

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
24 April 2014 (7.30 - 11.15 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Barry Oddy (in the Chair) Barry Tebbutt (Vice-Chair),
Rebecca Bennett, Roger Evans, Lesley Kelly and
+Pam Light

Residents' Group Linda Hawthorn and Ron Ower

Labour Group Paul McGeary

**Independent Residents
Group** +Michael Deon Burton

UKIP Group Fred Osborne

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Jeffrey Brace and David Durant.

+Substitute members Councillor Pam Light (for Jeffrey Brace) and Councillor Michael Deon-Burton (for David Durant).

Councillors Andrew Curtin, Wendy Brice-Thompson, Frederick Thompson and Barbara Matthews were also present for parts of the meeting.

50 members of the public and a representative of the Press were present.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

Through the Chairman, announcements were made regarding emergency evacuation arrangements and the decision making process followed by the Committee.

270 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 6 March and 13 March 2014 were agreed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

271 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Lesley Kelly declared a prejudicial interest in application P0315.14. Councillor Kelly advised that as the Cabinet member for Housing and Public Protection she held a prejudicial interest in the application. Councillor Kelly left the room prior to the discussion of the item and took no part in the voting.

272 P0115.14 - LAND ADJACENT TO BRAMBLE FISHING LAKE, BRAMBLE LANE UPMINSTER

The report before members detailed an application for landscaping works to a landfill site.

The application had previously been to Committee on 3 April 2014 with Members deferring the granting of planning permission to allow officers to seek additional information.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Linda Van den Hende on the grounds that it was considered that the proposal would be harmful to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt without any very special circumstances having been demonstrated. It was also considered that the proposal would be harmful to highway safety and amenity.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant.

The objector commented that the proposed works would involve over six hundred vehicle movements on the site. The objector also commented that there was no need for the works to take place and that the proposal could increase the potential flood risk of the site in the future. The objector also commented that the change to the landscape would look unsightly and lead to problems of overlooking during the construction period.

In response the applicant commented that the scheme was environmentally friendly and was remedying the past problem of back filling of household waste on the site. The applicant also commented that the site was prone to flooding due to poor drainage and that the scheme proposed was only a modest raising of land levels. The applicant also confirmed that all vehicular movements onto and off of the site would be logged using waste transfer records which could be scrutinised by the Environment Agency.

With its agreement Councillor Van den Hende addressed the Committee.

Councillor Van den Hende commented that the land was situated in the Green Belt and was regularly farmed for wheat although a wider range of crops could be grown on the land. Councillor Van den Hende also commented that no special circumstances had been submitted by the

applicant and that the proposed clay fill for the site was of a non-porous nature and could lead to future drainage problems.

During the debate members received clarification of the size of the piece of land in question and its proximity to neighbouring residential properties.

Views were expressed by a member that the report provided no very special circumstances which the Legal Advisor has highlighted in previous instances. The Legal Advisor clarified that in this case the proposed use was in policy terms an appropriate uses within the Green Belt, therefore there was no requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances.

Following a motion to refuse planning permission which was lost by 3 votes to 8. It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 2 with 1 abstention.

Councillors Oddy, Tebbutt, Bennett, Evans, Kelly, Light, Osborne and McGeary voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Hawthorn and Ower voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillor Deon-Burton abstained from voting.

273 **P1096.13 - 110 BALGORES LANE, (ABBNEYFIELD HOUSE) GIDEA PARK ROMFORD**

The report before members detailed an application for a change of use of a care home (C2 use) to a House in Multiple Occupation (sui generis use).

The application had been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the grounds that the development was likely to cause increased traffic nuisance to its neighbours and had insufficient parking for visitors and tenants. There could also be more than one occupier per bedsit if the permission was not conditioned.

Members were advised that an additional condition was being sought to restrict the occupation of the management flat to the Resident Manager.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant.

The objector commented that the proposed development would house twelve tenants but would only provide four communal bathrooms and a shared kitchen. The development would also lead to overlooking of

neighbouring properties and would only provide on-site parking for six vehicles.

In reply the applicant commented that the application had now been revised to provide en-suite bathroom facilities to all twelve units. The applicant also confirmed that a Unilateral Undertaking had been provided to the Council on the evening of the Committee to ensure that the property was properly managed. It was clarified that there was nothing in the Unilateral Undertaking save for reference to proper management and a schedule annexing a standard for tenancy agreement.

With its agreement Councillors Andrew Curtin and Wendy Brice-Thompson addressed the Committee.

Councillor Curtin commented that he wished to object to the proposed development for the following reasons mainly due to its intensive use. Councillor Curtin commented that there would be an adverse impact by reason of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers due to the use of the communal kitchen. Councillor Curtin also commented that there was no satisfactory visibility for access and egress given, to and from the site, given the increase in parking which could also lead to displaced parking in neighbouring side roads.

Councillor Brice-Thompson commented that there had been a large number of local residents who had raised objections to the scheme. Councillor Brice-Thompson also commented that the proposal would lead to a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers caused by intensification of the use of the garden and kitchen of the proposed development.

During the debate Members discussed the need for Key Worker accommodation in the area taking into account the new development on the former Oldchurch Hospital site.

Members also raised concerns regarding the management of the proposed development and agreed that enforcing conditions relating to occupiers of the development would prove difficult.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse planning permission which was carried by 11 votes to 0 it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds that:

- The proposal would result in excessively intensified occupation of the building, including in comparison with existing lawful use, that would cause material harm to living conditions of adjoining residents by reason of noise and disturbance. This would be exacerbated by the likelihood of extensive collective amplified and similar noise (eg TVs/radios/music) experienced through open windows, assembly of residents in collective areas such as undersized communal kitchen etc.

- The intensity of the use would result in vehicular movements to, from the premises and in the vicinity of the site would materially harm neighbours' amenity.
- The above harm to amenity, particularly in reason 1, would not be satisfactorily controlled/mitigated through the proposed managerial arrangements provided in the Unilateral Undertaking.

274 **P1549.13 - 11 RYDER GARDENS RAINHAM**

The report before Members sought retrospective planning permission for the variation of condition 8 of planning application P0574.09 to increase the number of children on the premises from twelve to fifteen.

Councillor Barbara Matthews had called in the application on the grounds that the site, a day nursery, was wholly unsuitable for an increase from twelve to fifteen children.

Members were advised that the applicant had submitted a letter advising that the application was no longer a retrospective but a prospective application with a proposed increase in child numbers.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by and objector without a response by the applicant.

The objector commented that the proposed increase of three children was a 25% increase in numbers and that the applicant was currently in breach of several planning conditions already attached to the previous planning permission.

With its agreement Councillor Barbara Matthews addressed the Committee.

Councillor Matthews commented that she supported the objector's views and was surprised that the applicant had applied for an increase in child numbers whilst being in breach of current planning conditions. Councillor Matthews also commented that the premise was not suitable for looking after 15 children.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse planning permission which was carried by 11 to 0 it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds that:

- Over intensification of use in a limited sized building causing noise and disturbance materially harmful to the neighbours' amenity, including the rear garden environment.
- Vehicular activity associated with the use would cause noise and disturbance materially harmful to the residential amenity.

275 **P1813.11 - FORMER SOMERFIELD DEPOT, NEW ROAD, RAINHAM**

The application before members was for the redevelopment of the former Somerfield Depot site to create a predominantly residential development providing four hundred & ninety seven residential units within eighteen apartment blocks and terraces of houses between three and six storeys in height. The development was proposed as an entirely private development with no affordable housing at the current time. The application was subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment and had been submitted with an Environmental Statement. The application had been previously included on the agenda for 25 April 2013, but had been withdrawn at staff's request.

Members were advised that condition 48 of the proposal was to be deleted following withdrawal of the representation of the Health and Safety Executive.

During the debate members discussed the possible impact the proposal could have on the surrounding area, in particular, its possible effect on schooling and medical provision for residents of the development. Officers advised that there was a review mechanism referred to in the Heads of Terms of the S106 of a financial re-appraisal should residential values increase, which could mean that on periodic financial reappraisal the site could support affordable housing provision.

Members received clarification on several points including why there was no provision for affordable housing within the proposal and whether Havering would receive nomination rights on any future lettings should an interested Registered Provider become involved in the development. Members questioned why a Registered Provider had not been secured given the length of the negotiation on the application.

Officers advised that the energy centre included in the proposal provided a source of both heat and power for residents and explained that lifetime homes meant that residents should be able to continue to live in the properties even if they were to need adapting in the future.

Mention was also made of the possible new railway station at Beam Reach, however members felt that this proposed station was still some way from reaching fruition.

Members also discussed the possible monitoring of air quality in the area and possible traffic movements affecting the A13/A1306.

A motion to refuse the granting of planning permission was lost by 4 votes to 7.

Members noted that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £723,500 and **RESOLVED** that having taken account of the environmental information included in the Environmental Statement and its

Addendum that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to:

- a) No direction to the contrary on referral to the Mayor for London (under the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008) ;
- b) The prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:
 - The sum of £2,236,500 towards the costs of infrastructure associated with the development based upon the current discounted tariff per dwelling in the Havering Riverside Area as set out in accordance with the Adopted Planning Obligations SPD.

Phasing to be:

- 25% to be paid prior to the commencement of development;
 - 25% to be paid prior to occupation of no more than 125 dwellings;
 - 25% to be paid prior to occupation of no more than 250 dwellings;
 - 25% to be paid prior to occupation of no more than 375 dwellings.
- The sum of £350,000 towards the cost of bus service enhancements;
 - The inclusion of a cascade and viability review clause in relation to the provision of affordable housing to ensure that the provision of affordable housing is maximised in relation to the financial viability of the scheme.
 - The submission of a phasing plan to demonstrate that Blocks A – H would be delivered at an early stage of the development and that the western most block/s (Blocks M and N) will be the final blocks to be constructed.

Prior to the construction of Blocks M and N that a design review be carried out to establish whether further pedestrian and vehicular linkages with land to the west can be achieved, subject to the design and planning of a new railway station at Beam Reach being at a sufficiently advanced stage. That Blocks M and N shall be so designed to achieve the desired pedestrian, cycling and vehicular linkages to the land to the west of the application site which is the potential site of a future Beam Reach Station.

- To provide training and recruitment scheme for the local workforce during construction period.
- A travel plan to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, including a scheme for submission, implementation, monitoring and review.
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council;
- The Council's reasonable legal fees for shall be paid on or prior to completion of the agreement and if for any reason the agreement is not completed the Council's reasonable legal fees shall be paid in full;
- The Council's planning obligation monitoring fees shall be paid prior to completion of the agreement.

That staff be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to include the following additional conditions and adjustments to the heads of terms:

- Additional conditions covering (1) waste management scheme especially for demolition/construction and (2) air quality.
- Adjust the head of term covering design review (bottom page 173/top page 174 of the report) deleting final sentence and wording to effect that "Blocks M and N shall be so designed to achieve the desired pedestrian, cycling and vehicular linkages to the land to the west of the application site which is the potential site of a future Beam Reach Station."

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 7 votes to 4.

Councillors Oddy, Tebbutt, Bennett, Evans, Light, Kelly and Osborne voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Hawthorn, Ower, McGeary and Deon-Burton voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

276 **P0315.14 - LAND OFF NEAVE CRESCENT ROMFORD - THE ERECTION OF TWO 2-BEDROOM BUNGALOWS FOR THE GENERAL NEEDS OF THE OVER 55'S**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £3,000 and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

As mentioned previously in these minutes Councillor Lesley Kelly declared a prejudicial interest in application P0315.14. Councillor Kelly advised that as the Cabinet member for Housing and Public Protection she held a prejudicial interest in the application. Councillor Kelly left the room prior to the discussion of the item and took no part in the voting.

277 **P0069.14 - 44 CHESTNUT AVENUE, HORNCHURCH - PROPOSED 2 BEDROOM HOUSE ON LAND ADJACENT TO 44 CHESTNUT AVENUE AND DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO 44 CHESTNUT AVENUE**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £2,160 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £6,000 towards the infrastructure costs arising from the development would be required to fulfil the requirements of the Planning Obligations SPD.
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement is completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That staff be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

278 **P0128.14 - 18 LITTLE ASTON ROAD HAROLD WOOD - PART SINGLE & PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

279 **P0136.14 - VEOLIA RAINHAM LANDFILL, COLDHARBOUR LANE, RAINHAM AND WENNINGTON - CONSTRUCTION OF AN EXTENDED AREA FOR BALES STORAGE, WATER STORAGE TANK, PUMP HOUSE AND ELECTRICAL SUB-STATION**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

280 **P0174.14 - BROADFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL FARINGDON AVENUE, HAROLD HILL - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and subject to the inclusion of two further conditions the precise wording of which is delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services as listed below in summary form:

- Details of site levels and finished building heights to be submitted to and agreed in writing by LPA prior to the development commencing.
- Details of a landscaping scheme designed specifically to screen and soften the visual impact of the development upon neighbouring residential properties should be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to development commencing.

281 **P1540.13 - 230-236 HORNCHURCH ROAD, HORNCHURCH - CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING A2 OFFICE USE CLASS TO C3 RESIDENTIAL USE CLASS, BY INTERNAL RECONFIGURATION OF EXISTING ACCOMMODATION, THE ADDITION OF FIRST FLOOR OVER PART OF GROUND FLOOR AT REAR, AND A TWO STOREY EXTENSION ALONG PURBECK ROAD, TO PROVIDE NINE FLATS OVER TWO STOREYS. RECONFIGURATION OF EXISTING CAR PARK TO PROVIDE COMMUNAL AMENITY SPACE, PARKING AND REFUSE AREA**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £1,618 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal

Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £54,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs.
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 Agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- To pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in association with the preparation of a legal agreement, prior to completion of the agreement, irrespective of whether the legal agreement is completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations/ monitoring fee prior to completion of the agreement.

That staff be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement that the Committee delegate authority to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

282 **P1257.13 - LAKE VIEW PARK, BRYANT ROW, 61 CUMMINGS HALL LANE, NOAK HILL ROMFORD - RETENTION OF A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING HOUSE, DECKING AND OUTBUILDING**

The Committee noted the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Kelly abstained from voting.

283 **P1451.13 - 155 BILLET LANE HORNCHURCH**

The application before Members sought a retrospective change of use to A4 (drinking establishment) from A3 (café/restaurant).

The application was deferred at the Committee meeting on 13 March 2014 to allow staff to seek further information and clarification on several matters.

The application had been called in by Councillor Barry Tebbutt on the grounds of the change of use and operating hours.

The Committee considered the report and noted the additional information contained therein.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to approve which was carried by 9 votes to 2. It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted for the hours applied for and for a temporary twelve month period.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 0 with 3 abstentions.

Councillors Hawthorn, Ower and Deon-Burton abstained from voting.

284 **P0225.14 - 67 CORBETS TEY ROAD, UPMINSTER - SECTION 73 APPLICATION FOR A MINOR MATERIAL CHANGE TO THE PLANS APPROVED UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION P1152.13**

The application was made pursuant to Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary Condition 2 of planning permission planning reference P1152.13 under Planning Application reference P0225.14. Condition 2 related to the standard 'in accordance with plans' condition. The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £16,560 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant completing a variation of the Section 106 Legal Agreement completed in relation to planning permission P1152.13 and dated 19th December 2013, to reflect the granting of a new permission with the reference P0225.14 and any other consequential changes as required. The legal agreement would continue to secure the following:

- The sum of £54,000 towards the costs of infrastructure associated with the development in accordance with the Planning Obligations SPD;
- All contribution sums shall include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council;
- The Council's reasonable legal fees for completion of the agreement shall be paid prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether or not it is completed;
- The Council's planning obligation monitoring fees shall be paid prior to completion of the agreement.

That staff be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, which shall be secured within 3

months of the Committee date, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 1.

Councillor Ower voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

285 **P0112.14 - LAND BETWEEN 115 AND 119 SHEPHERDS HILL, HAROLD WOOD**

The application before members sought planning permission for a new detached dwelling.

Councillor Barry Oddy had called the application in on the grounds that there was possible merit in the proposal and that Members may have wished to take an alternative view considering the site's location.

The Legal Adviser gave a brief explanation of the protection of the Green Belt and advised that the land was not diminished in terms of the protection afforded by Green Belt Policy by virtue of its current condition, whether overgrown or in a poor state. The land did not have to be green or open in its nature and considering a well landscaped site as not being Green Belt and therefore ripe for development was not consistent with Green Belt policy.

During the debate Members discussed the properties to the side and rear of the proposed site and questioned their influence on the openness of the Green Belt. Members also discussed the enhancement to the site that the proposed development would bring and any harm that could possibly arise.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to approve the granting of planning permission which was carried by 6 votes to 3 with 2 abstentions. The Committee noted that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £2,508.66 and **RESOLVED** that it be delegated to Head of Regulatory Services to approve the application contrary to recommendation subject to applicant agreeing to and then completing a unilateral undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure infrastructure tariff and subject to the conditions referred to in paragraph 8.2 of the report the precise wording of which is to be settled by the Head of Regulatory Services. The reasons for approval was that the material planning considerations resulting from the site forming part of a continuum of built form contained by existing housing to the sides and rear would influence its limited contribution to the openness of the Green Belt and the enhancement of the site's appearance would outweigh Policy DC 45 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and guidance on the Green Belt in the National Planning Policy Framework. Notwithstanding the in principle harm of a new building in the Green Belt

and the harm to the openness of the Green Belt, no other physical or environmental harm would arise.

The vote for the resolution to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to approve the application was carried by 7 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions.

Councillors Oddy, Tebbutt, Bennett, Light, Evans, Osborne and Deon-Burton voted for the resolution to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to approve the application

Councillors Hawthorn and McGeary voted against the resolution to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to approve the application.

Councillors Kelly and Ower abstained from voting.

286 **P0106.14 - REAR OF 16-20 CRANHAM ROAD HORNCHURCH**

The report before members proposed the demolition of existing workshops and buildings and the erection of a new two bedroom detached chalet style bungalow, with a garden to the side and parking area to the front served by an existing narrow access from Cranham Road.

The application had been called in by Councillor Paul Rochford on the grounds that the issues associated with the suitability of the proposal and other important considerations should be discussed by the Committee.

During a brief debate members discussed the probable improvement of the site and the removal of anti-social issues that the development would bring.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to approve which was carried by 11 votes to 0.

The Committee noted that the proposed development qualified for Mayoral CIL payment of £188 and **RESOLVED** to Delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the applicant completing a Unilateral Undertaking to secure a infrastructure tariff and subject to imposition of conditions to be settled by the Head of Regulatory Services and subject to resolution of any Fire Brigade objection. The reasons for approval concerned the improvement of the site, removal of non-conforming and potentially anti-social uses and the absence of any other environmental harm which were considered to be material planning considerations that outweighed the conflict with Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

287 PLANNING CONTRAVENTION - 356 RUSH GREEN ROAD

Members considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** it expedient that an Enforcement Notice be issued and served to require, within 3 months of the effective date of the enforcement notice:

1. Cease using the outbuilding shown hatched black on the plan for residential purposes
2. Remove from the outbuilding all fixtures and fittings associated with the unauthorised residential use.
3. Remove from the land at 356 Rush Green Road all rubble and waste materials, resulting from compliance with (2) above.

In the event of non compliance, and if deemed expedient, that proceedings be instituted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

288 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

During the discussion of the reports the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Committee Procedure Rule 8 in order to complete the consideration of the remaining business of the agenda.

Chairman