

COUNTY BOROUGH OF BLAENAU GWENT

REPORT TO: THE CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

**SUBJECT: PLANNING, REGULATORY & GENERAL
 LICENSING COMMITTEE – 3RD OCTOBER, 2019**

REPORT OF: DEMOCRATIC OFFICER

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR B. SUMMERS (CHAIR)

Councillors D. Bevan
 G. L. Davies
 D. Hancock
 W. Hodgins
 M. Moore
 J. P. Morgan
 K. Pritchard
 K. Rowson
 T. Smith
 G. Thomas
 D. Wilkshire
 B. Willis
 L. C. Winnett

WITH: Service Manager – Development & Estates
 Team Manager – Development Management
 Head of Legal & Corporate Compliance
 Team Leader – Development Management
 Team Leader – Highways & Development
 Planning Officer
 Press & Communications Officer

AND: **Public Speaker**
 Mr. Robert Hathaway (Agent) – Application No.
 C/2018/0323 – Land Adjoining Sunny Rise, Merthyr
 Road, Tredegar

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.	
No. 2	<u>APOLOGIES</u> An apology for absence was received from:- Councillor B. Thomas	
No. 3	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS</u> The following declaration was reported:- Councillor L. Winnett Item No. 10: Planning Applications Report Application No. C/2019/0090 Star Fields, Mountain Road, Ebbw Vale The reason for this declaration was because Councillor Winnett was heavily involved in campaigning on animal welfare issues, in particular large scale dog breeding and had initiated the motion at Council in respect of Lucy's Law.	
-----	<u>ORDER OF AGENDA</u> It was agreed that Item No. 10 – Planning Applications Report would be considered at this juncture.	
No. 10	<u>PLANNING REPORT</u> Consideration was given to the report of the Team Manager Development Management. The Service Manager – Development & Estates/Team Manager - Development Management explained the following planning applications to Members with the aid of slides:-	

Application No. C/2019/0090 – Star Fields, Mountain Road, Ebbw Vale - Retention of Stable (Building 4) Outbuilding and Containers for Storage Purposes and Change of Use of Stable (Building 1) to Dog Breeding Kennels

Councillor L. Winnett declared an interest in this item but following advice received from the Monitoring Officer was permitted to remain in the meeting and speak on the item. However, prior to a decision on the application being made Councillor Winnett was advised that she would be required to leave the meeting.

The Service Manager advised Members of late correspondence that had been received since the preparation of the report.

The Service Manager continued by providing details of the background to the application which had been presented to the previous Committee and subsequently refused. Following scrutiny of the minutes of the previous meeting, this report, therefore, captured the reason for refusal based on Members concerns raised at that meeting. It was noted that the reason for refusal did not cite land use planning issues.

The officer continued by stating that it was his duty as principal advisor to the Committee to highlight to Members that it was unlikely in light of an appeal that this reason would stand up and Members may be required to defend the decision with evidence.

The views of Members of the Committee were, thereupon, sought:-

- A Member referred to the proposal which had been refused at the previous Committee and said that the reason for rejection was not adequate. He stated that the buildings (some large in size) were located within a Special Landscape Area designated within the Local Development Plan, therefore, based on this information these buildings should not be located on that site.

The Service Manager advised that the Local Development Plan designated large areas of landscape and there was a rigorous appraisal that was undertaken as part of the process before any areas received designated status – there were also a variety of reasons that for which land could be designated. The officer explained that this designation would not necessarily prevent areas being developed but would be subject to a higher test in terms of acceptability. In respect of this application, the view of officers was that the proposal would not prejudice the Special Landscape Area.

- The Member expressed his concern that the fundamental fact was that buildings on site had been constructed without planning permission and the Committee was not in a position to condone buildings being on site and the use of those buildings contrary to the Local Development Plan. He pointed out that the authority had used its enforcement powers on many occasions for lesser breaches.

The Service Manager pointed out that it was a question of considering acceptability of uses and the fact that this was a retrospective application should not affect decision making. The other site referred to by the Member had been a ‘green wedge’ site and a Special Landscape Area was materially different and, therefore a comparison could not be made.

In reply to a question, the Team Leader – Highways & Development confirmed that the road which led up to the property was an adopted highway but from the gate onwards was private property.

- Another Member expressed his concern regarding the issues raised on Page 143 of the report and pointed out that bullet points 9 & 10 should not have been included in the report. In particular, the reference made to the ‘former council member’ was not relevant to the case.

The Service Manager advised that the content of the correspondence received had been brought out in bullet point form to summarise the information. As an officer he

had a duty to present and not censor the information submitted to the Committee.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Winnett pointed out that the registered dog charity had sought advice and had submitted the following reasons for refusal:-

1. The buildings and containers on this site represent a significant intrusion on the wider landscape, were clearly visible and out of character with the landscape of this part of a Special Landscape Area and lie in close proximity to the Eastern Valley slopes of Ebbw Vale.
 2. The utilitarian nature of the buildings detract from the attractiveness of this largely unspoilt valley area and the setting of the urban area of Ebbw Vale.
 3. The tipping of material and subsequent re-profiling of land adjacent to the application site associated with the use of the site for stabling and dog breeding was unacceptable in a Special Landscape Area.
 4. The proposed development would result in loss of amenity to nearby residents by way of the sound of people and vehicles going to and from the site which was likely to disturb neighbours at times when they could expect to enjoy the comfort of their surroundings.
 5. The proposal would lead to an unacceptable level of light pollution in this Special Landscape Area.
 6. The development of such a large puppy farm where over 100 dogs and puppies could be in occupation at any one time was not of a scale and design which respected the character of the surrounding area.
 7. The proposed puppy farm would require supervision 24 hrs a day, seven days a week and 365 days a year. This proposal, however, did not involve the provision of any residential accommodation for staff which would in any case
-

be unacceptable in this part of the Special Landscape Area.

8. The charity understood that the intention was to breed the puppies on this site and then sell from a residential dwelling elsewhere in the district which would lead to a large number of unnecessary vehicular movements and impact on residential amenities at that location.

Councillor Winnett pointed out that the visual impact the proposal was already having on the area was huge. She had received many complaints from the residents living in the valley opposite and the re-profiling of the land was out of keeping with this beautiful area. Lucy's Law overarched all departments and this valuable law should be cited as one of the reasons for refusal.

Councillor Winnett continued by stating that since the application had been submitted she had been inundated with concerns. The animal welfare issue was huge and Members had to be the voice of the voiceless. Councillor Winnett concluded by requesting that the Committee refuse the application.

Councillor Winnett left the meeting at this juncture.

A Member asked for clarity on the statement made i.e. whether the applicant was currently practising without a licence. The Service Manager advised that the legal status of whether a licence had been granted was not contained in the report because this was not the remit of the Committee and was irrelevant to planning considerations.

The Vice-Chair proposed that the reason for refusal be supplemented with the wording that the proposal was located within a 'Special Landscape Area' as this would add weight to reason. Another Member stated that the building was unsuitable for housing a large number of dogs and given the size and magnitude of the building located within a Special Landscape Area should also be added to the reason for refusal.

The Service Manager clarified that Members objected to the principle of the development based on the fact that it was located within a Special Landscape Area.

Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,

RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that planning permission be **REFUSED**. Authority was delegated to the Service Manager Development & Estates to word a reason for refusal based on Members concerns over the scale and impact of the building in this sensitive location in a Special Landscape Area.

An adjournment of the meeting took place from 9.55 a.m. to 10.00 a.m. to allow the gallery to clear.

Application No. C/2018/0323 – Land Adjoining Sunny Rise, Merthyr Road, Tredegar, NP22 3AE – Detached Dwelling, Vehicular Access and Parking

The Team Manager – Development Management gave details of the above application and explained that Members would recall that this application had been included on the agenda for the June 2019 Committee however, had been subsequently withdrawn at the request of the agent in order that further information could be submitted in an attempt to overcome the reason for refusal based on ecology grounds.

The development site formed part of a Woodland Tree Preservation Order and the applicant had, subsequently, submitted a Preliminary Ecological Assessment in order to address the ecological reason for refusal. It was noted that the applicant had not been requested to submit an ecological survey as officers did not want him to incur an unnecessary expense.

It had taken some time for an ecological assessment to be undertaken as further surveys needed to be carried out in respect of reptiles which had subsequently confirmed that no reptiles were found on site and the ecologist had confirmed that she was satisfied in this regard. However, the Council's ecologist had raised concerns that the loss of habitat and the buffering it provided would reduce the ecological resistance of this

woodland block in terms of its extent and connectivity value.

It was noted that the site lies adjacent to two relatively new properties which had received approval in 2000. The Woodland TPO had been designated in 2006 and at the time of the TPO designation a line of trees had provided significant barrier to the industrial estate and the existing houses along Merthyr Road.

At this juncture, the Team Manager with the aid of slides gave details of the elevated area on the site which would require a significant amount of excavation and the removal of trees. Whilst the quality of the trees had been debated, the Team Manager pointed out that it was not value of trees lost from part of the woodland area, it was the principle of allowing a development within a protected woodland area and if approved, would set a precedent for any future applications received.

The officer recommendation was that planning permission should be refused as the site formed part of a woodland protected by a Tree Preservation Order which provided a screen and buffer between Tafarnaubach Industrial Estate to the north and the residential properties on Merthyr Road.

Members were advised that the following late correspondence had been received since the preparation of the report and was summarised in the late correspondence sheet distributed at the meeting.

Agent – Mr. Robert Hathaway

At the invitation of the Chair, Robert Hathaway, the Agent representing the applicant was invited to address the Committee in respect of the planning application.

Mr. Hathaway commenced by advising that the proposed house lies within the settlement boundary and was located in an accessible area. Other houses have been built next door in recent years. Therefore, in planning policy terms the proposed new dwelling was acceptable.

The planning officer had no problem with the scale, mass or external design of the dwelling and was happy that the house would not overshadow or over dominate nor would overlook the next door property.

Access was also safe and off street parking was also provided and the highways officer had no comment.

The only reason that the planning officer gave for seeking to refuse the planning application was that the development would harm the woodland trees. Members would have seen in the late representations the views of the applicant's arboriculturalist and ecologist in relation to the officer's report.

However, the house itself would not involve the felling of any trees. Three trees are proposed to be removed as part of the development but these need to be felled for structural and physiological reasons. Members would note that the officers did not object to the expert advice provided by James Pinder of Tree Care Consulting on the need for the trees to be removed in health terms. Members may also be aware that the TPO guidance says that TPOs should not be used to hinder beneficial management work. So irrespective of the house the trees were in very poor health and need to be removed and replanted.

The case officer's report did not really bring out the tree planting proposals that replace the felled trees. The proposal would see the woodland edge enhanced with appropriate local trees including pine. This would enhance not reduce the buffer between the house and the woodland and also help the woodland screen between Merthyr Road and Tafarnaubach Industrial Estate. It was his opinion that the case officer was totally incorrect to say that the development would reduce the screening of the industrial estate. There was no woodland or standing stems between the houses opposite the site and the industrial estate. All that one saw was ground devoid of any trees and screening. New planting would therefore improve the visual screen.

Councillors should also note that none of the neighbours living opposite the site have complained about tree loss.

The applicant had paid for expensive ecological reports on the site. The site had no potential to support roosting bats. The wider woodland and local area had the potential to be used by bats. But this was the case for all but the most urban of habitats. The ecologist concluded that the very small scale habitat loss would have no adverse impact on bats. The risk implications for bats were, therefore, minimal.

Accordingly there were no strong and defensible grounds to refuse the application as there was no overall detrimental impact on either trees or ecology. Indeed the development would lead to the planting of substantially more trees to enhance the woodland edge and improve screening.

Mr. Hathaway concluded by recommending that the application was approved.

The views of Members of the Committee were, thereupon sought:-

- A Member said that he supported the application in its entirety - a new development was to be welcomed. He pointed out that the applicant had worked with the authority to try to address the concerns raised and would enhance the site with further tree planting – this was welcomed by the residents of Merthyr Road as there was no barrier between the site the industrial estate at present.

However, if the Committee was minded to agree with the officer recommendation, the Member requested that a site visit be made to assess the proposal in relation to the site/woodland area.

- The Vice-Chair expressed her concern that if planning permission was granted this would set a precedent for potentially further applications for a dwelling next door and this in turn could possibly remove even more of the woodland area.
- A Member suggested that a condition could be imposed indicating that no further development

should take place on the site. He concluded by stating that as the species of trees were of a low grade he supported the view of the local Member and supported the application.

The Service Manager clarified that this particular application was limited to a specific plot of land but if this proposal was approved there was nothing that could prevent further applications being received for further development in the area.

A Member said that if further applications were received, each application would have to be considered on its merits.

- The outlook for residents living opposite the site would be far better if the development took place as currently their outlook was a wind turbine located on the industrial estate.
- Another Member pointed out that if the application was approved the applicant would spend his own money to implement a tree planting programme.

The Team Manager, thereupon, responded to the following questions and clarified the points below:-

- It was fully acknowledged that some of the trees were not good specimens and the applicant had indicated that additional planting would take place on site. However, it was the principle of constructing a new dwelling in a protected woodland area combined with the potential effect of the dwelling would have on an established woodland area that officers were opposed to as this could set a precedent for the future.

It was noted that there were 3 trees that had been identified that would require to be felled (one specimen had already been removed). Whilst these trees were not necessarily good specimens, it was the effect and impact that the building and excavation works would have on the remaining protected woodland area that officers were opposed to.

- A significant amount of excavation works would have to be undertaken to construct the dwelling which could potentially be harmful to the trees.
- It was confirmed that the applicant was the land owner of the application site and the remainder of the woodland.
- Comparisons should not be made with previous applications as at that time the Woodland TPO had not been designated. For clarification however, it was reported that with regard to the properties that had been previously built adjacent to the site, these had only required a few small trees along frontage to be removed and this loss had been minimal.
- It was acknowledged that the applicant had worked with officers in order to address the issues raised. However, the applicant had decided to commission the ecological study in order to address ecological concerns that had been raised as part of the planning process.
- The Service Manager advised that there were two types of TPO i.e. an individual TPO and a group TPO. With a group or woodland TPO, the value was derived from the value of the group of trees as a whole.

Another Member advised that there were massive problems with overgrown trees throughout the borough this year and said that a tree management system needed to be introduced.

The Vice-Chair reiterated her concern regarding the proposal and the setting of a precedent and said that there was no guarantee that additional trees would not be felled as part of the development.

A Member proposed that the application be approved. This proposal was seconded. Another Member proposed that the application be refused – there was no seconder for this proposal.

Upon a vote being taken it was

RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that planning permission be **GRANTED**.

Members requested that the votes be recorded as follows:-

For Approval – 12 Members

Against – 1 Member – Councillor Mandy Moore requested that her name be recorded against the decision.

Abstention – 1 Member – Chair of the Committee

The Service Manager advised that a report would be presented to the next Committee outlining the conditions for the grant of planning permission.

Application No. C/2019/0099 – Land Adjacent to Bethany Baptist Chapel, Six Bells, Road, Six Bells, Abertillery – Expansion of Six Bells School Car Park including Alterations to Adjacent Footpath and Associated Landscaping Works

The Team Manager presented the above application which included works to expand the car park of the Six Bells School together with alterations to the adjacent footpath and associated landscaping works.

The officer advised that the report contained two illustrations which gave an approximate indication (marked in red) of the area of the proposed car park extension. She apologised however that the red line boundary on the aerial photograph in the printed reports had been wrongly represented due to an electronic transfer issue and that this had caused some confusion to third parties which had been picked up in recent press articles. She emphasised however that this photograph had only been included for indicative purposes to give a flavour of the scale of the works and the error had since been corrected on the slide presented at Committee and copies of a corrected version had also been sent to the press.

The current application related to land situated

immediately to the east of the existing car park area and the proposal would involve minor amendments to the layout of the approved car park and the provision of an additional 13 car parking spaces.

There had been no particular issues raised as part of the consultation exercise. However, some concerns had been raised by the Team Manager Green Infrastructure which related to the loss of trees and the fact that providing additional car parking conflicted with other policies e.g. encouraging children to walk to school and the Future Generations Act relating to sustainability.

A significant amount of excavation work would be required as the footpath would be required to be realigned. As part of these works it was noted that there would a loss of some self-seeded trees.

Both Network Rail and Welsh Water had raised no objections to the proposals as part of the consultation process.

At this juncture it was noted that late correspondence had been received from the Council's Destination Management officer supporting the application but noted some temporary negative impacts during the construction stage of the school.

The Team Manager Green Infrastructure had raised significant concerns from a landscape and aboricultural perspective to the proposal to extend the recently constructed car park into existing established native woodland and the manner in which the works might affect remaining trees or impact on the footpath network in the area. Whilst the Team Manager – Development Management said that it was regrettable that a potential extension would be required to the car park now the school had recently become operational, an assessment would be made over the next few months to ascertain if the current level of car parking provision met the needs of the school.

In referring to correspondence received from local businesses and organisations she advised that most of their concerns related to general and technical issues

relating to the newly constructed car park and that these had been previously covered in detail as part of the original planning application process for the new school. It was noted that should planning permission be granted the decision whether to implement the scheme would be a matter for the Council as the applicant to determine.

The Team Manager concluded by advising that should permission be granted a full list of conditions would be prepared.

The views of the Members of the Committee were, thereupon sought:-

- A Member pointed out that if the funding had been received earlier these works could have formed part of the original school development. He concluded by stating that he looked forward to the extension to the car park and supported the officer's recommendation for approval.
 - Another Member enquired if permission was granted, whether an analysis could be undertaken to assess whether there was a need for additional car parking provision at the site. The Team Leader Highways & Development said he was currently working with Education colleagues and the school to produce a working travel plan. Road Safety Officers were also visiting the school. It was noted that the Highway Authority had raised no objections to the proposals.
 - Concern was expressed regarding the considerable amount of congestion outside of schools and a Member said it would be beneficial to increase the car parking provision at the site. This would allow vehicles to park off the highway and provide a safer environment for the children.
 - Another Member pointed out that most people had issues with car parking issues and she could not see how this proposal could be justified.
 - The Chair said that if approved, the construction
-

	<p>works would not be carried out until next summer holidays assuming that between now and July 2020.</p> <p>The Team Leader Highways & Development confirmed that an analysis would be undertaken and the situation would be monitored and assessments undertaken to ascertain how the existing car parking was being utilised. It was noted that travel movements in any new school fluctuated.</p> <p>➤ Another Member said that the additional car parking would also alleviate the pressure on businesses located in the vicinity of the school and said he supported the application.</p> <p>Councillor W. Hodgins left the meeting at this juncture.</p> <p>➤ Another Member said that the additional car parking was much needed since the school had opened as problems had been experienced with parking/congestion and issues were being experienced in respect of the approach road from A467. This additional parking would also alleviate the pressure for visitors visiting the Guardian.</p> <p>Councillor W. Hodgins returned to the meeting at this juncture.</p> <p>The Service Manager advised that in planning terms the proposal was acceptable and if permission was issue it would be the Council in its capacity as the applicant which would decide if the proposal was implemented.</p> <p>Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,</p> <p>RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing, that planning permission be <u>GRANTED</u>, subject to the conditions outlined in the report of the Team Manager Development Management.</p>	
No. 4	<p><u>QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE INFORMATION</u></p> <p><u>QUARTER 1 – APRIL TO JUNE 2019</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Service</p>	

	<p>Manager Development & Estates.</p> <p>The Service Manager outlined the Council's current performance as follows:-</p> <p>Figure 1 – the Council was ranked 1st in terms of its performance for determining applications in time. This equated to 100% of the total applications, compared to the Welsh average of 85%.</p> <p>Figure 2 – on average it took 67 days from registration to decision for the Council to determine an application, whilst the Welsh average was 79 days.</p> <p>Figure 3 – 0% of Planning Committee decisions had been made contrary to the officer recommendation. The Welsh average was 10%.</p> <p>Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the Quarter 1 Performance Information contained therein be noted.</p>	
No. 5	<p><u>DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE</u> <u>DECISION: 30MW SOLAR PARK AT WAUNTYSSWG FARM, ABERTYSSWG, RHYMNEY, TREDEGAR</u></p> <p>The report of the Team Leader Development Management was submitted for consideration.</p> <p>The Team Leader Development Management provided an overview of the report and explained that at the previous Committee Meeting Members had expressed disappointment at the Welsh Minister's decision to grant planning permission for the above development, contrary to the advice of the Planning Inspector who had recommended that planning permission be refused on the basis that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the local landscape, would cause harm to the views of users of the public rights of way in the area and would have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the Cholera Cemetery Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p> <p>Members had, therefore, requested that a letter be</p>	

prepared for the Welsh Minister setting out the views of Members. This draft letter had been attached at Appendix 1 to the report for endorsement.

A Member expressed his appreciation to the Team Leader for an extremely well drafted and comprehensive response for the Minister.

In reply to a comment made, the Team Leader explained that the Minister had sought advice from Welsh Government officers prior to determining the application.

Another Member said that this matter had been debated and scrutinised by relevant stakeholders i.e. this Committee, the Town Council and local Members and expressed his concern that Welsh Government had overturned local democracy and that this could happen again in the future.

The Team Leader explained that the Welsh Government had introduced a separate process to deal with applications of national significance and from a local perspective all the authority could do was contribute to the consideration of these developments through a local impact report. It was the Welsh Government that ultimately took the final decision in respect of developments of this nature. If there were similar developments of this nature in future the same process would be followed.

Members, thereupon, requested that the following points be included in the correspondence to the Welsh Minister:-

- An invitation be extended to the Minister to visit Blaenau Gwent to view the proposed site that the development would have an adverse impact on.
- The correspondence also be signed by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee in addition to the officer.

RESOLVED, subject to the foregoing amendments, that the report be accepted and the draft letter for the Minister for Housing and Local Government be endorsed and forwarded to the Minister on behalf of the Committee.

No. 6	<p><u>APPEALS, CONSULTATIONS AND DNS UPDATE OCTOBER 2019</u></p> <p>Members considered the report of the Service Manager Development & Estates.</p> <p>The Service Managing spoke briefly to the report outlining the status of each appeal and it was,</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the information contained therein be noted.</p>	
No. 7	<p><u>PLANNING APPEAL UPDATE: 37 BENNETT STREET, BLAINA</u></p> <p>The report of the Planning Compliance Officer was submitted.</p> <p>Members were advised that the applicant had appealed against the period of compliance (4 months) which, had been issued on the enforcement notice. However, the appeal had been dismissed and the applicant would now have 4 months from the date of the Inspector's decision notice (13th September, 2019) to comply with the enforcement notice.</p> <p>A Member asked how the authority could expect the applicant to comply with the notice as there were on-going legal proceedings and asked whether the compliance with the enforcement notice should be held in abeyance until these proceedings had concluded. It was noted that the neighbouring property would not allow the applicant onto his property to undertake the remedial work.</p> <p>The Service Manager advised that the authority had an obligation to the neighbouring property as the building was overbearing on next door property. Three options had been provided to the applicant to comply with the enforcement notice and the Planning Inspector had acknowledged the point that it would be technically possible to achieve the works without erecting scaffolding on the adjacent ground belonging to the neighbour.</p>	

	<p>The Service Manager confirmed that a further report would be submitted to Committee with a recommended course of action at the conclusion of the notice period (mid-January 2020).</p> <p>Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the appeal decision be noted, namely that the appeal was dismissed.</p>	
No. 8	<p><u>PLANNING APPEAL UPDATE: TIR PENTWYS, HAFODRYNYS, PONTYPOOL, TORFAEN</u></p> <p>Consideration was given to the report of the Team Leader Development Management.</p> <p>The Team Manager – Development Management spoke briefly to the report and highlighted the background to the case which had been on-going since 2003. It was noted that the application site fell entirely in Torfaen and Torfaen C.B.C. had refused planning permission for the development.</p> <p>Subsequently, an appeal was lodged and this had also been dismissed by the Planning Inspector.</p> <p>Councillor D. Wilkshire left the meeting at this juncture.</p> <p>Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report be accepted and the appeal decision be noted, namely that the appeal was dismissed.</p>	
No. 9	<p><u>LIST OF APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS BETWEEN 22nd AUGUST AND 18TH SEPTEMBER, 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 22nd August and 18th September, 2019 be noted.</p> <p>Councillor D. Wilkshire joined the meeting at this juncture.</p>	
11.	<p><u>ANY AREAS FOR MEMBER TRAINING/BRIEFINGS</u></p> <p>Planning Compliance – Conservation Areas</p> <p>A Member requested that a training session be held in relation to the above topic in particular covering areas around signage and shutters.</p> <p>The Service Manager reported the following:-</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 in January 2020.</p> <p>RESOLVED accordingly.</p>	
12.	<p><u>ENFORCEMENT CLOSED CASES BETWEEN 20TH AUGUST AND 23RD SEPTEMBER, 2019</u></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 Service Manager Development & Estates.</p> <p>Upon a vote being taken it was unanimously,</p> <p>RESOLVED that the report which related to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Authority) be accepted and the information contained therein be noted.</p>	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--