

## **THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CHESTER-LE-STREET**

Report of the meeting of Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Newcastle Road, Chester-le-Street, Co Durham, DH3 3UT on Monday, 9 February 2009 at 6.00 pm

### PRESENT:

Councillor Ralph Harrison (Chairman)

### Councillors:

T J Smith	P H May
L E W Brown	P B Nathan
L Ebbatson	D L Robson
M Gollan	J Shiell
D M Holding	S C L Westrip
W Laverick	F Wilkinson
M D May	

### Officers:

S Reed (Development and Building Control Manager), C Potter (Head of Legal and Democratic Services), D Chong (Planning Enforcement Officer), J Taylor (Senior Planning Officer) and M Fell (Democratic Services Assistant)

Also in Attendance as Observers: T Galloway (Director of Development Services) and H Geertsema (Communication and Public Relations Officer).

There were also 16 members of the public in attendance.

#### **47. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors S Barr, J W Barrett, G K Davidson, A Humes, K Potts, M Potts, M Sekowski, D Thompson and A Turner.

#### **48. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD 19 JANUARY 2009**

RESOLVED: "That the Minutes of the proceedings of the Meeting of the Committee held 19 January 2009, copies of which had previously been circulated to each Member, be confirmed as being a correct record."

The Chairman proceeded to sign the minutes.

#### **49. TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS**

Councillor Sheill declared a prejudicial interest in Item No. 2 of the Planning Matters report, as he would be speaking as an objector to the application. He proposed to leave the meeting whilst the item was being discussed and return once a decision had been made.

Councillor Smith declared a prejudicial interest in Item No. 2 of the Planning Matters report. She also proposed to leave the meeting whilst the item was being discussed and return once a decision had been made.

## **50. CONFIRMATION OF SPEAKERS**

The Chairman referred to the list of speakers and confirmed their attendance.

## **51. PLANNING MATTERS**

A report from the Development and Building Control Manager was considered, copies of which had previously been circulated to each Member.

The Chairman suggested that the order of the Agenda be changed to reflect the registered speakers present and it was agreed that it be considered in the following order – Item Nos. 2, 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

### **(A) District Matter Recommended Approval – Refused**

- (2) Proposal: The construction of a 104 bed residential care home including access details, car parking surfacing, landscaping and boundary treatment.**

**Location: Site of Former County Council Depot, Picktree Lane, Chester-le-Street, Durham, DH3 3RW**

**Applicant: Mr J. Oates – Reference: 08/00456/FUL**

The Development and Building Control Manager referred to photographs and plans in relation to the proposal, which were displayed for Members' information.

**Councillor Shiell, Mr Smith and Mr Howd (the objectors) and Mr Self (the applicant's agent) and Mr Oates (the applicant) spoke in relation to the application.**

The Development and Building Control Manager spoke in relation to the issues raised by the objectors, the applicant and his agent and clarified the following points:

In relation to the comments made concerning the site access and parking provision around the site, he stated that although concerns had been raised in relation to the additional traffic on the estate roads surrounding the site, the County Council as Highways Authority were firmly of the opinion that transport congestion issues were not grounds enough to recommend refusal. He commented that temporary problems were often experienced during the construction stage of larger development especially in relation to traffic congestion and that the acceptability of the scheme would depend on how the development functioned at the operational stage, once the development is built. He further advised that as the previous applications for this site had not been refused on highway and parking issues, he felt it would be inconsistent and unreasonable for Members to refuse the current application on these grounds.

In relation to the comments made regarding the alleged lack of need for the development, the Development and Building Control Manager advised that the County Council's Adult Social Care team had raised doubt as to whether there would be a demand for this size of facility however he advised that this was a commercial decision for the applicant to take and was not a material planning consideration.

In relation to the comments made concerning the ground conditions of the site, the Development and Building Control Manager advised that the Council's Building Control team were satisfied that the ground conditions of the site were suitable to accommodate, in structural terms, the type and scale of the proposed development.

In relation to the comments made regarding the applicants' responsibility to comply with the public artwork policy as per Local Plan Policy BE2, the Development and Building Control Manager advised that a legal agreement had been submitted to discharge his responsibility to provide this and confirmed that the figure contained in the report was consistent with the figures requested for similar development on this site.

In relation to the comments made on the comparisons between the current application and other similar development within the Chester-le-Street area, the Development and Building Control Manager advised that Planning Law required each planning application to be assessed on its own merit. He also felt that there were clear differences between the schemes referred to by the applicant elsewhere in the District and the scheme for consideration.

In relation to the comments made by the applicant and his agent on the need for consistent decision-making by the authority, the Development and Building Control Manager advised that Local Authorities were guided by National Planning advice in relation to being consistent when making decisions. He further advised that an incorrect comment had been made regarding the scale and massing of the current proposal in relation to the previously approved application for 88 bedrooomed residential care home and clarified that the scale and massing of the current proposal remained unchanged from the application for 104 bedrooomed home, which had been refused by the

Committee in March 2008. He commented that the comparative differences between the various applications had been highlighted in the table on page 31 of the Planning Matters report, for information.

Councillor Westrip sought clarification from the applicant in relation to the landscaping of the site and the proposed external amenities available to residents.

**At this point Councillors Shiell and Smith left the Meeting.**

Councillor Brown thanked the speakers for their presentation and advised that their comments and observations had been both noted and appreciated. He expressed concerns in relation to the development and advised that he could not support the Officer's recommendation of conditional approval because of the following reasons:

- The scale and massing of the development remaining unchanged from the application for 104 bedroomed residential care home, which had been refused by the Planning Committee in March 2008.
- The overall increase in height of the proposal compared with the 88 bedroomed care home application approved in August 2008.
- The development would be incongruous within the street scene and as such would be detrimental to visuality of the wider locality.
- The development would have an overbearing and overlooking impact on the residents of Hopgarth Court and Hopgarth Gardens and in particular would be harmful to their amenities.
- Criteria in respect of the RSS Policy, Chester-le-Street Local Plan Policy HP9 and HP17, and National Planning Policy PPS1 and PPS3 not being met.

Councillor Holding was in agreement with the comments made by Councillor Brown and raised further concerns in relation to the overbearing impact of the proposal and the lack of open areas available to the residents. He also spoke in relation to proposed extra condition 11 of the recommendations and queried whether this could be amended to require that a travel plan be submitted by the developer as soon as the building becomes occupied rather than within 6 months of occupation as recommended.

The Development and Building Control Manager advised that the County Council as Highways Authority were of the opinion that a travel plan can only be formed once a developer has had the opportunity to observe how the development is operating, therefore the developer is allowed to submit the plan within 6 months of occupation.

Councillor P May was in agreement with Councillor Brown's comments in relation to the scale and massing of the development and felt the proposed

impact on the street scene remained unchanged from the previously refused application.

Councillor Gollan referred to the comments made in relation to the need for consistent decision-making by the Committee and felt that it would be consistent for Members to refuse the current proposal, as it seemed to be similar to the previously refused application for 104 bedroomed care home. He also expressed concern in relation to the travel plan and car parking provision included in the proposal.

Councillor Laverick was of the opinion that the scale and massing of the development was similar to the adjacent development of Sandringham Court and due to the orientation of the proposal, the residents of Sandringham Court would not be directly overlooked. In his opinion there was a demand for nursing care of this nature within the community.

Councillor Westrip sought clarification from the Development and Building Control Manager in relation to the elevation heights of the proposal, compared to that of Sandringham Court, the live application for 88 bedroomed care home and Hopgarth Court.

The Development and Building Control Manager confirmed that the elevation of the proposal would be one storey higher than the approved elevation of the live application for 88 bed roomed care home. He also clarified that the additional storey would face onto Hopgarth Court; although design amendments had been made to lower the eaves height, which had created a steeper pitched roof.

In relation to a query raised by Councillor Robson as to the reasons why Officers were minded to approve the current proposal, the Development and Building Control Manager stated that changes made by the applicant to significantly reduced the amount of glazing which faces on to Mr Howd's property. He commented that the quantity of clear glazing now facing Hopgarth Gardens would be similar to the quantity which had been agreed in the live application for an 88 bed roomed care home.

The Development and Building Control Manager also spoke in relation to the scale and massing of the proposal and commented that following lengthy discussions between Planning Officers and Mr Oates' Solicitor and Architect; the County Council's Design Officer was now prepared to support the scale, massing and design of the current proposal. He added that both these factors had been influential in the Officers decision to recommend approval of the scheme.

Councillor Wilkinson felt the applicant had altered the degree in which the local residents were overlooked; however he felt the massing and overbearing impact of the development on local residents and Chester-le-Street itself, still remained.

After much discussion and consideration of the points raised by the speakers, the Chairman requested that Members move towards a decision in relation to the proposal.

Following the outcome of the vote in relation to the proposal, the Development and Building Control Manager requested that Members clarify their decision to refuse the scheme and their reasoning. He stated that refusal on the grounds of the inappropriate scale and massing of the scheme and the overbearing impact on surrounding residents, as previously discussed by Members, would in principle be valid planning reasons to refuse the application.

Councillor Ebbatson proposed that the application be refused due to the inappropriate scale and massing of the scheme and the overbearing impact on surrounding residents. This was seconded by Councillor Brown.

The proposal to refuse this application for the reasons suggested was carried.

RESOLVED: "That notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation of conditional approval, the application be refused for the following reasons:

Extra 1.

The proposal would provide for a form of development that would be harmful to the amenities of surrounding residential occupiers by virtue of an undue overbearing impact contrary to the aims of Policy HP 9 of the Chester-le-Street Local Plan.

Extra 2.

The proposal, by way of inappropriate scale and massing, would provide for a form of development that would be incongruous within the street scene and as such would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the wider locality, contrary to the aims of PPS 1 and PPS 3, Policy 8 of the Regional Spatial Strategy, and Policies HP 9 and HP 17 of the Chester-le-Street Local Plan."

**Councillors Shiell and Smith returned to the Meeting.**

**Councillor Nathan left the Meeting at 6.56pm.**

**(B) District Matter Recommended Refusal**

**(1) Proposal: Erection of 62 bed residential care home with access and landscaping.**

**Location: Former Pelaw Grange Cottage, North Road,  
Chester-le-Street, Durham, DH3 2AD.**

**Applicant: W. Todd Builders Ltd – Reference: 08/00422/FUL**

The Development and Building Control Manager referred to photographs and plans in relation to the proposal, which were displayed for Members' information.

Councillor P May spoke in relation to the proposal and felt the design and scale of the development was not in keeping with the surrounding area. He also raised concerns in relation to the site's close proximity to the BOC plant, as he considered that from a health and safety point of view, this would be hazardous to the occupants of the residential care home.

Councillor Laverick was in agreement with Councillor P May's comments in relation to the scale and design of the development, and also the site's close proximity to a neighbouring hazardous site. In addition he felt the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the surrounding residents of the site.

Councillor Brown agreed with the comments expressed by Councillors P May and Laverick, and proposed to move the Officer's recommendation of refusal, which was seconded by Councillor P May. This proposal was carried.

RESOLVED: "That the recommendation of the Development and Building Control Manager to refuse the application be agreed for the following reasons:

Extra 1.

The development hereby proposed is incongruous in appearance by virtue of its poor design, scale and massing harmful to the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policy 8 of the Regional Spatial Strategy, and Policies HP9 and HP17 of the Chester-le-Street District Local Plan.

Extra 2.

The development proposed would result in a level of risk and potential harm to those within the development from the neighbouring hazardous site such that the application should be refused on safety grounds in accordance with Policy 2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 23.

Extra 3.

The access to the A167 (North Road) has an inadequate radii and the manoeuvrability space between parking bays is unsatisfactory and as such the proposal is not safe and accessible contrary to Policy T15 of the Chester-le-Street District Local Plan."

**(C) District Matter Recommended Approval**

- (3) Proposal: Variation of Condition 4 of consent 07/00165/FUL to allow the following construction hours; mon to fri 07:00 to 19:00, sat and sun 08:00 to 16:00, no working**

**on Bank Holidays.**

**Location: 2 Drum Park, Drum Industrial Estate, Chester-le-Street,  
Durham, DH2 1AE**

**Applicant: Mr H. Slater – Clegg Food Projects Ltd**

**Reference: 08/00459/VAR**

The Development and Building Control Manager referred to photographs and plans in relation to the proposal, which were displayed for Members' information. He advised that photographs and plans on display would relate to items 3, 4 and 5 of the Planning Matters report, as all of these items applied to the same application site.

The Development and Building Control Manager spoke in relation to the application and advised that the purpose of the application was to extend the construction hours of the site. He informed Members that the request had been made by the applicant to allow various internal works to be carried out on the site, as set out in the Extended Work Schedule received by the Planning Authority on the 10<sup>th</sup> December 2008. He also felt that Environmental Health team's decision not raise any objections to the proposal had been influenced by the clarification that the construction work would be internally based.

The Development and Building Control Manager referred to the view expressed by the applicant that the extension of construction hours would speed up the programme of works and result in a faster completion of the construction works.

Councillor Ebbatson raised concerns in relation to work being carried out on site in all daylight hours and sought clarification from the Development and Building Control Manager as to the reasons why the operating hours of the site had originally been restricted by the Planning Authority.

The Development and Building Control Manager advised that the restrictions had been put in place to prevent the developer from carrying out 'heavy-duty' works, such as those experienced at the external construction phase, during hours, which were deemed unacceptable by the Environmental Health team. He further advised that the Environmental Health team had examined the schedule of works and were satisfied that the proposed works would be low-level internal works, with the possibility of some minor external works also being carried out.

Councillor P May spoke in relation to the proceeding application for additional external works on the same site, which was item 4 on the agenda, and queried whether the applicant would be allowed to carry out these works during the proposed extended construction hours. In addition, he felt that it

would be unfair to local residents to allow external alterations to be carried out on Sundays.

The Development and Building Control Manager clarified that the proceeding item on the agenda did propose for external alterations to be carried out, however they were not included on the schedule of works for which the extended hours were being applied for. He also commented that the Environmental Health team had requested that extra condition 2 be included in the recommendation of approval, as this required any openings in the building including windows and doors to be kept closed for the duration of the construction period, in an effort to minimise any noise disturbance for local residents.

In relation to concerns raised by Councillor Westrip as to how any concerns in relation to the proposal would be monitored, the Development and Building Control Manager stated that any conditions imposed as part of this planning permission would be monitored and enforced by the Planning team. He also confirmed that the Council's Environmental Health team would investigate any complaints made relating to noise levels from the site, which exceeded the statutory nuisance threshold.

Councillor Laverick highlighted the fact that having gone through the full consultation procedure only one letter of concern had been received from the occupier of an adjacent industrial unit.

Councillor Holding was in agreement with the comments made by Councillor Laverick, and added that the reference to local residents was misleading as the nearest local residents were in fact separated by the east coast mainline railway and landscaping, which would minimise any noise disturbance.

Councillor M May was of the opinion that acceptance of the proposal would create further noise disruption for local residents.

Councillor Ebbatson raised concern in relation to work being carried out on Sundays, and questioned whether it would be possible to amend the recommendations to agree the extended hours with the exclusion of Sunday working, in the interests of local residents.

The Development and Building Control Manager was in agreement and suggested re-wording extra condition 1 of the recommendations to state that any operation in relation to the construction phase of the development should not be carried out on Sundays. Whilst he reminded Members of the Environmental Health team's decision not to raise any objections to the proposal, he concluded that final approval of the application was a Member decision.

It was therefore proposed by Councillor Ebbatson and seconded by Councillor M May that the proposal be approved subject to extra condition 1 being amended to prohibit any construction works being carried out on Sundays & Bank Holidays. This proposal was carried.

RESOLVED: "That the recommendations of the Development and Building Control Manager for approval in respect of the application be agreed, subject to the following conditions:

Extra 1.

Operations in relation to the construction phase of the development approved by planning approval 07/00165/FUL shall not be carried outside the following hours: -

Monday to Friday – 0700 to 1900,  
Saturday – 0800 to 1600  
No working on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

In the interests of residential amenity and the avoidance of any potential disturbance or disruption to adjoining residents which may have arisen through working outside these hours and to accord with the aims of Policy IN3 of the Local Plan.

Extra 2.

Notwithstanding the submitted information, any openings in the building including windows and doors shall be kept closed for the duration of the construction period, unless for essential access to the building. In the interests of residential amenity and the avoidance of any potential disturbance or disruption to adjoining residents and to accord with the aims of Policy IN3 of the Local Plan.

Extra 3.

No works or operations shall be carried out on site within the extended operating times permitted by this permission, other than those set out in the document titled Proposed Extended Work Schedule, received 10th December 2008, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. In the interests of residential amenity and the avoidance of any potential disturbance or disruption to adjoining residents and to accord with the aims of Policy IN3 of the Local Plan."

**(4) Proposal: Revision of application 07/00165/FUL to provide a chassis wash area, on site fuel tank, x2 sprinkler tanks, motorbike shelter and other external minor works.**

**Location: 2 Drum Park, Drum Industrial Estate, Chester-le-Street, Durham, DH2 1AE**

**Applicant: Mr Haydn Slater – Clegg Food Projects Ltd**

**Reference: 08/00474/FUL**

The Senior Planning Officer spoke in relation to the application for minor external works to be carried out on the site, with particular emphasis being based on the location of each item. He advised Members that at the request of the County Council's Highway Authority, an additional motorcycle shelter had been included in the proposal.

The Development and Building Control Manager further commented that the majority of the external work would be located to the rear and side of the industrial unit, which would lessen the impact on residential properties, in terms of noise disturbance.

Councillor Wilkinson therefore proposed to move the Officer's recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Brown. This proposal was carried.

RESOLVED: "That the recommendations of the Development and Building Control Manager for approval in respect of the application be agreed, subject to the following conditions:

Extra 1.

The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, in order to prevent the accumulation of unused planning permissions as required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Extra 2.

The development hereby approved shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details contained in the application as submitted to the Council on the date specified in Part 1 of this decision notice and as amended on plan 15299//A0/0100 Rev C received 24th December 2008; unless otherwise firstly approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority; in order to ensure the development is carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans.

Extra 3.

Notwithstanding any details submitted with the application the screen for the chassis wash shall be profiled steel sheeting and be no higher than the eaves height of the adjoining Vehicle Maintenance Unit and exactly match the colour of same unit in order to ensure the design quality and integrity of the scheme in accordance with Policy 8 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy IN3 of the Chester-le-Street District Local Plan."

**(5) Proposal: Revision of application 07/00165/FUL to provide minor changes to the elevation of the previously approved warehouse and vehicle maintenance unit.**

**Location: 2 Drum Park, Drum Industrial Estate, Chester-le-Street, Durham, DH2 1AE**

**Applicant: Mr Haydn Slater – Clegg Food Projects Ltd**

**Reference: 08/00475/FUL**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the case before Members and clarified that the purpose of the application had been to provide ventilation louvers for the various plant and equipment on site. He advised that the application had been discussed with the Council's Environmental Health team and as a result the applicant's agent had submitted a revised noise assessment, which confirmed that noise levels created by the proposal would remain the same as previously approved.

In relation to a query raised by Councillor Westrip on the nature of the fumes being vented from the unit, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that essentially the purpose of the louvers would be to ventilate the main development to prevent any overheating of the equipment.

Councillor Holding therefore proposed to move the Officer's recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Brown. This proposal was carried.

**RESOLVED:** "That the recommendations of the Development and Building Control Manager for approval in respect of the application be agreed, subject to the following conditions:

01C The development hereby approved shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details contained in the application as submitted to the Council on the date specified in Part 1 of this decision notice and as amended on plan 15299//A0/0100 Rev C received 24th December 2008 unless otherwise firstly approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority; in order to ensure the development is carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans.

Extra 1.

The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, in order to prevent the accumulation of unused planning permissions as required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)."

**(6) Proposal: Erection of workshop and offices with ancillary access and parking (partly retrospective).**

**Location: Land West of Stella Gill Industrial Estate, Pelton Fell, Chester-le-Street, Durham**

**Applicant: Mr D. Potter – Ambic Ltd – Reference: 08/00484/FUL**

The Development and Building Control Manager referred to photographs and plans in relation to the proposal, which were displayed for Members' information.

Councillor Laverick felt that there was no reason to object as in his opinion the building had been erected on more suitable site.

Councillor Robson therefore proposed to move the Officer's recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Laverick. This proposal was carried.

RESOLVED: "That the recommendations of the Development and Building Control Manager for approval in respect of the application be agreed, subject to the following conditions:

Extra 1.

The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, in order to prevent the accumulation of unused planning permissions as required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Extra 2.

Notwithstanding any description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until samples or precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and / or roofs of the building(s) have been submitted to, approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development upon completion, in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with the provisions of Policy IN4; of the Chester-le-Street District Local Plan.

Extra 3.

The hereby approved development shall be carried out in accordance with a scheme of landscaping to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any development on site, and which scheme may provide for the planting of trees and / or shrubs (including species, sizes, numbers and densities), the provision of screen fences or walls, the movement of earth, the formation of banks or slopes, the seeding of land with grass, or other works for improving the appearance of the development. The works agreed to shall be carried out within the first planting season following completion of development of the site (or of that phase of development in the case of phased development) and shall thereafter be maintained for a period of 5 yrs following planting; in the interests of visual amenity, the satisfactory appearance of the development upon completion and in accordance with the provisions of Policy IN4 of the Chester-le-Street District Local Plan.

Extra 4.

The development hereby approved shall not be open for business outside of the hours of 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Saturday, with the exception of

operations related to essential plant and equipment maintenance, in order to ensure the development does not adversely affect the amenities of nearby occupiers

Extra 5.

The door openings in the west facing elevation of the building hereby approved shall remain closed at all times the development is operational, except for instances of emergency, in order to ensure the development does not adversely affect the amenities of nearby occupiers

Extra 6.

Vehicular deliveries shall not be carried out outside of the hours of 08:00 to 16:30 with a maximum of 2 such visits per hour, in order to ensure the development does not adversely affect the amenities of nearby occupiers

Extra 7.

Notwithstanding the details contained in the application hereby approved precise details of the construction specification of the proposed building (to include appropriate sound attenuation measures) shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the commencement of development on site. Thereafter the development shall be constructed wholly in accordance with the approved details, in order to ensure the development does not adversely affect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers.

Extra 8.

No more than 1 number loading bay door shall be open at any one time when the development hereby approved is in use in order to ensure the development does not adversely affect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers.

Extra 9.

Within six months of the occupation of the development hereby approved the developer shall submit a Travel Plan to demonstrate proposed measures to reduce the reliance on the use of the private motor car to access the development to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the agreed travel plan, unless otherwise firstly agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. To ensure the development meets the aims of sustainable transport and to accord with the aims of policies 2 and 54 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and policies T6 and T15 of the Chester-le-Street Local Plan.”

## **(C) Planning General**

### **(1) List of Planning Appeals and Current Status**

The Chairman referred to the list of Planning Appeals, which were included in the report for information.

RESOLVED: "That the list of Planning Appeals and the current status be noted."

**(2) Development Control Performance Update for Quarter One and Three 2008/09**

Consideration was given to a detailed update on the Development Control Team's performance during the first three quarters of 2008/09.

RESOLVED: "That the contents of the report be noted."

**52. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS. TO RESOLVE:-**

RESOLVED: "That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Public and Press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 6(a), 6(b) and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act."

**53. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PERFORMANCE UPDATE**

Consideration was given to a report, which provided Members with a comprehensive and detailed update on the planning enforcement discipline within the Authority.

The Planning Enforcement Officer spoke in relation to the report and advised Members that performance had continued to improve due to the Authority being able to provide additional Officer resources to the team. He advised that if Members did have any queries in relation to the individual cases outlined in the report they should contact the Enforcement Officer outside the Meeting. Discussion ensued in relation to the report.

RESOLVED: "That the contents of the report be noted."

At the close of the Meeting, Members gave their thanks and appreciation to the Planning team for their consistent hard work.

The meeting terminated at 7.55 pm

This page is intentionally left blank