

COUNTY BOROUGH OF BLAENAU GWENT

REPORT TO: **THE CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

SUBJECT: **PLANNING, REGULATORY & GENERAL
LICENSING COMMITTEE – 4TH JULY, 2019**

REPORT OF: **DEMOCRATIC OFFICER**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR B. SUMMERS (CHAIR)

Councillors D. Bevan
G. L. Davies
D. Hancock
W. Hodgins
M. Moore
K. Pritchard
K. Rowson
T. Smith
B. Willis

WITH: Service Manager - Development & Estates
Team Manager - Development Management
Communications, Marketing and Customer Access
Manager
Engineering Services & Transportation Planning
Manager
Solicitor
Planning Compliance Officer x 2

DECISIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
No. 1	<u>SIMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION</u> It was noted that no requests had been received for the simultaneous translation service.	

<p>No. 2</p>	<p><u>APOLOGIES</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from:-</p> <p>Councillors B. Thomas, G. Thomas, D. Wilkshire and L. Winnett.</p>	
<p>No. 3</p>	<p><u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS</u></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest or dispensations reported.</p>	
<p>No. 4</p>	<p><u>QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE INFORMATION</u> <u>QUARTER 4 – JANUARY TO MARCH 2019</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Service Manager Development & Estates.</p> <p>At the invitation of the Chair, the Service Manager Development & Estates explained that the report contained the most recent performance data relating to all types of planning and related applications. This information had been published by the Welsh Government on its website on 17th May, 2019.</p> <p>The Service Manager continued by outlining the Council's current performance as follows:-</p> <p>Figure 1 – the Council was ranked 7th in terms of its performance for determining applications in time. This equated to 94% of the total applications, compared to the Welsh average of 88%.</p> <p>Figure 2 – there had been a marked increase to 83 days from registration to decision for the Council to determine an application, whilst the Welsh average was 78 days.</p> <p>It was noted that this decline in performance had been expected because it had coincided with an officer secondment to another local authority. However, this secondment had now come to an end and it was hoped that performance would now start to gradually improve over the next few months.</p>	

	<p>Figure 3 – 17% of Planning Committee decisions had been made contrary to the officer recommendation. The Welsh average was 7%.</p> <p>A Member commented that although Blaenau Gwent was ranked 22nd in order of performance in respect of decisions that had been made contrary to the officer recommendation, this actually only equated to 1 out of 6 decisions made. The Service Manager acknowledged this comment but said that his concern was that the Council was consistently in the bottom third of this particular table. Any further applications determined contrary to officer recommendation from 1st April, 2019 would be reported in the next quarterly returns.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the Quarter 4 Performance Information contained therein be noted.</p>	
No. 5	<p><u>APPEALS, CONSULTATIONS AND DNS UPDATE JULY 2019</u></p> <p>Members considered the report of the Service Manager Development & Estates, whereupon:-</p> <p><u>C/2018/0181</u> <u>APP/X6910/A/19/3222578 – 9 Park Place, Abertillery – Retention of Rear Decking and Change of Use of Land to the Rear of 9 Park Place to Residential Curtilage</u></p> <p>The Service Manager – Development & Estates advised that the appeal had been dismissed and a copy of the decision letter had been included as Item No. 6 on the agenda.</p> <p><u>C/2018/0262</u> <u>APP/X6910/A/19/3227350 – Garden of 9 Ivy Close, Rassau – Residential Property (Outline)</u></p> <p>It was noted that the unaccompanied Inspector's visit was due to take place this week.</p>	

CO/2017/0133

APP/X6910/A/18/3218033 – 37 Bennett Street, Blaina, Abertillery – Enforcement Appeal: Garden Room Annex. Ground G Appeal – “The Time to Comply with the Notice is too Short”

The background papers had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate and the planning responses were required to be submitted by 18th July, 2019. However, the respondent had felt that the time to comply with the notice was too short and should have been extended until December.

For clarification, the Service Manager - Development & Estates advised that there were three options that would enable the respondent to comply with the notice, i.e.

- (1) Alter the structure in accordance with the 2013 planning permission.
- (2) Alter the structure in accordance with the 2019 planning permission – this would involve access onto the neighbouring land.
- (3) Demolish the structure.

It was noted that if option 3 was implemented, the notice would be able to be complied with within the necessary timeframe.

PA/2016/144 & PA/2017/300

APP/X6910/A/16/3154384 – Wauntysswg Farm, Abertysswg, Tredegar – Proposed 30mw Solar Photovoltaic Park and Ancillary Development

CON/2006/0001 – Tir Pentwys Cut, Blaen-y-Cwm Road, Hafodyrynys, Pontypool – Reclamation of Former Opencast Workings, Recovery of Secondary Aggregates and Construction of New Access road Affecting Public Right of Way (Amended Scheme)

The Planning Inspector's decisions in relation to the above applications were still awaited.

	RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that the report be accepted and the information contained therein be noted.	
No. 6	<p><u>PLANNING APPEAL UPDATE: 9 PARK PLACE, ABERTILLERY</u></p> <p>The report of the Team Leader Development Management was submitted for consideration.</p> <p>The Service Manager – Development & Estates spoke briefly to the report and advised that the Planning Inspectorate had supported refusal of planning permission due to the fact that the decking in its current form gave rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking of adjacent properties on Park Place, Abertillery.</p> <p>For clarification, the Service Manager said that an applicant was not entitled to an absolute level of view but the impact and the right to a view could be considered when an application was determined. However, in this case the impact of the proposal was quite severe on the adjacent properties.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the appeal decision in respect of C/2018/0181 be noted, namely that the appeal was dismissed.</p>	
No. 7	<p><u>LIST OF APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS BETWEEN 21ST MAY TO 19TH JUNE, 2019</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Senior Business Support Officer.</p> <p>Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the list of applications decided under delegated powers between 21st May to 19th June, 2019 be noted.</p>	
No. 8	<p><u>PLANNING REPORT</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Team Manager Development Management.</p>	

The Service Manager – Development & Estates/Team Manager - Development Management explained the following planning applications to Members with the aid of slides:-

Application No. C/2019/0002 – Cwmcrachen Gypsy & Traveller Site & Land Off Blaenant Road (to be Accessed off Blaenant Industrial Estate), Nantyglo – Demolition of Existing Gypsy and Traveller Site including Removal of Existing Access Road and Provision of New Turning Facility and the Development of a New Gypsy and Traveller Site to Accommodate 28 Pitches, Associated Amenity Blocks, a Warden Office and Associated Works

The Service Manager – Development & Estates explained that this was a follow up report in relation to the above planning application. It was noted that the original report had been discussed at the June 2019 Committee at which Members had raised concerns regarding the number and size of the proposed pitches. It had, therefore, been resolved to defer determination of the application in order that a fact finding site visit was undertaken to view the site and size of pitches and determine if the site could accommodate the development.

It was noted that since the June Committee had been held, additional representations which were summarised within the report had been received as follows:-

- An e-mail from a Ward Member.
- Four additional letters – one in objection, one in support, one relating to highway safety concern with the current access arrangements to the existing site and one regarding a conversation between two residents and a traveller that resided at the site.

In addition, since the preparation of the report further late correspondence had been received. This was an unsigned letter of objection purporting to be from 'Tenants of Barleyfield Industrial Estate'. Whilst they did

not object in principle to the redevelopment they objected to the scheme for reasons summarised below:-

- The tenants occupied the industrial units directly next to the current site and had not been properly consulted.
- The layout did not provide a privacy zone for the industrial units. The layout put Unit 25 directly onto the industrial estate, whereas the current site put all units away from the industrial estate.
- There was no 3m gap from the boundary for a fire prevention measure.
- The site should not be positioned so close to industrial land for health and safety reasons for children.
- The split layout did not follow Welsh Government Guidance – there were clearly areas that could be used for occupation.
- Other design options should be explored and re-use Adrian Lewis site for employment.
- The number of pitches exceeded Welsh Government Guidance.
- The statement that adjacent units were empty was untrue. There was a strong demand for industrial units in Brynmawr. When the Heads of the Valleys was finished, the need for employment land would increase.
- The site should have a manager that lived on the site.

It was noted that the matters raised had already been addressed within the officer's report or were not material planning considerations in the determination of the application. Therefore, the officer recommendation remained unchanged, i.e. that the proposal complied with local and national planning policy and that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.

For clarity the Service Manager confirmed that although the late correspondence was purported to be signed on behalf of a number of other bodies this was unable to be verified but all representations received in respect of planning applications were accepted and considered.

The views of the Committee were, thereupon, sought.

- A Member said that whilst he welcomed the development of the site he expressed his concern that the size and number of proposed pitches i.e. 28 was contrary to Welsh Government guidance which stipulated that “new sites should comprise 20 pitches or less, other than in exceptional circumstances and where consultation and engagement have taken place with all stakeholders”.

In addition, other avenues should have been explored to develop smaller sites in the first instance as recommended in Welsh Government guidance. He pointed out that in his opinion there was nothing to justify ‘exceptional circumstances’ and concluded by stating that 20 pitches was adequate for the site.

For clarification the Service Manager – Development & Estates confirmed that there were 24 plots available on the site, because planning permission had already been granted for an additional 4 plots. In addition, the Welsh Government guidance was specifically for developers in relation to the design of new Gypsy and Traveller sites and whilst it should guide and inform the design, it did not have to be slavishly followed. Therefore, in planning consideration terms there was no reason to withhold consent.

- A Member pointed out that there was some ambiguity about the Welsh Government funding the proposal despite the plans being contrary to its own guidelines.

The Service Manager advised that this would be a matter for Welsh Government to respond to and added that the Committee was charged with considering the land use implications of the site. In addition, the Committee should have regard to and consideration of the identified need for this type of site in the Borough, if the site could accommodate the proposal and the impact of the proposal on surrounding land users.

- A Member advised that at the fact finding site visit, there had been an agreement in principle that the pedestrian link in the vicinity of Nantyglo Rugby Club would be re-defined. This was due to concerns that had been raised that if this walkway became a footpath, members of the public would be able to traverse through the Gypsy and Traveller site.

The Service Manager explained that the scheme for the footpath must be submitted for approval before the development could commence and at that stage a condition could be included to stipulate that the footpath was not an extension of the public right of way.

- Another Member said that he would not want to contradict Welsh Government guidance because Welsh Government was the governing body and, therefore, this advice should be adhered to. He also referred to the proposal for grazing land and pointed out that he was unable to understand this concept as 60 years ago the caravans would have been towed by horses but today this was not the case.

The Member continued by pointing out that a local factory was located in close proximity to the site and the area of land in the Local Development Plan had been identified for manufacturing purposes. He enquired whether the owners of the factory had been consulted to ascertain if it was their intention in the future to expand the site. This needed to be taken into account at this juncture because once the land which was earmarked for manufacturing purposes had been disposed of, it would be too late.

The Service Manager confirmed that the factory had been a consultee as part of the planning process and the proposal discussed with their agent. Whilst there may be a footprint to expand at a future time, this would have to be considered by the Committee at that juncture. It was difficult to determine a decision based on something that could potentially occur at a future date. It was noted that the land located to the rear of the factory was not in the ownership of the factory.

It was noted that if planning permission was refused the applicant may have the right of appeal.

The Vice-Chair, thereupon, proposed that the officer recommendation i.e. that planning permission be granted be supported. There was no seconder for this proposal.

A Member proposed the following **amendment** to the recommendation i.e. that planning permission be granted for no more than 20 pitches at the site.

At this juncture, the Service Manager confirmed that the Committee was required to determine the application before it i.e. the demolition of the existing Gypsy and Traveller site including removal of existing access road and provision of new turning facility and the development of a new Gypsy and Traveller site to accommodate 28 pitches, associated amenity blocks, a warden office and associated works.

Another Member proposed that planning permission be refused because it was contrary to Welsh Government Design Guidelines "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites" i.e. the site exceeded 20 pitches. This proposal was seconded.

Upon a vote being taken it was,

RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that planning permission be **REFUSED** due to the development being contrary to Welsh Government Design Guidelines for Gypsy and Traveller Sites.

Application No. C/2018/0293 – Unit 18, Rassau Industrial Estate, Ebbw Vale, NP23 5SD – Erection of 1 Wind Turbine and Associated Infrastructure

The Team Manager - Development Management explained that the application sought planning permission for one wind turbine and associated infrastructure at the above site. This application had been assessed against national planning policy, supplementary planning guidance including landscape sensitivity and the capacity of landscape to accommodate the proposal.

At 80m in height the turbine had only just tipped into the 'large scale' development category (this was defined as being 80m or more in height and comprising just one wind turbine). Given the fact that it would sit between two turbines measuring 74m and 77m when viewed in context over a distance it was not considered that the turbine would appear excessively taller than the existing turbines. It was noted that this matter had been considered by both the Case Officer and Landscape Officer as part of the application process.

The Team Manager - Development Management, thereupon, advised Members of the following omission from the report:-

Paragraph 3.38 – Response – the Committee was advised that whilst three letters of objection had been referenced, only two had been named as part of the consultation responses i.e. one from a neighbouring industrial unit and the other from Brecon Beacons Park Society. It was pointed out that the third objection received had been from a resident of Maple Way, Rassau. However, it was noted that all objections were listed within the report including those objections raised by the resident of Maple Way.

The Team Leader advised, however, that the majority of objections had been received from the occupier of the neighbouring Unit No. 19. This individual had invested into the refurbishment of the unit and was concerned that having a turbine located in the vicinity would make the unit less attractive for further expansion.

Members were advised that if they were minded to grant planning permission, this would be subject to numerous conditions including conditions relating to noise emission levels imposed by the Environmental Health Section. However, since the preparation of the report discussions had taken place between the applicant and the Environmental Health Section with a view to possibly reviewing the complexity of these conditions and merging a number of the conditions.

Therefore, if planning permission was granted Members were requested to grant delegated powers to officers to merge the noise emission level conditions subject to the agreement of the Environmental Health Officers.

The Team Manager stated that this proposal had been evaluated by various experts particularly, in respect of its visual impact and noise emission levels and concluded by advising any issues that had been raised could be covered and addressed by planning conditions.

The views of Members of the Committee were, thereupon sought.

- A Member proposed that the officer's recommendation for approval be endorsed.
- Another Member enquired as there were already two wind turbines located in the area, whether there were already any issues that had been raised regarding noise emission levels.

The Team Manager advised that whilst she was not aware of any issues she was unable to confirm if the Environmental Health Section were aware of any such issues.

In reply to a question whether there was a policy in place to deal with wind turbines, the Service Manager advised that there was supplementary planning guidance dealing with wind development but no sites had been allocated for wind turbines with the Local Development Plan. A Member said that sites for wind turbines should be incorporated within the Local Development Plan.

- A Member raised his concern regarding the issue of 'topple'.

The Team Manager advised that the issue of 'topple' relating to a previous local decision in respect of a wind turbine had been challenged successfully at the High Court whereupon it had been confirmed that there was no issue to address in respect of 'topple'.

She further advised that in this particular case the wind turbine would be erected at a level significantly below that of the nearest estate road that ran immediately to the north. She also confirmed that whilst there were other regulatory powers that considered the safety of wind turbines, a planning condition had been included in the recommendation to ensure that the foundations of the wind turbine were suitable and fit for purpose.

- Another Member said that whilst he was not opposed wind turbines, he questioned the proposal to erect a wind turbine on land that was protected for employment purposes.

The Team Manager advised that there were approximately 50 hectares of land that was protected in the Borough for employment purposes. Recent guidance that had been published also indicated that a development of this nature could be classed an employment use and the amount of land that would be lost for one wind turbine would be very minimal in the context of the land use that was currently available. In addition, this proposal would not necessarily restrict any expansion proposals that Unit 19 may have.

- Another Member said that green energy needed to be supported.

The Service Manager said that there was known to be a shortage of power on the Rassau Industrial Estate and this proposal would secure a supply and guarantee pricing.

-
- A Member asked whether it would be possible for the Committee to visit the site whilst the foundations for the wind turbine were in the process of being constructed.

The Service Manager advised that if permission was granted prior to the commencement of development a detailed Construction and Environmental Management Plan would need to be submitted to and approved by the local authority. However, he would liaise with the developer to ascertain if a visit to the site could be made by the Committee during the construction period.

Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,

RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to the conditions outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.

FURTHER RESOLVED that:

- delegated powers be granted to officers to amend and/or merge conditions relating to the noise emission levels (subject to the agreement of the Environmental Health Officers).
- discussions take place with the developer to ascertain if the Committee could visit the site during the construction period.

Application No. C/2018/0285 – Gardner’s Cottage, Woodland Terrace, Nantyglo – Rebuild of Existing Dwelling, Raising of Main Roof, Two Storey Rear Extension and Front Porch

Members were advised that this application had originally been presented to the Committee on 4th April, 2019 with a recommendation for refusal but had been deferred pending a fact finding site visit. There had been three main reasons for refusal and these were:-

- The original residential use of the existing building was considered to have been abandoned.
-

-
- The access route that served the site was not of an acceptable highway standard to meet the needs of the proposed dwelling.
 - Potential for the proposed development to cause harm to bats.

The agent had subsequently submitted an Ecology Report and following its review the Council's Ecologist had raised no objections to the proposed development provided that the recommendations and mitigation measures within Section 9.1 of the report were secured via condition.

The Service Manager advised that the officer recommendation, however, remained unchanged i.e. that of refusal because it was considered that the original residential use of the building had been abandoned. It was noted that if Members were minded to grant permission in favour of a new development in countryside, the planning application would need to be advertised in the press as a departure from the Local Development Plan.

The views of Members of the Committee were, thereupon sought.

- A Member said that there had been a building located in this area for a considerable number of years and the property needed to be redeveloped. He, thereupon, proposed that planning permission be granted.
- Another Member pointed out that the highway access route did not serve any other properties, therefore, associated works such as a footpath would not be required and stated that the application should, therefore, not be refused on highway grounds. The Member concluded by stating that planning permission should also be granted in order that the property could be rebuilt.

The Service Manager sought clarification from the Committee if the development was considered acceptable, the grounds on which planning permission

was to be granted i.e.

- the original residential use had not been abandoned and as such, the existing building had a subsisting and lawful use; **or**
- the original residential use had been abandoned, however, material considerations in favour of a new house on the application site outweighed the conflict with Policy SB1 of the LDP and paragraphs 3.56 and 4.2.24 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10, December 2018).

The Service Manager referred to the previous grants of planning permission and pointed out at that time, the Case Officer had deemed that the dwelling had been abandoned and the residential use no longer existed.

A discussion ensued when the Chair proposed **reason 2 be endorsed i.e.** that permission be granted as the original residential use had been abandoned; however, material consideration in favour of a new house on the application site outweighed the conflict with Policy SB1 of the LDP and paragraphs 3.56 and 4.2.24 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10, December 2018). This proposal was seconded.

Upon a vote being taken this proposal was

RESOLVED accordingly.

The Service Manager advised that because reason 2 had been endorsed the planning application would need to be advertised in the press as a departure to the Local Development Plan which could initiate further representations in respect of the application. He, thereupon, suggested that a decision on the planning application be deferred.

FURTHER RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that the planning application be advertised as a departure to the local development plan and the decision in respect of the application be **DEFERRED**. This would allow the opportunity for a further report to be brought back to the September 2019 Committee setting out any responses

received as part of the additional consultation and a set of conditions appropriate to the new residential development.

Application No. C/2018/0065 (Outline) – Rhyd-y-Blew Inn, Rassau Road, Rassau, Ebbw Vale – Residential Development (6 Units)

The Team Manager gave details of the proposal which was to demolish the now derelict Rhyd-y-Blew Inn and build 6 residential properties (i.e. 3 pairs of semi-detached dwellings) on the land.

It was noted that the application had been assessed through the usual internal and external processes and this had confirmed that the building was not included on any statutory protected listing. However, Natural Resources Wales had objected to the development on flood risk grounds and there were also a number of ecology concerns that needed to be addressed.

Whilst the report clearly detailed that the application should normally be refused on flood risk grounds there were, however, two aspects which were relevant to the circumstances and consideration of the current application site that in the Team Manager's opinion would tip the balance in favour of a positive recommendation and these were explained in more detail in paragraphs 5.3.5 and 5.3.7 of the report.

Natural Resources Wales had indicated that should the Authority be minded to approve the development, that a Flood Consequence Assessment be requested that might demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding could be managed to an acceptable level in accordance with TAN15 advice. The applicant had subsequently undertaken an assessment which had been forwarded to the Natural Resources Wales.

Following a site visit between the agent and Natural Resources Wales it had been confirmed from a technical point of view that Natural Resources Wales were reasonably satisfied the consequences flooding on the site could be managed and that the amount of any flooding would could be minimal i.e. only the parking and

access to two of the dwellings and not the properties themselves. NRW had confirmed however that this was being dependent upon the development being implemented in full accordance with the revised layout plans dated February 2019.

The Team Manager advised however that it was now a matter for the Committee to determine whether to approve planning permission for dwellings that were located within a C2 flood zone.

Members were advised that a full list of recommended conditions would be imposed if the Committee was minded to grant planning permission and these conditions would include i.e. a condition relating to the raising of the ground levels; Drainage ; Demolition Method Statement; Ecology Statements, highways and parking, Ground Stability Assessment, Construction and Environmental Method Statement. This list was not exhaustive.

It was noted that should the outline application be approved this would grant permission for the access and layout of the proposed scheme but issues such as scale, appearance and landscape would be the subject to a further application.

The views of Members of the Committee were, thereupon sought.

- A Member said that the proposal would enhance the area and proposed that the outline planning permission be granted.
- In reply to a question regarding a blocked culvert, the Team Manager said that entry to the culvert was above Rassau Road and it would be a matter for the landowner to address any such issues.
- For clarification, it was noted that Natural Resources Wales had confirmed that flooding would not affect the properties themselves but could potentially affect the access and car parking areas of plots 4 & 5.

The Team Manager noted that whilst Members were usually advised that highly vulnerable development such as residential proposals in C2 areas were not acceptable in policy terms, she was reasonably satisfied in this instance that matters raised which were particular to the site and the additional information provided by the agent which was accepted by the relevant statutory consultee justified the positive determination of the application.

In reply to a question, the Team Manager advised that she was not aware of any evidence that the area had been previously flooded.

With regard to the issue of land ownership, it was noted that the revised proposal still included a small portion of Council land for garden use purposes. Following discussions between the applicant and Estates Department, in order not to delay determination of the application and address the matter, the applicant had served notice on Estates Department on 21st June, 2019. This effectively meant that the application could not formally be determined until 12th July, 2019. Therefore, delegated authority for officers was sought in order that a decision could be issued after 12th July, 2019. It was noted that should further information be received during this period a decision notice would not be issued.

Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,

RESOLVED that the outline application be supported **IN PRINCIPLE**, subject to a number of conditions relating to i.e. a condition relating to the raising of the ground levels; Drainage Study; Demolition Method Statement; Ecology Statements, highways and parking, Ground Stability Assessment, Construction and Environmental Method Statement. This list was not exhaustive.

FURTHER RESOLVED that in light of the need to defer making a formal decision on this application until the expiry of the statutory period for the service of a Notice on all relevant landowners, that delegated authority be granted to the Service Manager – Development & Estates to:-

	<p>(i) issue a decision in accordance with Recommendation A after 12th July, 2019; or</p> <p>(ii) defer issuing such a decision until a further report was presented to Committee that addressed any responses received during the consultation period that may raise any material planning issues which had not been addressed in the current report.</p>	
9.	<p><u>ANY AREAS FOR MEMBER TRAINING/BRIEFINGS</u></p> <p>The Service Manager reported the following:-</p> <p>Wales Audit Office Report:</p> <p>The Wales Audit Office had published a recent report relating to the effectiveness of local planning authorities in Wales. It was noted that the report was critical of the practice of some authorities but did acknowledge, however, that the resources of planning departments had been reduced and indicated that the planning process was becoming increasingly complex.</p> <p>The Service Manager advised that a report would be presented to the September Committee for consideration together with an action plan to address the recommendations contained within the Wales Audit Office report. In the meantime, a copy of the Wales Audit Office report would be circulated to Members.</p> <p>Visit to Neighbouring Planning Authority:</p> <p>The visit to a neighbouring planning authority was still in the process of being arranged.</p> <p>Houses of Multiple Occupation:</p> <p>A training event in respect of HMO's i.e. House of Multiple Occupation would be held during the autumn.</p>	

10.

**ENFORCEMENT CLOSED CASES BETWEEN 23RD
MAY AND 21ST JUNE, 2019**

Having regard to the views expressed by the Proper Officer regarding the public interest test, that on balance the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information and that the report should be exempt.

RESOLVED that the public be excluded whilst this item of business is transacted as it is likely there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 14, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

Consideration was given to the report of the Service Manager Development & Estates, whereupon:-

CO/2019/00037

For clarification, the Planning Compliance Officer confirmed that this case had arisen as a result of a complaint received relating to an unauthorised change of use. However, no breach had been identified and the case had, therefore, been closed.

RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that the report which related to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority) be accepted and the recommendations contained therein be accepted.

The Chair mindful of officer's commitments, requested that Members in future notify the Planning Compliance Officers if they wished to raise any issues at the Committee relating to enforcement matters. Arrangements would then be made for an officer to be present at Committee in order to answer questions and clarify any points.

11.	<p><u>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</u></p> <p>Councillor D. Bevan left the meeting at this juncture.</p> <p>Having regard to the views expressed by the Proper Officer regarding the public interest test, that on balance the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information and that the report should be exempt.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the public be excluded whilst this item of business is transacted as it is likely there would be a disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 14, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).</p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Team Manager Development Management.</p> <p>A Member complimented the officers on the good work undertaken at this site and requested that the Service Manager liaise with the Communications Section to publicise this.</p> <p>RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that the report which related to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority) be accepted and the recommendation contained therein be accepted.</p>	
-----	--	--