

North Yorkshire County Council

Planning and Regulatory Functions Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on 29 August 2017 at 10.00 am.

Present:-

County Councillors Peter Sowray (Chairman), David Blades, Eric Broadbent, Robert Heseltine, David Hugill, Mike Jordan, John McCartney, Zoe Metcalfe, Richard Musgrave, Chris Pearson, and Clive Pearson.

There were seven members of the public in attendance.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

19. Minutes

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2017, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

20. Declarations of Interest

County Councillor Zoe Metcalfe declared an interest in respect of the applications at Minute No. 22 (C3/16/01918/CPO - (NY/2016/0194/ENV)) and Minute No. 23 (C3/17/00064/CPO – (NY/2017/0129/FUL) in relation to her having a conflict of interest due to a member of her extended family being the owner of Scampston Hall, which has a boundary with the application site and her having free use of the Hall for a charity event. She considered that the connection could give rise to an appearance of a lack of impartiality and, therefore, she withdrew from the meeting during consideration of these Items and took no part in the discussion or vote thereon.

21. Public Questions or Statements

A representative of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) reported that, apart from the people who had registered to speak in respect of the applications listed below, and who would be invited to do so during consideration of those Items, there were no public questions or statements from members of the public.

Councillor Metcalfe left the Chamber for the consideration of this Item.

22. C3/16/01918/CPO – (NY/2016/0194/ENV) - Erection of a Green Energy Facility (6,342 sq. metres) (energy from waste via gasification), office reception building (91 sq. metres), substation and switchroom (39 sq. metres), air cooled condenser (195 sq. metres), installation of a weighbridge, earthworks, 20 car parking spaces, extension to internal access road, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including a local connection via underground cable (340 metres) to the 11kV grid via a proposed substation at land south of Knapton Quarry/Landfill as well as an underground connection (Option 1 - 5.26 km and Option 2 - 8.25km) to the 66kV grid via the

primary substation at Yedingham at Land to the South of Knapton Quarry/Landfill Site, Knapton

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine a planning application, as outlined above.

The application was subject to 18 objections having been raised by local members of the public (summarised in paragraph 5.4 of the report), an objection from the County Council's Principal Landscape Architect and also significant concerns raised by Ryedale District Council, the North Yorkshire Moors National Parks Authority National Trails Officer and Wintringham and Scampston Parish Councils (Section 4 of the report). The application was, therefore, reported to the Committee for determination.

This application had been deferred at the last meeting of the Committee on 18 July 2017.

The Chairman advised that on 18 August 2017 the Applicant (Tetragen) had circulated a brochure to all Members of the Committee which set out potential amendments to the proposed development and requested consideration of the deferral of the application to allow the formal submission of the amendments to the Authority. The reason stated was that the Applicant had suggestions for changes to the proposed development that could reduce or mitigate the perceived impacts and felt that these improvements could be made if there was further dialogue with officers.

The Chairman commented that, should the Committee be minded to agree to defer the application, for what would be a second time, this should not be taken in any way by the applicant as making approval of the application any more or less likely when it is next considered by the Committee.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred.

A Member stated that, whilst he was not speaking against the Motion for deferment, he felt that it was important that officers worked through any issues with the applicant, as the Committee could not continue to be asked to defer this matter.

On being put to the vote, the motion was approved. Therefore, it was

Resolved -

That the above application be deferred for consideration at a subsequent meeting to enable further discussions between officers and the applicant.

Councillor Metcalfe left the Chamber for the consideration of this Item.

- 23. C3/17/00604/CPO - (NY/2017/0129/FUL) - Retention and change of use of existing waste transfer buildings and associated yard, weighbridge and ancillary structures to allow for waste recycling and pre-treatment operations on land at Knapton Quarry Landfill Site, Knapton, Y017 8JA, on behalf of FD Todd and Sons Ltd**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine an application for the retention and change of use of existing waste transfer buildings and associated yard, weighbridge and ancillary structures to allow for waste recycling and pre-treatment operations on land at Knapton Quarry Landfill Site, Knapton.

The application was subject to an objection having been raised by the County Council's Principal Landscape Architect and objections and concerns raised by two local residents and Heslerton Parish Council and was, therefore, reported to the Committee for determination.

A Member commented that this application was linked closely to the application at Minute No. 22, above, which had been deferred. He therefore proposed that the application be deferred, without prejudice, to enable further dialogue between officers and the applicant.

On being seconded, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried. Therefore, it was

Resolved -

That consideration of the above application be deferred, without prejudice, to a subsequent meeting, to allow further dialogue between officers and the applicant.

24. C6/500/95/D/CMA – (NY/2011/0429/ENV) - Extension to existing sand and gravel workings at Ripon Quarry, North Stainley, Ripon, North Yorkshire, HG3 3HT on behalf of Hanson Quarry Products Europe Ltd

Considered –

The report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine a planning application for an extension to existing sand and gravel workings on land at Ripon Quarry, North Stainley, Ripon, North Yorkshire, on behalf of Hanson Quarry Products Europe Ltd.

Whilst the application was not subject to objections having been raised by those statutorily consulted on behalf of the County Planning Authority, or from those with whom discretionary consultations have been undertaken, representations had been made by three local residents and, therefore, in accord with Schedule 4 of the County Council's adopted Officers' Scheme of Delegation in its *Constitution*, this application was brought before the Committee for determination.

The matters raised in representation included, *inter alia*, the lack of adherence to the previously imposed time limit; impacts upon residential amenity including noise, alleged out-of-hours working; impacts upon hydrology, archaeology and ecology and the lack of public consultation.

The Head of Planning Services presented the report, highlighting the proposal; the site description; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representations; planning guidance and policy; planning considerations; and provided a conclusion and recommendation.

Detailed plans, photographs and visual information were presented to complement the report.

Members undertook a discussion of the application and the following issues and points were raised:-

- Some people had issues with de-watering and a farmer had said that it was impossible to farm land which had been de-watered. The Head of Planning Services outlined the process involved in de-watering where, essentially, the de-watering pumps ensured that water levels were suppressed during restoration works. Then, over time, the water level re-establishes itself to the former level.

- Where was West Tanfield on the Plan presented? The Head of Planning Services advised that it was not on the Plan, but it was referred to in Section 2 of the report. West Tanfield was 4.5 kilometres from the development.
- Were the pumps turned off in the evening? The Head of Planning Service responded that the pumps were kept on overnight. However, they were surrounded by noise attenuation measures and modern pumps, such as these, were far quieter than their predecessors. The Company was aware of this issue and had implemented measures to support noise reduction.
- Was a list of sites of aggregate resources kept? The Head of Planning Services confirmed this was the case and there was a regular survey of all mineral operators to ascertain how much was being sold off-site.
- Did the application involve moving the Gas Pipe, as this could cause difficulties? The Head of Planning Services responded that as a statutory undertaker, the Gas Provider, had permitted development rights and this would be part of the process following determination.
- It was understood that southern distribution areas could be exhausted if this demand was not looked at. How bad was the situation? The Head of Planning Services advised that there was no cause for concern over the “at least seven years” landbank requirement. As sites were worked out, the Plan would be reviewed. The amount of mineral required depends on factors such as house building. At the current rate of house building, the limit would be reached sooner rather than later.
- There had been problems in Scarborough with springs. Were officers aware of any issues? The Head of Planning Services responded that an Impact Assessment had identified that work could be carried out without causing any harm to springs.

Resolved -

That, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement, the application be approved for the reasons stated within the report and subject to the Conditions detailed within the draft Schedule of Conditions.

- 25. C8/45/13AL/PA – (NY/2016/0185/ENV) - 8 hectare extension to the existing limestone quarry into Area 5 & 6 from the current working Area 4 and east in Area 7 to 20 metres AOD to provide 4.4 million tonnes of limestone and restore the site with engineering fill from the existing waste treatment facility to create 1 in 2.5 slopes against the exposed face at Went Edge Quarry, Went Edge Road, Kirk Smeaton, Selby, WF8 3LU on behalf of Went Valley Aggregates and recycling Limited**

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, requesting Members to determine a planning application, as outlined above.

This application was subject to 95 objections having been raised by members of the public in respect of this proposal (summarised in paragraph 5.5 of this report) and objections from Kirk Smeaton and Little Smeaton Parish Councils (summarised in paragraphs 4.11 & 4.12 of this report) and was, therefore, reported to this Committee

Submissions from objectors

The Chairman reported that written representations, against the application, had been received from Martin Gough and Gillian Ivey, Vice Chair of Little Smeaton Parish Council (on behalf of the Parish Council) and he asked the Clerk to read these out.

The Clerk read out the submissions received:-

Mr. Martin Gough

1. *Most of the jobs are for HGV drivers - there is at present a shortage for HVG drivers. I understand the current drivers are on contract anyway.*
2. *Could you please give me a list of the other limescale sites that were considered as I cannot believe that this area is the only one in the country.*
3. *The road cannot withstand the HGV traffic. Just take a look.*

Also, the main issue is that the lorries pull out and this is just an accident waiting to happen

Gillian Ivey, Vice Chair Little Smeaton Parish Council

Dear County Councillors

I write on behalf of Little Smeaton Parish Council regarding planning application NY2016/0185/ENV for determination by committee today 29.08.17

We apologise that we are unable to attend in person.

We note that the officers' recommendation is for approval and we understand this, as the site is part of the North Yorkshire Minerals and Waste Plan.

Our residents are extremely concerned however regarding the large numbers of vehicle movements each day, the dirty state of Wentedge Road near the quarry entrance and the very poor state of the road surface particularly at the T. junction with the B6474.

For several years now our residents who use that road to access the A1 have reported the dirt and dust on their cars, the careless way that the HGV's round the corner at the junction mentioned above; and on occasions a chip in their car or cracked windscreen caused by a stone falling off the back of an HGV.

Indeed we have written to the County Council about these matters on a previous occasion.

We anticipate that the agent for the applicant will say that everything possible has been done to keep the road clean, but whatever has been done is not sufficient and not acceptable.

We have been promised on several occasions that the potholes will be filled in at the junction Wentedge Road/B6474, but unless they have been done in the last week, then this promise has not been kept.

We are concerned therefore on behalf of Little Smeaton residents who use Wentedge Road on a regular basis, that your approval of this application will simply give permission for the situation described above to continue.

We suggest, should the committee be minded to grant approval, that.....

- a) *Stricter conditions be put in place*
- b) *A local liaison committee be formed at which parish councillors from both Smeaton villages can have their say face to face with the quarry management, and ensure that residents concerns are heard, discussed and acted upon.*

In addition to the above written representations, Mary McCartney attended the meeting and also spoke against the application.

Mary McCartney

Mary McCartney addressed the Committee and made the following points in particular:-

- This application was not consistent with previous decisions of the Committee.
- It seems to depend upon where greenfield land is. In this case, the application was within the green belt and was being recommended for approval, yet other applications within a green belt have been recommended for refusal.
- Planning Policy promotes the protection of valued landscapes such as this.
- Some of the points made in the report presented to the meeting today concerning the application relating to Knapton Quarry, did not seem to stretch/apply to Selby.
- There have already been two previous occasions where there were good reasons not to approve such applications, but the Committee nodded them through.
- For there to be 95 objections in such a small area is amazing and illustrates the strength of feeling.
- The Committee, had the power to do something about this.
- If the application were to be approved, the suggestion by the Parish Council for there to be a Local Liaison Committee would be of some help and this Committee should consider agreeing to that.

Submission by the applicant

John Carlon, of Cromwell Wood Estate Company, the agent, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee.

He thanked the officers for their advice and made the following points:-

- Leaflets distributed in the villages concerned, discussed an increase in traffic and landfill. This was not correct.
- The material is inert. It is tipped against the quarry face and then covered with soil.
- With regard to the A6474, all work traffic turns right out of the site to join the A1 after 600 metres.
- The national speed limit had to be adhered to.
- HGV drivers operated under a “three strikes and you are out” system.

- The report, which recommended approval to the application, was substantial and comprehensive.
- He hoped that the Committee would approve the application which would help to continue to provide employment for people in the area and security for their families.

A representative of the Head of Planning Services presented the Committee report, highlighting the proposal; the site description; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representations; planning guidance and policy; planning considerations; and provided a conclusion and recommendation.

Detailed plans, photographs and visual information were presented to complement the report.

An Addendum to the report had been circulated which contained amendments to the suggested Condition Nos. 21 and 27 and the insertion of an additional condition as set out below:-

Condition 21 – to be amended to read:

Within 1 month of the date of this planning permission and prior to the commencement of mineral extraction within Area 6, a Written Scheme of Investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- i. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;*
- ii. Community involvement and/or outreach proposals;*
- iii. The programme for post investigation assessment;*
- iv. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;*
- v. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;*
- vi. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; and*
- vii. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.*

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation.

Inclusion of additional condition to read:

Within 6 months of completing the archaeological field investigations in Area 7, a report which shall comprise of an assessment of the archaeological remains recovered from the site and an outline of the subsequent programme of analyses, publication (including a date for publication) and archiving, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The programme of analyses, publication and archiving shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved, and in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the County Planning Authority.

Condition 27 – to be amended to read:

The existing wheel wash facilities shall be kept in full working order at all times. All vehicles involved in the transport of materials or finished products to or from the site shall be thoroughly cleaned before leaving the site so that no mud or detritus are deposited on the public highway.

Members undertook a discussion of the application and the following issues and points were raised:-

- The Chairman asked the representative of the Head of Planning Services to comment on the proposal by the Little Smeaton Parish Council that a Local Liaison Committee be established. He also sought confirmation that it was the case that traffic was routed direct to the A1.

The Head of Planning Services advised that it would be permissible to have a Local Liaison Committee, should this Committee be agreeable to that proposal and confirmed that traffic was routed direct to the A1, but this was not conditioned.

The representative of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) advised the Committee that she had some concerns as to how a Local Liaison Committee could be incorporated into the terms of the agreement. Terms of Reference for the Local Liaison Committee would be required.

The Head of Planning Services advised that it had to be considered reasonable and appropriate for Members to consider the establishment of a Local Liaison Committee.

- A Member commented that, in his Ward, there were Committees similar to the Local Liaison Committee that was being proposed and the arrangement worked well in sorting out issues that arose.

The agent for the applicant informed the Committee that he had been involved in working with Local Liaison Committees previously. The owner of the Company was in regular contact with Kirk Smeaton Parish Council and there was a good relationship between the two Parish Councils and the applicant. Therefore, he did not see this as a problem and would be happy to organise the setting up of a Local Liaison Committee and liaise with the two Parish Councils and the wider community.

- A Member sought clarification as to the point that Mr. Gough was making in his written submission where he said *“Most of the jobs are for HGV drivers - there is at present a shortage for HVG drivers. I understand the current drivers are on contract anyway.”* The Head of Planning Services felt that the point being made here was that there is a shortage of HGV drivers.
- The 95 objections had been summarised briefly at paragraph 5.5 of the report and had then only been referred to further at paragraph 7.42. Nowhere else in the report was any mention made of objections having been raised or responded to. In the Member’s view, the objections seemed to have been ignored.

The representative of the Head of Planning Services responded that reference to addressing the objectors concerns had been made in several parts of the report. For example, paragraph at paragraph 7.12 objections were noted in relation to the impact upon local amenity and the cumulative aspects of dust from continued quarry operations and, in acknowledgement of the potential for dust emissions to be generated from the proposed extraction of limestone at the site, which could have an impact upon the local amenity, an Air Quality Assessment had been submitted by the applicant. This had indicated that PM10 levels associated with health issues were unlikely to be emitted and there was no risk to the health of people from emissions at the quarry or the health of the flora in the area.

He added that the objections had been summarised. This was normal practice.

- A Member felt that officers should ask themselves why had this application led to 95 objections? This should be a perfect site, so why had there been so many people objecting to the application. Serious issues had been raised and there was amazing strength of feeling from local people.

- The application was dated 28th November 2016 and appeared to be very retrospective. Area 5 had been quarried and the company had adopted a cavalier approach. The representative of the Head of Planning Services advised that, although there had been some extraction of Area 5, none of this had taken place prior to approval.
- Reference had been made to the Selby Green Belt. This does not exist.
- It seemed that no comments had been received from Selby District Council. The representative of the Head of Planning Services said that comments had been received from the District Council's Environmental Health Section.
- If there was such a great relationship between the company and the local community, then how is it that there are so many objections? The proposed Committee needed to be regularised and part of a Section 106 Agreement.

The representative of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services) suggested that Terms of Reference for the proposed Local Liaison Committee be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, should Members agree to this. If it was not possible for this to be resolved and incorporated into a Section 106 Agreement, the matter would be brought back to the Committee.

- No objections about noise or air quality had been raised. There was a good after care Plan. It was appreciated that there were a lot of objections but a lot of the concerns had been answered

A Member moved that the recommendations be approved, with the addition that Terms of Reference be established for a Local Liaison Committee (and delegation to the Head of Planning Services to agree the Terms of Reference) and subject to it being a Condition that all lorries in or out of the site drive immediately to the A1.

On being seconded, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried.

NOTE: Councillor Heseltine asked that it be recorded he abstained.

Resolved –

That planning permission be granted for the reasons stated within the report, subject to the Conditions detailed in the report and in the addendum to it, and also subject to the following:-

- a) Prior completion of a Legal Agreement relating to a Restoration, Aftercare and Management Plan; Local Liaison Committee; and a Traffic Route Agreement/condition that all lorries in or out of the site drive immediately to/from the A1.
- b) Delegation to the Head of Planning Services to agree the Terms of Reference being agreed for the establishment of a Local Liaison Committee to be incorporated into a Section 106 Agreement.

26. C8/2017/0516/CPO – (NY/2017/0041/FUL) - Extraction of the residual deposit of sand from land west of the sandpit until 6 January 2019 at Eggborough Sandpit, Weeland Road, Hensall, Goole, North Yorkshire, DN14 0RL

A report by the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services, was presented which requested the Committee to determine a planning application for the extraction of

the residual deposit of sand from land west of the sandpit until 6 January 2019 on land at Eggborough Sandpit, Weeland Road, Hensall, Goole, North Yorkshire, DN14 0RL, on behalf of Mone Bros.

This application was subject to an objection having been raised in respect of this proposal on the grounds of this slowing down the restoration of the site and the continuation effects of noise from the site and was, therefore, reported to this Committee for determination.

Submissions from objectors

Mr. Laurenson

Mr. Laurenson addressed the Committee and made the following points, in particular:-

- This was originally approved in 2008 and it was said then that the area would be restored to farmland in two or three years. Nine years on, there had been minimal reinstatement.
- There was no sign that the extraction was coming to an end and now more work was being proposed.
- The company will want more landfill and this would prolong people's misery.
- The work blights our local environment.
- There was no timetable for reinstatement. I would suggest this be 2019.
- Experience elsewhere was that reinstatement does not happen and was not enforced.
- The surrounding road is brown and covered in dust.

The representative of the Head of Planning Services presented the report, highlighting the proposal; the site description; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representations; planning guidance and policy; planning considerations; and provided a conclusion and recommendation.

Detailed plans, photographs and visual information were presented to complement the report.

The representative of the Head of Planning Services informed the Committee of the following updates to the report:-

- On 11th August 2017, Network Rail Had advised that they had no objection to the proposal.
- At paragraph 7.10, third line, where there was a house name missing, this should say "Springfield House" to the north.

Members undertook a discussion of the application and the following issues and points were raised:-

- Regarding the state of the road, that had been referred to, were wheel wash facilities working and, if they were, why was there sand and mud on the road? The representative of the Head of Planning Services advised that no complaints

had been received and the Highways Authority had not raised any concerns about this.

- If the changes to delegation arrangements had been approved, this report need not have been considered by Committee. The Head of Planning Services advised that the request to amend delegation arrangements would be considered by the Constitution Working Party at its next meeting.
- One objection had received eleven lines in this report - the previous report (Minute No.25) contained eleven lines covering 95 objectors.
- There had never been a complaint. This is a site that does not cause any bother to the enforcement office.

Resolved -

That the application be approved for the reasons stated within the report and subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

27. C8/137/177E/PA – (NY/2017/0038/FUL) - Variation of Condition No. 6 of Planning Permission Ref. C8/2015/0769/CPO for the reduction of the frequency of the noise monitoring reports to be carried out on an annual basis at Eggborough Sandpit, Weeland Road, Hensall, Goole, North Yorkshire, DN14 0RL

Considered –

The report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environment Services, which requested the Committee to determine a planning application for the variation of Condition No. 6 of Planning Permission Ref. C8/2015/0769/CPO for the reduction of the frequency of the noise monitoring reports to be carried out on an annual basis on land at Eggborough Sandpit, Weeland Road, Hensall, Goole, North Yorkshire, DN14 0RL on behalf of Mone Bros.

The application was subject to an objection having been raised in respect of this proposal on the grounds of reducing on-site controls and was, therefore, reported to this Committee for determination.

Submissions from objectors

Mr. Laurenson

Mr. Laurenson addressed the Committee and made the following points, in particular:-

- It was said that there could be no further sand extraction at the site.
- The application just approved had many noise regulating conditions attached to it.
- This would extend the area of devastation around Hensall for many years.

The representative of the Head of Planning Services presented the report, highlighting the proposal; the site description; the consultations that had taken place; the advertisement and representations; planning guidance and policy; planning considerations; and provided a conclusion and recommendation.

Detailed plans, photographs and visual information were presented to complement the report.

The representative of the Head of Planning Services advised that:-

- at paragraph 7.11 of the report the final sentence should read “Condition 19 has been amended”;
- the approved monitoring was currently carried out in three-monthly intervals, with an annual report being made. The application sought to vary this to annual monitoring – still with an annual report. The applicant had requested this as noise level permissions had never been exceeded and no complaints had ever been received; and
- should noise levels at any stage exceed permitted levels, this would be rectified immediately and additional noise monitoring would be undertaken.

Members undertook a discussion of the application and the following issues and points were raised:-

- What are the maximum noise levels permitted for this application?
The representative of the Head of Planning Services advised that it was seven decibels.
- This operation is working brilliantly – if it is not broke, do not change it. If monitoring was changed to annually, there could be complaints. Would it then be possible to reinstate quarterly monitoring?

The representative of the Head of Planning Services advised that if any complaints were received in regards to noise, the permitted levels for which would not increase as a result of this application, the County Council would still have enforcement powers on the site to control its operation.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be not approved on the basis that there seemed no point in changing something that worked well.

The Head of Planning Services advised that the application from the smaller area had noise monitoring on an annual basis. This application, for a larger area, if refused, would have four times more monitoring than for the smaller area.

The Member who moved the Motion then indicated that he wished to withdraw it.

It was then moved and seconded that the application be approved.

On being put to the vote the Motion was carried and it was, therefore,

Resolved:-

That planning permission be granted for the reasons stated within the report, subject to the Conditions detailed.

28. Items dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services, outlining the Items dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation between 19 June and 30 July 2017 inclusive.

Resolved -

That the report be noted.

29. Publication by Local Authorities of information about the handling of planning applications

Considered –

The report of the Corporate Director, Business and Environment Services which outlined the County Council's performance in the handling of 'County Matter' and County Council development planning applications for Quarter 1 (the period 1 April 2017 to 30 June 2017).

Information on Enforcement Cases was attached as an Appendix.

The Head of Planning Services drew Members attention to page 378 of the papers which showed that the County Council's performance was 88.9%. The threshold was 60% so the County Council was performing well above that.

Resolved –

That the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 12.45 p.m.

PD