



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

### MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 14 March 2012 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Ketan Sheth (Chair), Daly (Vice-Chair), Cummins, Hashmi, Kabir, McLennan, Mitchell Murray, CJ Patel and RS Patel

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Mary Arnold, Councillor Patricia Harrison, Councillor Jean Hossain, Councillor Paul Lorber, Councillor Jim Moher, Councillor Kana Naheerathan and Councillor Harshadbhai Patel

Apologies for absence were received from Singh

#### 1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

8. First floor, 1-3 Lonsdale Road, London NW6 6RA (Ref. 11/3247)

Councillor Cummins declared that he knew the applicant's parents. Councillor Cummins indicated his intention to withdraw from the meeting room during consideration of this application and take no part in the discussion or voting.

13. Ground and first floors, 967 Harrow Road, Wembley HA0 2SF

Councillors Daly and Ketan Sheth declared that that had been approached by objectors to the application. Councillors Daly and Ketan Sheth indicated their intention to withdraw from the meeting room during consideration of this application and take no part in the discussion or voting.

#### 2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 February 2012 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### 3. **The Crest Boys' Academy & The Crest Girls' Academy, Crest Road, London NW2 7SN (Ref. 11/3393)**

PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 3 (development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans and documents) and condition 32 (details of facade/cladding works) of full planning permission 11/1698 dated 19/10/2011 for phased development comprising enabling works including demolition of existing temporary structures, formation of new access road from Dollis Hill Lane and car park (44 spaces), erection of temporary school accommodation (2.5 year permission).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant consent for variation of conditions 3 and 32 and a new permission issued.

DECISION: Planning permission granted for variation of conditions 3 and 32 and a new permission issued.

#### **4. Thames Water Utilities, St Michaels Road, London NW2 6XD (Ref. 11/1135)**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of a residential development comprising 23 houses (17 x 4-bed, 5 x 3-bed, 1 x 2-bed) and 16 flats (2 x 3-bed, 10 x 2-bed flats, 4 x 1-bed flats), with 44 parking spaces and associated landscaping and cycle storage with combined vehicular and pedestrian access via existing access from St Michael's Road and pedestrian access onto Olive Road accompanied by a Design & Access Statement and as amended by revised plans received 29/02/12.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) Grant Planning Permission, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 2 and 4, an appropriate form of Agreement in order to secure the measures set out in the Section 106 Details section of this report, or
- (b) If within a reasonable period the applicant fails to enter into an appropriate agreement in order to meet the policies of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Strategy and Section 106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning, or other duly authorised person, to refuse planning permission.

Rachel McConnell, Area Planning Manager responded to the issues that were raised by members at the site visit. In respect of traffic and parking spaces, she stated that each unit would have one parking space in addition to five visitor parking spaces. She continued that as only maintenance work and vehicles associated with them would be accommodated, vehicular use would fall considerably and accordingly the scheme would not worsen the existing situation on the local highway network.

On residential amenity, Rachel McConnell advised members that as the nearest houses would be at least 14m away, she was satisfied that the relationship would be acceptable. She added that the high quality of architecture and proposed landscaping which would be secured via conditions would improve the setting of the landmarks without detracting from them. She referred to the Section 106 financial contribution of £329,400 for local infrastructure of which a substantial percentage could be made available for helping to provide additional school places. In reiterating the recommendation for approval, Rachel McConnell drew members' attention to an amendment to condition 2 to include correct revisions of approved plans as set out in the tabled supplementary report.

Ms Ruth Roth objected to the proposed development on the following grounds;

- i) It would destroy the green space.
- ii) It would have a detrimental impact on school places in the area.
- iii) Additional traffic would result creating congestion and parking problems.

Mrs Jayne Graham objected to the application on the grounds that it would result in the loss of trees and the park. She continued that Olive Road was already densely populated and that an additional development as proposed would increase the population density with additional impact on local school places. Mrs Graham added that the proposed development would be out of character with properties in the area.

Mrs Linda Aitken, the applicant's consultant started by saying that she had met with different community groups regarding the application for the development which was located within a brownfield site and which, in her view, was a blight on Gladstone Park. She added that the development would reduce considerably the number of vehicles to and from the site. She continued that with a significant amount of orchid trees to protect the hedgerows and the use of opaque glazing in some of the windows the development would not create overlooking or loss of privacy.

During members' questioning, Councillor Hashmi asked about any measures that the applicant had taken to address the parking situation. Councillor Daly asked about the number of proposed replacement trees and the design aspects of the development. The Chair requested the consultant to comment on the alleged loss of wildlife.

Mrs Aitken stated that a total of 44 car parking spaces (incl. four disabled) and two bicycle stores were proposed around the site, with the majority of the proposed houses having off-street car parking within their curtilage. She added that although the scale of the proposal was unlikely to have a significant impact on the local transportation network, a supporting Transport Statement had been provided which demonstrated that the overall transport impact would be acceptable and that the parking provisions complied with standard PS14 of the adopted UDP 2004. She continued that about fifty three (53) new trees would be planted and that the design of the low density development accorded with the London Plan. Mrs Aitken informed the Committee that there was no wildlife corridor on the site.

Steve Weeks, Head of Area Planning in responding to questions about aesthetic enhancements and encroachment stated that a condition had been imposed to ensure that acceptable materials would be used so as to ensure that the aesthetic quality of the development did not suffer. He added that Thames Water were running down their operational contractors on the site who were moving elsewhere. He suggested an amendment to condition 4 to require replacement planting within 5 years.

DECISION:

- (a) Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in conditions 2 and 4 as set out in the tabled supplementary report, an appropriate form of Agreement in order to secure the measures set out in the Section 106 Details section of this report, or
- (b) If within a reasonable period the applicant fails to enter into an appropriate agreement in order to meet the policies of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Strategy and Section 106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning, or other duly authorised person, to refuse planning permission.

**5. 165 Edgware Road, Kingsbury, London NW9 6LL**

PROPOSAL: Change of use from Off Licence shop (Use Class A1) to Slot Machine Arcade (Sui Generis)

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The application was deferred at the Planning Committee on 18 January 2012 to allow time to gather further information regarding residents' and Ward Councillors' concerns about anti-social behaviour in the area and in particular to seek the views of, and evidence from, the Metropolitan Police's Safer Neighbourhoods Team for Fryent Ward. Rachel McConnell, Area Planning Manager informed the Committee that as a result of the evidence gathered, officers had reconsidered the merits and harm of the application and had concluded the application should be refused for reasons set out in the main report.

Mr Keith Martin, Secretary of Springfield Estate Residents' Association, welcomed the Committee's decision at the last meeting to defer the application for further evidence. He continued that a meeting of the Association, Ward Councillors, Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) and the Metropolitan Police agreed that anti-social behaviour which had in the past resulted in dispersal orders would be on the increase if the application was approved. In addition, parking provision would be inadequate to support the proposed change of use to slot machine arcade. Mr Martin endorsed the officer's recommendation for refusal.

***In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor J Moher***, ward member, stated that he had been approached by the local residents. Councillor J Moher in endorsing the officer's recommendation for refusal added that his views were also shared by the other Fryent ward members.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

**6. Meera House, 146-150 Stag Lane, London NW9 0QR (Ref. 12/0060)**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of No.s 1 and 3 Tintern Avenue and construction of two storey building to provide a 10 bed (net increase of 9 bedrooms) extension to Meera Nursing Home with ground and first floor link to existing home, replacement laundry facilities and associated works as revised by plans received 23/02/2012.

RECOMMENDATION:

- (a) Grant planning permission subject to conditions and an appropriate form of Agreement in order to secure the measures set out in the Section 106 Details section of this report, or
- (b) If within a reasonable period the applicant fails to enter into an appropriate agreement in order to meet the policies of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Strategy and Section 106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning, or other duly authorised person, to refuse planning permission

DECISION:

- (a) Planning permission granted subject to conditions with additional informative on construction hours and an appropriate form of Agreement in order to secure the measures set out in the Section 106 Details section of this report, or
- (b) If within a reasonable period the applicant fails to enter into an appropriate agreement in order to meet the policies of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Strategy and Section 106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning, or other duly authorised person, to refuse planning permission.

**7. 72 High Street, London NW10 4SJ (Ref. 11/3017)**

PROPOSAL: Change of use from amusement arcade (sui generis) to retail (use class A1).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

**8. First Floor, 1-3 Lonsdale Road, London NW6 6RA (Ref. 11/3247)**

PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 4 (for temporary one year period) involving the extension of hours of usage to 06:00 - 22:00 Monday to Saturday and 06:00 - 21:00 Sundays and bank holidays of full Planning Permission ref:11/1956 Change of first floor use from office (use class B1) to yoga studio (use class D2)

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in planning reference 11/1956 and re-issuing the decision notice as set out in the supplementary report.

Members noted an advice by the Director of Legal and Procurement to issue a fresh permission under Section 73. In view of the advice, officers recommended that the relevant conditions from the original permission ref:11/1956 be included in this consent.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as set out in planning reference 11/1956 and re-issuing the decision notice.

**9. 2-12 inclusive, Priory Park Road, London NW6 7UG (Ref. 11/3364)**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 2-12 Priory Park Road [inclusive] (currently accommodating a HMO and a 79 room/ 198 person hostel) and erection of a proposed 6 storey building (plus basement), accommodating a 178 room/ 351 person hostel, with associated communal facilities at ground and lower ground level, and landscaping works.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

Andy Bates, Area Planning Manager confirmed advice from Housing Services that they did not anticipate that they would use or need the level of accommodation proposed. He then referred to a petition against the proposed development which effectively endorsed the recommendation for refusal.

Mrs Dawn Reidy, speaking on behalf of Brent Eleven Streets (BEST), objected to the proposed development on the grounds that it would lead to the loss of an existing historic building which made a strong contribution to the historic street scene in that part of Kilburn and which she felt deserved to be listed. She added that the doubling of the size of the hostel accommodation would have an adverse impact on the area particularly with several other developments that had taken place within the area.

***In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Arnold***, ward member, stated that she had been approached by the objectors to the application. Councillor Arnold stated that the grant of planning permission would not only double the density of units but also result in the loss of a building of Victorian architecture. She also referred to complaints she had received regarding management and environmental issues of the existing hostel. Councillor Arnold endorsed the recommendation for refusal.

Nick Taylor, the applicant's agent stated that the current cost of providing the hostel accommodation was becoming prohibitive and that the building, in its current state, did not conform to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). In his view there was a strong demand for short term hostel accommodation for Brent residents and others from neighbouring boroughs. He added that as the occupiers would stay temporarily, the officer's reasons 6, 7 and

8 for recommending refusal as set out in the main report would not be applicable. Nick Taylor continued that by using obscure glazing, the proposal would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

**10. Brookford, 13 Kilburn Lane, North Kensington, London W10 4AE (Ref. 11/3064)**

PROPOSAL: Change of use of the ground floor from sui generis (laundrette) to A5 (hot food take away).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

With reference to the tabled supplementary report, Andy Bates, Area Planning Manager stated that most of the issues raised by the objectors had been addressed in the main report. He added that in relation to noise, disturbance and pollution from existing takeaways Environmental Health Officers had provided information to confirm that there had been no complaints in the past three years in relation to litter or pest problems associated with take-ways on this stretch of Kilburn Lane. In conclusion he stated that the proposal was not considered to have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residents or other existing uses in the area.

Tracey Brent (local shop keeper), stated that as there were three (3) similar businesses in the area there was no need for a further takeaway as it would constitute an over-concentration of use. She added that the proposed use would create a detrimental impact in terms of noise, smells and other environmental health issues including pest problems.

In response to members' questions, Andy Bates referred to an amended condition 5 which addressed issues relating to ventilation and odours. He added that with only four (4) such uses out of seventeen (17) commercial units in that shopping parade, the proposed change of use would not constitute an over-concentration. He clarified the differences in use between the proposal and public houses and added that the proposal in itself would not worsen the traffic situation in the area. Steve Weeks added that a justification would have to be made to require "no deliveries" to the site. He however recommended an additional condition requiring that no food deliveries would be allowed unless the applicant had made a provision which had been agreed by officers regarding the storage of delivery vehicles.

Councillor Daly having commented on traffic impact, problems from delivery vehicles and noise nuisance put forward an amended motion for deferral. This was put to the vote and declared lost.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions with an additional condition relating to the control of any delivery vehicles and amendments to condition 5 relating to odours and fumes.

**11. Miracle Signs and Wonders Ministries, Church Road, London NW10 9NR (Ref. 11/3173)**

PROPOSAL: Part conversion and re-development of existing building to facilitate the erection of a 7 storey building to accommodate D1 use on ground floor and 28 residential units on upper floors ('Car Free' Scheme).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as amended in condition 12, an additional condition relating to noise insulation, the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Planning & Development) to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in condition 12, an additional condition relating to noise insulation, an informative relating to construction hours and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Planning & Development) to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

**12. Lonsdale House, 43-47 Lonsdale Road, London NW6 6RA (Ref. 12/0049)**

PROPOSAL: Change of use of ground floor from printing press (Class B2) to mixed use comprising restaurant (Class A3), wine bar (Class A4) and delicatessen selling hot and cold foods for consumption off the premises (Classes A5 and A1), including the installation of extraction plant, external alterations to the front elevation of the building and the creation of an external seating area.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions, additional conditions on amplified music and informatives.

Andy Bates, Area Planning Manager in reference to the tabled supplementary report drew members' attention to letters of support of the application. He added a further recommendation in response to a resident's request for an additional condition on amplified music and public address system in order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residents. He referred to the applicant's request for extended opening hours which he considered to be in excess of similar developments in Lonsdale Road and which had led to residents' initial concerns. In reiterating the recommendation for approval as amended, he considered that condition 5 as set out in the main report would be appropriate to protect neighbouring amenity.

Mr Mark Gautier, the applicant reiterated his request to members for the hours of opening to start from 08:00 hours instead of 10:00 hours at weekends.



In response to that Andy Bates pointed out that the recommended hours would be an acceptable balance to protect residential amenity and in response to Councillor Cummins' enquiry added an additional condition on refuse storage.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions, additional conditions on amplified music and refuse storage area and informatives.

**13. Ground and first floors, 967 Harrow Road, Wembley HA0 2SF (Ref. 11/3205)**

PROPOSAL: Erection of three storey side extension and associated works to curtilage including hard and soft landscaping and creation of new vehicle crossover to rear premises.(Revised plans received 03/02/2012)

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Neil McClellan corrected that the proposed office use should be B1 use and not B2 as stated elsewhere in the main report. He then responded to the issues raised at the Committee site visit. He informed the Committee that the application met the maximum parking standard and that the Council's Transport Officer had confirmed that the servicing standard for the extended building would be met by the 8m long vehicle bay to be accessed from Harrow Road, as proposed in the amended scheme. He continued that conditions were proposed restricting the width and height of vehicles entering the site from The Boltons thereby ensuring that the rear of the site can only be accessed by cars, thus minimising impact on road safety. In officers' view, the modest increase of additional 2 car parking spaces to be accessed via The Boltons was not considered likely to have a negative impact on highway conditions in the Boltons.

He confirmed that the proposal which was for 106sqm was below the threshold level at which B1 office space would require S106 contributions. He continued that as the proposed development would result in 156sqm of additional floor space, it would have qualified for the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), adding that the CIL would not take effect until April 2012.

Mr Sarkis Zacharian an objector stated that the due to its height and proximity to the boundary of nearby residential property, the proposed development would lead to loss of light and over-shadowing. He considered that in its current form, the proposal would be an over-development of the site. He urged that the applicant be requested to revise the plans.

Mr Mohan an objector raised concerns about the rear access to the building which he felt would encourage pavement parking to the detriment of residential amenity and also obstruct the movement of refuse trucks to The Boltons.

***In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Lorber***, ward member, stated that he had been approached by objectors and the local residents. Councillor Lorber stated that the rear access to the site would create difficulties for vehicle movement. The situation would be made worse in terms of enforcement as the area was not within a controlled

parking zone (CPZ). He therefore emphasised the need to retain the closure of the rear access. Councillor Lorber urged members to defer the application and request the applicant to submit a revised scheme.

In responding to the concerns on access, Neil McClellan reiterated the advice by the Council's Transportation officer that access to the building via the rear yard and parking would be acceptable.

In the ensuing discussion, Councillor Hashmi expressed concerns about the narrowness of the rear access and the problems that were likely to be caused as there were no parking controls and enforcement in The Boltons. He therefore put forward an amended motion for deferral. Councillor Cummins added that parking problems would result. Councillor Mitchell-Murray also expressed concerns about the ability of children to play in the area, refuse collection and the likely impact on the pavement.

Steve Weeks, Head of Area Planning stated that a large service area would be provided to the front, in accordance with advice by Transportation officers in addition to the parking spaces. He however recommended an additional condition on controlling the height of vehicles using the rear access.

The amended motion in the name of Councillor Hashmi was put to the vote and declared lost. Members then voted on the amended recommendation which was declared carried.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and an additional condition relating to the location and access to refuse collection.

**14. 210 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8PB (Ref. 09/2528)**

PROPOSAL: Erection of a smoking shelter and erection of a trellis around the site (retrospective application)

RECOMMENDATION: Grant one year temporary planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Temporary planning permission granted for one year subject to conditions.

**15. Texaco Star Market, Forty Avenue, Wembley HA9 8JS (Ref. 11/2976)**

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of the site to provide a five storey residential building comprising 32 flats and a terrace of 3 three storey houses, car and cycle parking, private and communal amenity space including a children's play area and landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant consent subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

Neil McClellan, Area Planning Manager informed members that the scheme had been amended to two 3-storey houses for which the section 106 financial contribution had also been revised to £183,600. He then responded to a number of issues raised at the site visit which required clarification. He advised that the quality of accommodation complied with the minimum floor space standards set out in the current London Plan and external amenity and play space standards. He referred members to condition 8 which covered landscaping and sought to address issues about boundary security to the rear. He advised members that the Council's Highways officers had re-confirmed their view that the proposed access arrangements would be satisfactory in road safety terms. Neil McClellan drew members' attention to condition 5 that sought to control noise and disturbance during demolition and construction, adding that the s106 agreement required the developer to join and adhere to the considerate construction scheme.

The Chair exercised his discretion to allow three (3) objectors in view of the prior agreement to requests to speak and the late request by a resident adjoining the site.

Mrs Myers, speaking on behalf of the neighbour at 152 Elmstead Avenue stated that whilst she was not against the principle of development on the site, she had concerns about the height of the scheme. She stated that the development should not exceed two storeys so as to match the character of the properties in Elmstead Avenue and prevent loss of privacy. She also expressed concerns about noise and disturbance during demolition and construction.

Mr Paul Horwitz expressed concerns (on behalf of the resident at 182 Elmstead Avenue) on the density which he felt would constitute an over-development of the site and the height of the proposed development which would lead to loss of privacy. He added that the parking problems in the Elmstead Avenue area would be made worse by the development. Mr Horwitz also expressed concerns about noise and disturbance during demolition and construction on the 88 year old resident at No. 182.

Monica Patel, representative of Elmstead Avenue Residents' Association expressed concerns about the development on the following grounds;

- (i) The height, design, layout and appearance would not fit in with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- (ii) The proposed development, due to its five-storey height, would overshadow the back gardens and rear living areas of adjacent properties, resulting in a loss of privacy for adjacent properties.

- (iii) The proposal would significantly increase traffic in an already heavily congested area leading to further pollution and noise as well as making it difficult for emergency services to access Elmstead Avenue.
- (iv) The increased traffic levels would compromise the safety of pedestrians in the vicinity of the site, including children at the adjacent school.

***In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor HB Patel***, ward member, stated that he had been approached by the objectors. Councillor HB Patel, in endorsing the objections raised by objectors added that the proposed development which he considered to be of a significant density, would adversely impact on school places and facilities including drainage. He added that the proposed multi-storey block of flats could give rise to social problems in the area and urged the Committee to request the applicant to re-submit a revised application that sought to overcome the concerns expressed.

Mark Pender, the applicant's agent informed the Committee that the applicant had held an exhibition with the purpose of addressing residents' legitimate concerns. He continued that in addition to the section 106 financial contribution the scheme which would comply with the London Plan and SPG17 including amenity space requirements would make available six (6) affordable units. Mark Pender added that there would be no overlooking and loss of privacy from the development for which a satisfactory daylight and sunlight assessment had been submitted. He concluded that the scheme would be in keeping with the local character of the block of flats in both Forty Avenue and the houses in Elmstead Avenue.

In responding to the concerns expressed, the Area Planning Manager drew members' attention to the remarks section of the main report for clarity. He also clarified that out of the total £183,600 in respect of the section 106 financial contribution, £15,000 would be spent on mitigating impact on transportation. Steve Weeks added that whilst there was no defined threshold level for an apprenticeship scheme, the development was smaller than any previous scheme where it had been sought.

**DECISION:** Planning permission granted subject to conditions with an additional condition relating to sustainable drainage materials, a correction to condition 5 referring to British Standard and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

**16. Land surrounding Wembley Stadium, Empire Way, Wembley, HA9 (Ref. 03/3200)**

**PROPOSAL:** Deed of variation to the Section 106 agreement for Outline Planning Consent reference 03/3200, the Quintain "Stage 1" consent.

RECOMMENDATION Grant approval of the proposed Head of Terms for the deed of variation and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning to agree the exact terms thereof on advice of the Director of Legal and Procurement.

With reference to the tabled supplementary report, Neil McClellan, Area Planning Manager corrected a typographical error in the main report that the payment per square metre should read £2,508 and not £2,058. He also clarified the affordable housing required to be provided on-site.

DECISION: Granted approval to vary the proposed Head of Terms for the deed of variation and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning to agree the exact terms thereof on advice of the Director of Legal and Procurement.

**17. Planning and enforcement appeals December 2011 and January 2012**

RESOLVED:

that the planning and enforcement appeals for December 2011 and January 2012 be noted.

**18. Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

**19. Date of next meeting**

The date of next meeting would be announced at the Annual meeting of the Council in May 2012.

The meeting ended at 10:30pm

COUNCILLOR KETAN SHETH  
Chair

Note: at 8:30pm, the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes.