, the decision was not issued as the applicant did not sign the s106 agreement. Following further discussions and the submission of a revised scheme an agreement had been reached with the applicant. The Planning Manager (Northern Area) clarified that the details proposed for entrance control measures to the basement car parking area would involve a two lane ramped carriageway leading down to the basement with an access width of 6.3m. He added that the Director of Transportation had re-confirmed his satisfaction with the mix of the affordable and private car spaces and six bicycle spaces controlled by a pair of electrically operated gates (with a fob key). He referred to a second letter of objection which raised the following concerns; the area was too densely populated; inadequate facilities; too much traffic; too little parking; increase in noise and crime but reiterated the recommendation subject to a s016 agreement.

Mr Cunningham the applicant was satisfied with the recommendation for approval subject to a s106 agreement and did not wish to speak at the meeting.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

## **SOUTHERN AREA**

2/01 06/3185 Unit 1, Chapman Park Industrial Estate, 378 High Road, London, NW10 2DY

Change of use from light industrial to car repair and refurbishment.(As accompanied by general process description for body & paint shop, certificate of compliance, monitoring of flue stack emissions and spray booth specification)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

2/02 06/3253 Aerial Services, 300 High Road, London, NW10 2EN

Demolition of existing building and erection of a 5 storey building comprising 14 flats ( 8 x 2 bed and 6 x 1 bed), one retail unit on the ground floor and ancillary service and bin storage area

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

Members were informed that the application had since been withdrawn. The Head of Area Planning recommended the Committee to confirm that based on information available they would have refused the application.

DECISION: The application would have been refused on the basis of information available.

2/03 06/3102 5 Carlisle Road, London, NW6 6TL

Retention of a single storey detached building in rear garden of dwellinghouse.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

## **WESTERN AREA**

3/01 06/2528 12 Littleton Road, Harrow, HA1 3SU

Erection of a part single-storey and two-storey side extension, first-floor rear extension and rear dormer window extension and installation of a rooflight to each side roof-plane of the dwellinghouse.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

In reference to the applicant's photographic submissions to support his claim about precedents at No 29 Littleton Road (05/2036) and numbers 47 & 49 Sudbury Court Drive (06/0899 & 03/0230 respectively) the Head of Area Planning submitted that neither case was comparable for the following reasons;

(a) In the cases of Nos. 29 Littleton Road and 47 Sudbury Court Drive the original house was a wider two storey building and, the rear extension in-filled a proportion of the rear building line, the overall two storey rear part is not as wide as the pre-existing two storey building.

(b) 47 Sudbury Court Drive occupies a corner plot some 12 metres wide. However, it is just outside the Area of Distinctive Residential Character. He added that the proposed rear extension was over-sized, out of keeping with the scale and character of the original dwellinghouse and detrimental to the visual amenity of the subject site and surrounding Area of Distinctive Residential Character (ADRC). The applicant had been unwilling to agree the amendments sought to reduce the overall size, resultant bulk and scale of the development to ensure the extensions were appropriate for their setting and did not detrimentally alter the scale and character of the house. He recommended refusal

Mr Nawaz the applicant submitted that the application complied with Brent's planning policies including Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 (SPG5) and the 2:1 rule in terms of amenity, lighting and ventilation. He stated that none of the neighbours had objected to the application which was not only consistent with previous approvals but would not set undesirable precedents. He added that officers' request for a reduction of depth at first floor would spoil the appearance contrary to policy BE9 of the UDP and that beams and fortified foundations to take the additional loads would prove too costly. In reference to developments at 74 and 49 Sudbury Court Drive and 29 Littleton Road, he reiterated that his application would not cause precedents.

During debate, Councillor Cummins expressed a view that the rear of the application was not visible from the streetscene, the proposal had no massing and overbearing impact, he indicated his support for the application. Councillor Dunwell referred to other cases where the Planning Committee had considered that the overall scale and projection of rear extensions was a concern, even outside Areas of Distinctive Residential Character. In bringing the discussion to a close, the Chair stated that regard must be had to the overall massing, impact on neighbours and subsidiarity.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

3/02 06/2771 75 Farm Avenue, Wembley, HA0 4UY

Retention of single-storey outbuilding at rear of garden

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

Outline planning application for the demolition of 4 existing semi-detached houses and erection of a 3-storey building comprising 14 self-contained dwellings, provision of 15 car-parking spaces including 1 disabled bay, cycle store, refuse store, formation of new vehicular and pedestrian access to site (matters to be determined: siting and means of access).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

In reference to the supplementary report, the Head of Area Planning stated that in response to required revisions, the applicant had submitted revised drawing which included an additional cycle store and auxiliary bin store closer to the rear wall of the proposed building. The subject site adjoins but is not within the area previously designated as the Preston Park Conservation Area. In justifying the reasons why Logan Road was a preferable location for the vehicular access to the development, he said that the provision of the access from Preston Road would result in conditions prejudicial to the free flow of traffic on the highway and an increase in the intensity of use would be detrimental to highway safety. As the density level of the proposed development was below the range specified within SPG17 it constituted an under-development of the site in principal but the applicant had provided illustrative information to demonstrate both a reasonably good overall scheme as well as an appropriate dwelling mix. Although this was an outline application for siting and access, the detail stage would allow the applicant to incorporate sustainability measures and accordingly he recommended that the Section 106 Head of Terms be amended to include the submission and approval in writing of a revised Sustainability Checklist score of at least 51 %. He noted that the proposal included sufficient separation between the parking area and the boundary with No. 1 Logan Road to implement screen planting along this boundary adding that details of that would be required through condition.

Mrs G Swan objected to the proposed development on the following grounds;

- i) Overlooking, loss of privacy and higher levels of trespassing which would compromise residents' security;
- ii) Increase in population density in the area would lead to an increase in noise nuisance
- iii) Lack of adequate parking facilities leading to increased on-street parking, traffic congestion and pollution especially to No 1 Logan Road.

Mrs Swan suggested that if Members were minded to grant approval then the applicant should be required to limit the height to 2 storeys, provide secure access from Preston Road and an increase in on site parking facilities. Although she noted the recommended condition screen planting Mrs Swan requested a

brick wall and fence in the interest of residential amenity and privacy, to be erected prior to demolition.

Mr Barry Sutton the applicant's agent stated that this outline application had addressed concerns and the reasons for which the previous application was refused. The application complied with Brent's policies and standards on density levels and parking requirements and would allow the smooth flow of traffic on the highway whilst maintaining road safety. He urged members to approve the outline planning application.

The Chair read out a statement from Councillor Blackman, a ward member which drew members' attention to the re-designation of the area as an Area of Distinctive Residential Character (ADRC), the dangers in siting the vehicular access onto Logan Road, the detrimental impact on residential amenity in particular No. 1 Logan Road and the inappropriate siting of the proposed car park adjacent to No 1 Logan Road. For the above reasons, Councillor Blackman's statement urged the Committee to be minded to refuse the outline planning application.

In responding to some of the issues raised, the Head of Area Planning submitted that the current revised outline application had addressed the concerns with the previous application in terms of the mix of housing units, refuse storage bins in an acceptable area, pedestrian entrances to all elevations, re-sited parking area with a 2 metre buffer zone to allow for screening plants and thus minimise noise and disturbance, appropriate massing and density levels.

During debate, Councillor Dunwell expressed his support for the density aspect of the outline planning application but added that he could not concur with the comments by Director of Transportation. He therefore moved an amendment for deferral to enable the Council, applicants and the residents to review the access and parking situations. This was put to the vote but it fell.

**DECISION:** Planning permission granted subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

## **5. Planning Enforcement Monitoring**

This report from the Director of Planning asked Members to note and endorse the enforcement actions taken between 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2006 and 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2006 as outlined in his report. The Head of Area Planning informed the Committee that the during the quarter appeal success rate had fallen from 80% to 60% mostly because planning and enforcement appeals relating to such development s as outbuildings were not supported by the Planning Inspectorate. As a result, the Planning Service was reviewing its level of enforcement activity following which resources may be appropriately concentrated on preventative work, particularly in conservation areas rather than pursuing outbuildings. The review would seek be reported to this Committee. The Committee welcomed the

content and clarity of the report and recognised the need to review priorities for action.

RESOLVED:-

That the enforcement actions taken between 1<sup>st</sup> October 2006 and 31<sup>st</sup> December 2006 as outlined in this report be noted and endorsed.

## 6. **Planning Appeals**

Members were requested to note the list of planning and enforcement appeals for November and December 2006.

RESOLVED:-

that the following list planning and enforcement appeals for November and December 2006 be noted:-

- (i) Planning appeals received
- (ii) Enforcement appeals received.
- (iii) Planning appeal decisions.
- (iv) Copies of selected appeal decisions.

## 7. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would take place on **Wednesday, 31<sup>st</sup> January 2007**. As that meeting would consider policy issues only there would no prior site visits. The next meeting that would consider applications would take place on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2007.

The meeting ended at 10.40 pm.

S KANSAGRA  
Chair

Notes:

1. **At 9.05 pm the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes.**
2. **At 10.30 the Committee voted unanimously to disapply the guillotine procedure to enable all applications to be considered on the night.**

S:\COMMITTEES\MINUTES\Minutes 06-07\Council\Planning\23 Jan 07.doc