

Minutes**Central & South Planning Committee****18 May 2016****Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge**

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), John Morse and Brian Stead.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager) Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
4.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Janet Duncan and Manjit Khatra, with Councillors Mohinder Birah and John Morse substituting.</p>
5.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Morse declared a pecuniary in agenda items 9 and 10, which related to Brunel University as he was an employee of the University. Councillor Morse left the room during discussion of the items.</p>
6.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 31 MARCH 2016 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2016 were agreed.</p>
7.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>No matters had been notified in advance or were urgent.</p>
8.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that agenda items numbered 1 to 18 were Part I and would be considered in public. The agenda items numbered 19 to 23 were Part II and would be heard in private.</p>

9. **14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2016/203** (*Agenda Item 6*)

First floor rear extension.

Officers introduced the report, which related to a first floor rear extension on a detached two storey dwelling. This was located on the west side of Moorfield Road. There had been a number of previous applications at the site and construction had taken place to extend the property. Applications to increase the height of the building to two storeys had previously been approved by the Committee and most of the works carried out had been undertaken as permitted development.

The application was for the construction of a first floor extension above a previously constructed single storey element. This would have a depth of 3.6 metres and a width of 6.6 metres. This would be less than half the width of the existing extended dwelling. The proposed design of the extension was in character with the existing building. It was noted that the dwelling was within a flood zone three. The Council's flooding experts had been consulted and had raised no objections. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

A petition had been submitted by the applicant in objection to the application. Councillor Richard Mills addressed the Committee on behalf of the petitioner and made the following points:

- A number of applications had previously been submitted in relation to the property.
- The development overpowered and was overbearing and out of keeping with the small and tight road that it was within.
- The property had previously been referred to as a "Lego" building, with bricks and extensions being added on wherever the applicant found some space.
- A number of extensions had been added to what had originally been a bungalow.
- Approval of the current plans would amount to giving permission to a bigger dwelling than that which had previously been refused.
- Only five neighbours had been consulted in relation to the proposals, all of whom had objected.
- Local residents had needed to put together multiple petitions in objection to the various applications at the site.
- Cllr. Mills did not completely agree with officers that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact on neighbours.
- The site plan was incorrect as it did not reflect all the work undertaken at the site.
- It was frustrating that the applicant had not engaged with officers in order to understand which schemes were likely to be viable at the site.
- The site was within a flood risk area, so the more development that took place, the bigger the likely impact.
- It was requested that the application be refused, but that as a minimum, the Committee should undertake a site visit.

Neither the applicant nor their agent wished to address the Committee in relation to the application.

The Chairman advised that the Committee should consider the building as it currently stood and the application currently before Committee, rather than what had previously

been at the site.

Members asked for confirmation of the number of proposed bedrooms at the property, the gaps between buildings, the number of car park spaces and for clarification of whether the extensions built so far all had permitted development rights. Officers advised that permitted development rights had been used to build the rear extension. The growth in footprint of the premises had all occurred due to the permitted development rights that the property had. The gap between the property and neighbouring properties was one metre on one side and considerably more on the other. The property had a garage which Members had previously conditioned should be retained as a garage. Parking provision was compliant with relevant policies. It was confirmed that maximum permissible parking provision for the premises was two spaces, which the property had. The proposals did not suggest any changes to the existing parking provision. It was also confirmed that the garage was large enough for a car to be parked in it.

Some Members felt that a site visit would be beneficial in order to help them to more fully understand the possible impact of the proposals on the area. Other Members were not convinced of the benefit of undertaking a site visit as they felt that there were not any valid planning grounds for considering refusal of the application.

Officers advised that should the Committee feel that the development was becoming so significant that it was out of character with the area, that this could be a ground for refusal. However, the difficulty was that the original bungalow had also been out of character with the area and the previous extensions were such that the dwelling was now considered to be in character with the other properties in the street. In order to be able to refuse the application on the basis of the impact on the local area, it would be necessary to evidence the harm that this was causing. Officers considered that the application was policy compliant and would have very limited impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The proposal to defer the application for a site visit was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for a site visit to take place.

10. **4 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 42162/APP/2016/915** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Demolition of existing building and erection of a three storey building to provide 6 x 2-bed self contained flats with associated parking (Outline application).

Officers introduced the application, drawing Members' attention to a number of associated issues. The application had been submitted as an outline but the plans did show the proposed design, scale and appearance. The site was within a floodplain three zone. The applicant had not provided the supporting justification that was required to support proposed development in such an area. General advice provided by the Government, London Plan and Council policies was that the location of new development within such areas was unacceptable when there were other sites available that were less at risk of flooding.

The property was currently a bungalow, with the proposal being to provide a substantially larger footprint and to use the remainder of the site for car parking. The proposals did not provide any amenity space. This in itself would be a reason for refusal. Access to the car parking was also too narrow. The proposed building was not

considered to be in keeping with neighbouring properties in the road. It would also have an impact in terms of outlook. No information had been provided by the applicant to advise whether the trees that were currently in the rear garden of the property would be retained. It seemed unlikely that the trees would be retained, which was unacceptable. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal.

Officers advised that in relation to reason for refusal number two contained within the officer's report, policy H12 was not applicable in this case and it was requested that this be deleted from the reason for refusal. This was because policy H12 related specifically to residential development behind existing buildings.

Councillor Richard Mills, ward Councillor for Brunel, addressed the Committee. The following points were made:

- The flood risk at the site was a significant issue and this could be detrimental to neighbouring properties.
- The three storey building would overlook neighbouring properties on Moorfield Road and on High Road, Cowley. This would result in loss of privacy and the casting of shadows.
- The removal of the existing garden and construction of six flats with no amenity space would not provide a good quality of life for residents of the flats.
- The Committee was asked to consider refusing the application.

The Committee was concerned about the architectural merit of the proposals, parking arrangements, access difficulties, the flood risk and possible overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously refused.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation, subject to the removal of reference to Policy H12 from reason for refusal number two.

11. **4 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 42162/APP/2016/912** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Demolition of existing building and erection of 4 x 3-bed, semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space (Outline application).

Officers introduced the application, noting that the concerns with regard to this application were similar to concerns raised in relation to the other application at the same site (42162/APP/2016/915) that had just been determined by the Committee. These concerns included that the application site was within a flood plain, the use of land that had previously been used as a garden and the impact on adjoining occupiers. The width of the development, minimal amenity space, the size of the proposed dwellings and likely loss of trees at the site were also considered to be unacceptable. The proposals were also out of character when compared to neighbouring properties. Officers recommended that the application be refused.

Councillor Richard Mills, ward Councillor for Brunel, addressed the Committee. The following points were made:

- Approval of the application would result in the development of garden space.
- A number of factors suggested that the proposals were not suitable for the site.

These included construction on the flood plain and the negative impact on neighbours, the narrow entrance to the parking and the houses being too small to meet minimum standards for acceptable living space.

- It was requested that the Committee support the officer recommendation for refusal.

The Committee considered that the proposed reasons for refusal were the same as for the application at the same site that had previously been refused. These were considered to be strong.

It was requested that reason for refusal number 2 be strengthened to reflect that the proposals amounted to tandem development and their likely impact on biodiversity of the area.

The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously refused.

RESOLVED: That

- 1. The application be refused as per the officer recommendation, subject to an amendment to the reason for refusal number 2 to ensure that it appropriately reflects the harm created by virtue of the tandem nature of the development and the impact on biodiversity.**
- 2. Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree, in conjunction with the Chairman and Labour Lead, the final wording of the reasons for refusal.**

12. **BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE - 532/APP/2016/210** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Variation of condition 2 (Submitted Plans) of planning permission
Ref:532/APP/2014/2161 dated 24/02/2015 to alter the parking layout (Installation of 52 additional parking spaces).**

Officers introduced the application, which requested a reduction of three parking spaces compared to the condition that had previously been agreed as part of a previously approved planning permission. The alterations would incorporate the provision of 4 disabled parking spaces.

The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

13. **BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE - 532/APP/2016/211** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Variation of condition 2 (Submitted Plans) of planning permission
Ref:532/APP/2014/2163 dated 24/02/2015 to alter the parking layout (Installation of 42 additional parking spaces).**

Officers introduced the application, which requested a reduction of five parking spaces compared to a condition that had previously been agreed as part of a previously approved planning permission. The alterations would incorporate the provision of 4 disabled parking spaces.

The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

14. **HAYES FOOTBALL CLUB YARD - 29439/APP/2016/322** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Erection of two linked portacabins for use as a day nursery.

The application site was the Hayes Football Club Yard, which was located on the northern side of Kings Hill Avenue. The application proposed the erection of portacabins to the rear of the main building, linked together to create a children's nursery. The structure would be 13 metres wide, eight metres in depth and three metres in height. It was designed to accommodate a maximum of 35 children between 8am and 4pm on term time week days.

It was noted that the Council's Family Information Service had advised that there was a shortage of childcare places in the area, which were required in order to meet the local authority's statutory duty to provide free child care for disadvantaged two year olds. There were 79 two year olds living in the area who were eligible for free child care, but only 22 places available, leaving a shortfall of 57 places.

The application site was located within the green belt. Development of such a structure in the green belt would only normally be considered where the applicant could demonstrate a case of special circumstances. The applicant had stated that they had tried without success to find alternative locations and that the site was within walking distance of the main catchment area for the proposed childcare facility. They also considered that the layout of the existing building at the site was inadequate.

The proposed development was relatively small in scale compared to the existing site. Officers considered that the need for the development outweighed the need to prevent such a structure being built within the green belt. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

A 54 signature petition had been received in support of the application. The lead petitioner was present, but did not wish to address the Committee.

In response to a Member question, it was confirmed that the existing car park, pedestrian access and existing amenities would be reused to service the proposed development. It was anticipated that some of the storage containers at the rear of the site would be removed, although some would remain operational for the football club.

Members considered that the need for additional childcare facilities outweighed the fact that the development would be on green belt land.

The proposal for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

15.	<p>1 SALCOMBE WAY, HAYES - 48976/APP/2016/520 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a lean-to structure (Retrospective).</p> <p>The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, noting that although the doors of the bicycle store and bin store opened over the adjacent footpath, a proposed condition would require that the doors would remain closed and locked when not in use. It was noted that the footpath served only five or six neighbouring dwellings. The proposals would have little visual impact. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members noted that the doors to the bicycle and bin store would only open over half the width of the footpath and therefore, the footpath would not be completely impeded, even when the doors were open.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
16.	<p>49 CENTRAL AVENUE, HAYES - 38444/APP/2016/744 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from a 6 person house in multiple occupation (Use Class C4) to a 10 person house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application. The house was currently in use under use Class C4, which allowed it to be inhabited by up to six people. The application proposed that this be increased to ten people, which would change the use category to Sui Generis. No changes were proposed to the size of the building, with extensions having previously been granted permission.</p> <p>The only proposed alterations to the external appearance of the building were changes to the front garden layout. Four parking spaces would be provided at the site, which complied with requirements. The proposed room sizes were also compliant with Council standards. No complaints had been received in relation to the management of the premises. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The Chairman asked officers to confirm how accessible the site was for public transport. The site was located on the edge of a public accessibility level 2 area and was close to being in a level 3 area. The site was therefore considered to have adequate access to public transport.</p> <p>The Chairman advised that the issue for the Committee to consider was the proposed intensification of the use of the property and the appropriateness of this.</p> <p>The Committee sought clarification as to whether a ten bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) would normally be required to be built in a detached house. Officers confirmed that the Council's supplementary planning guidance from 2004 specified that HMO'S with around ten people in should normally be located within detached dwellings. Although the house that the application concerned was semi-detached, at 160 square metres plus in size, it was quite large. Therefore, the fact that it was not</p>

detached, was not considered to be particularly problematic by officers.

Concerns were raised that one of the habitable rooms appeared to have a garage door to the front of it, rather than a window. Officers advised that an acceptable residential environment for the occupier of the room could be ensured by imposing a planning condition to require the replacement of the garage door with a window.

The Chairman said that the Committee should consider whether the proposed intensification of use, in close proximity to other properties, was appropriate. The Committee should consider the potential for harm to be caused to neighbouring occupiers through noise and disturbance.

Members considered that the proposals amounted to an extreme intensification of use as the proposals were in an area that contained predominantly three bedroom properties. It was suggested that four parking spaces was not enough, although it was acknowledged that it may meet the Council's required parking standards. The availability of amenity space was also mentioned as being a possible cause for concern. Officers advised that space provided by the proposals was well above the minimum level required.

In response to a Member question about whether the applicant would subsequently be able to convert a lounge into a bedroom, officers advised that while there was no specific condition, the applicant would be required to comply with approved plans and to maintain this. It was also noted that approval of the application would grant permission for a 10 person residence. Therefore, allowing more people than this to live at the premises would be in breach of this permission.

Members discussed the possibility of overturning the officer recommendation due to the intensification of use and the inappropriateness of use when compared to the surrounding area. It was considered that building had not been designed for such a use and that it was unlikely that neighbours would welcome ten people living at the premises.

Officers advised that the provision of parking was not a valid reason for refusal and that the Committee needed to consider what harm would be caused by intensification of use. Officers had assessed the ability of the building to reasonably accommodate ten people and had determined that all the room sizes met the minimum standards. The Committee was encouraged to consider what the difference was between the current six people living at the property and the application under consideration which proposed that ten people be allowed to live there. The Committee would need to consider how this intensification would become evident to people living in the vicinity. Officers had not been able to find a reason as to why the proposed intensification would make approval of the proposals unacceptable.

Members felt that the proposed increase in occupancy of the premises from six to ten persons, a 66% increase, was significant. However, it was difficult for valid refusal reasons to be identified as the proposals complied with the relevant planning policies. Members were also concerned about the increase in noise and rubbish that could be caused by an increased number of people living at the property.

The Chairman summarised the Committee's view that the application amounted to an intensification of use by a sizeable amount. The location in a residential street, adjoining another dwelling, created the possibility of a noise and disturbance being

caused in the event that ten people were permitted to live at the property. The fact that the Council's own guidance specified that properties housing ten persons or more should normally be detached was also of concern. While it was recognised that the property may be large enough to accommodate ten people, there was concern with regard to there being sufficient separation from neighbouring properties. The Committee needed to consider whether this intensification of use amounted to a valid reason for refusal.

Officers advised that the maximum number of people permitted to live at the property under its current C4 use class was six. More than six people living at a property would be classed as a Sui Generis use. This demonstrated that the Government considered there to be a more significant impact when more than six people lived at a property. It was for the Committee to determine at what point the threshold was crossed for where the number of people in a property was likely to start causing a disturbance.

Officers considered that the applicant was responsible and would be willing to put in place a suitable management plan in order to ensure that issues such as refuse were dealt with. The requirement for a management plan had been secured through a planning condition. This had been included in one of the recommended conditions for approval within the officer report.

The proposal to overturn the officer recommendation for approval of the application was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- i) The increased intensification of the use would create noise and disturbance to the detriment of the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers.**
- ii) The application site fails to accord with the Council's HMO SPG which advises that HMO's to house this number of people should be detached properties.**

2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to determine the precise wording of the reasons for refusal.

17. **86 EAST AVENUE, HAYES - 40159/APP/2015/4610** (*Agenda Item 14*)

Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to a nursery (Use Class D1).

Officers introduced the application, advising that the application site was located within a secondary shopping area. The proposal was seeking change of use from retail to a nursery. This was considered to be unacceptable due to the resulting loss of a retail unit and the fact that it would cause retail frontage in the area to fall below the target level of 50%.

The applicant had not provided details of the proposed number of children and staff at the nursery facility, details of parking provision at the site or the proposed operating hours. Details of operating hours would be required to enable consideration to be given to recommending approval of the application. This was due to the potential impact on neighbouring occupiers. Although additional childcare provision was needed within the Borough, the applicant had not provided sufficient information to enable officers to

	<p>consider recommending approval of the proposal. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
18.	<p>94 HERCIES ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 19969/APP/2016/757 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Extension of roof to create additional habitable roof space to include 2 new side dormers and enlargement of existing dormers (Part Retrospective).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was part retrospective. The proposals did not comply with the Council's normal requirements for dormers. The dormer occupied the majority of the side of the dwelling and was substantially larger than what would normally be considered for approval. The application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>The Chairman advised that the character of the building had been changed by the development.</p> <p>Officers advised that the plans submitted did not fully reflect what had been built as the plans did not show the link that had been built between the dormers.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
19.	<p>133B HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 68976/APP/2016/253 (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>Retention of outbuilding to the rear as built to be used as a community centre/place of worship.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was presented to the Committee jointly with application number 68976/APP/2016/254.</p> <p>Member's attention was drawn to the comments made by the Conservation Officer. These comments had set out in detail the aspects of the proposals that were considered to be unacceptable. It was noted that the building that the application premises was attached to was a listed building. Works that had been carried out at the site had not been carried out in accordance with previously approved plans. This had had an impact on the listing building. Officers were recommending that the applicant be asked to ensure that the development complied with the previously approved drawings. The applicant had been asked to submit revised drawings, but these had not been provided and officers had been attempting to negotiate an agreeable solution with the applicant for a number of months. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>Members were concerned that what had been built did not match the previously approved plans and that damage had been caused by work that had been undertaken.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p>

	<p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
20.	<p>133B HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 68976/APP/2016/254 (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p>Retention of outbuilding to the rear as built to be used as a community centre/place of worship (Listed Building Consent).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was presented to the Committee jointly with application number 68976/APP/2016/253.</p> <p>Member's attention was drawn to the comments made by the Conservation Officer. These comments had set out in detail the aspects of the proposals that were considered to be unacceptable. It was noted that the building that the application premises was attached to was a listed building. Works that had been carried out at the site had not been carried out in accordance with previously approved plans. This had had an impact on the listing building. Officers were recommending that the applicant be asked to ensure that the development complied with the previously approved drawings. The applicant had been asked to submit revised drawings, but these had not been provided and officers had been attempting to negotiate an agreeable solution with the applicant for a number of months. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>Members were concerned that what had been built did not match the previously approved plans and that damage had been caused by work that had been undertaken.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
21.	<p>27 KINGSTON AVENUE, YIEWSLEY - 67220/APP/2015/3631 (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p>Single storey side extension.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was for what was considered to be a very minor development. It was considered that the proposals would have very little impact on the street scene or on neighbouring occupiers. The application was being considered by Committee due to the site having an enforcement history. An enforcement notice had previously been served on the outbuilding to the rear of the property. This was in the process of being demolished, which was evidence that the enforcement notice was being complied with. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. The application had been referred to Committee</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendation.</p>

22.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 19</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
23.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 20</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
24.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 21</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>

25.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 22</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
26.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 23</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 pm, closed at 8:40 pm.</p>

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

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.

This page is intentionally left blank