

# Public Document Pack

## NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES, GERONON ROAD, LETCHWORTH GARDEN CITY, SG6 3JF  
ON THURSDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 2024 AT 7.30 PM

#### MINUTES

**Present:** *Councillors: Nigel Mason (Chair), Amy Allen, Sadie Billing, Ruth Brown, Emma Fernandes, Ian Mantle, Bryony May, Caroline McDonnell, Michael Muir, Louise Peace and Tom Tyson.*

**In Attendance:** *Isabelle Alajooz (Legal Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer), Ben Glover (Senior Planning Officer), Shaun Greaves (Development and Conservation Manager), Alex Howard (Senior Planning Officer), Susan Le Dain (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Christella Menson (Principal Planning Officer) and Sjanet Wickenden (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer).*

**Also Present:** *At the start of the meeting approximately 22 members of the public, including registered speakers were present.*

*Councillors Daniel Allen and Ralph Muncer were also present.*

#### 83 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

*Audio recording – 2 minutes 4 seconds*

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Elizabeth Dennis.

#### 84 MINUTES - 10 OCTOBER AND 24 OCTOBER 2024

*Audio Recording – 2 minutes 14 seconds*

Councillor Nigel Mason, as Chair, proposed and Councillor Ian Mantle seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Meetings of the Committee held on 10 October 2024 and 24 October 2024 be approved as true records of the proceedings and be signed by the Chair.

#### 85 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

*Audio recording – 3 minutes 25 seconds*

There was no other business notified.

#### 86 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Audio recording – 3 minutes 29 seconds*

(1) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be recorded.

- (2) The Chair drew attention to the item on the agenda front pages regarding Declarations of Interest and reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest needed to be declared immediately prior to the item in question.
- (3) The Chair clarified matters for the registered speakers.
- (4) The Chair advised that Section 4.8.23(a) of the Constitution applied to the meeting.

## 87 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

*Audio recording – 5 minutes 48 seconds*

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance.

## 88 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

*Audio recording – 6 minutes 15 seconds*

In accordance with Standing Order 4.8.11, three questions had been submitted by the required deadline set out in the Constitution.

- (1) Councillor Ralph Muncer to Councillor Nigel Mason, Chair of the Planning Control Committee:

‘What is the Council’s policy regarding the application of its powers under the Listed Building Act 1990, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and the Buildings Act 1984, in respect of holding building owners to account for the dilapidation of Listed Buildings, especially for registered Assets of Community Value?’

Through the Chair, the Development and Conservation Manager provided the following response:

‘The Council do not have an adopted policy, as such, we apply the relevant Acts based upon basic Government guidance. As far as the listed buildings, as far as the Buildings Act that is a matter for Building Regulations and is not a matter for me to comment on and building regulations deal with dilapidation buildings generally.

With regards to listed buildings, as I said earlier we do not have a policy on such matters but we do follow government guidance, there is no specific duty on owners to keep their buildings in a good state or repair, but we do have powers to take action where a designated heritage asset has deteriorated to the extent that its preservation may be at risk. And there are various notices that we can use under the Listed Building and Conservation Area Act. Section 54 and 55 deal with urgent works to buildings, but that can only apply to an unoccupied building or parts of a building that is unoccupied. And then there is the repairs notice under section 48 of the Town and Country Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act, that can relate to listed buildings which are occupied and we can serve a repairs notice on the owner in regards to those. The notice would specify the works that the authority considers reasonably necessary for the proper preservation of the building it does not deal with the restoration of the building it just deals with preservation and therefore the requirements of such a notice can only deal with buildings that are in such a state that the preservation is at risk and the works that we can require are to bring it to a point where it is no longer at such risk. We cannot require its restoration to a much better state than that which is just required to ensure that basically it does not fall down. There is the ability to compulsory purchase a listed building and that is outside my purview and delegated powers and then that would be a matter for others within the Council.

You asked a question about Registered Assets of Community Value, those have no relevance to the Listed Buildings Act and to whether something is a listed building.

Assets of Community Value were assets where the communities have the right to identify the building or the land that they believe to be important to the community and it really only deals with the ability of the community to purchase a building, and they can only apply that ability in the event that a building is put up for sale. So it does not really relate necessarily to listed buildings as such but to building where the community consider it an asset and should be given an opportunity to purchase that building in the event that it comes up for sale. An asset last about five years on a list before it has to be reviewed.'

Councillor Ralph Muncer asked a supplementary question, as follows:

'Are there any plans to bring forward a policy to codify the enforcement approach in North Hertfordshire?'

Through the Chair, the Development and Conservation Manager provided the following response:

'No there are not, the main reason for that is that the approach taken is very much dependent on the particular building concern. All listed buildings are very different and therefore you apply the law, the acts based upon the particular circumstances on each case, I am not sure that a policy would be particularly beneficial in that regards because each case is dealt with individually.'

- (2) Councillor Ralph Muncer to Councillor Nigel Mason, Chair of the Planning Control Committee:

'In particular, if the Council becomes aware that a Listed Building or building within a Conservation Area is at risk from dilapidation, to what extent will the Council allow the building to deteriorate before exercising its power to take formal legal enforcement action under the above acts?'

Through the Chair, the Development and Conservation Manager provided the following response:

'As I said earlier that would very much depend on the particular circumstances of the building and certain buildings would be looked at on their own merits and we would normally undertake or commission a survey to be undertaken if we consider that building has reached a point where it is in danger of failing if it is a listed building with a view to preserving that building. Something that has fallen down basically.'

Councillor Ralph Muncer asked a supplementary question, as follows:

'Within the last civic year do you know how many cases of formal legal action were brought against owners of property under the above acts?'

Through the Chair, the Development and Conservation Manager provided the following response:

'We have not had any.'

(3) Councillor Ralph Muncer to Councillor Nigel Mason, Chair of the Planning Control Committee:

'If the owner's maintenance of a Listed Building falls below the Council's minimum standard requirement (as in (2) above), and indeed the minimum standard required by legislation, how much time will the Council give the owner to restore the building to comply with informal requests and comply with statutory requirements before taking formal legal action to protect the historic building?'

Through the Chair, the Development and Conservation Manager provided the following response:

'It would depend upon the particular building concerned, the degree of its state in terms of what is necessary to preserve it, and that will reflect the amount of work involved in its repair to a point where it can be preserved and therefore it is not possible to say what specific time period we would give, it would depend on the particular building and its state.'

Councillor Ralph Muncer asked a supplementary question, as follows:

'In your experience, what is the average time?'

Through the Chair, the Development and Conservation Manager provided the following response:

'I would not be able to, would not want to hazard a guess to an average time, they are quite rare, and so working out an average which would be quite difficult because they are such rare occurrences.'

**89 22/02675/FP KIMPTON GRANGE, LUTON ROAD, KIMPTON, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG4 8HA**

*Audio recording – 14 minutes 48 seconds*

The Senior Planning Officer provided an update that the Applicant was actually Mr J Grint and not Clear Architects as stated in the report.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of Application 22/02675/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Amy Allen
- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Bryony May
- Councillor Tom Tyson

In response to questions, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- The northern access would remain as a gated entrance.
- The southern access point would lead to the land gifted to the Parish Council and to the 4, two bedroom dwellings.
- There would be 15 dwellings in total.
- The application met the affordable housing allocation, as the dwellings in the Grange were conversions and not new builds.
- The four affordable houses would be sited facing inwards and not towards the street.
- Replacement trees would be planted.

The Chair invited Davina Malcolm to speak against the application. Ms Malcolm thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- The development would cause the destruction of wood land.
- There were no guarantees that the gifted land would not be developed on, at a later date.
- The site was on green belt land and was outside the village boundary.
- The site was in the conservation area of Kimpton Bottom and was an area of principle historic interest with wooded boundaries.
- The development of the four houses was considered as infill building but would be hidden from the street by trees.
- The removal of woodland negated the conservation and green belt status.
- Kimpton needed affordable homes, the application stated all the homes were exceptional, but the 4 affordable homes were not exceptional.
- The deciduous trees and wildlife should be protected, the new dwellings would cause traffic and light pollution.
- There would be a loss of over 50 trees and the associated wildlife would be displaced, it would take decades to replenish these losses.
- There would be water build up from the removal of the trees.
- The site would have a 51.3% biodiversity net gain, however who would look after the new woodlands.
- The village was surrounded by farms and footpaths, it did not have a need, nor funding to maintain any extra gifted land.

The Chair thanked Ms Malcolm for her presentation and invited Councillor Ralph Muncer to speak against the application. Councillor Muncer thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- The Grange conversion and the building of the lake homes would give a new lease of life to the site.
- The siting of the four affordable homes was not in keeping with the rest of the development. These dwellings were situated in green belt and conservation land and were outside the settlement boundary. The siting of these dwellings would cause harm to the area.
- Very special circumstances had not been demonstrated to build in this area as specified in paragraph 152 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The applicant was seeking to use the infill building exception to this policy, however this should not be used as the site was outside the village boundary.
- The applicant had failed to demonstrate any very special circumstances and great weight should be allocated to the harms caused by this development under paragraph 205 of the NPPF.
- The Parish Council had raised concerns regarding the loss of the Rookery, and these had not been addressed.
- The affordable homes should be integrated into the site as currently there were clear distinctions between the two styles of homes. Planning applications had previously been refused for this reason.
- The site was not identified in the Local Plan.
- The applicant should listen to the residents, as the proposed development would cause harm to the green belt and to the Kimpton conservation area.

In response to a question from Councillor Tom Tyson, Councillor Muncer advised that, had the four affordable dwelling been situated in a more conservative area and the concerns of the Parish Council been addressed then the objections may have been resolved.

The Chair thanked Councillor Muncer for his presentation and invited Paul Hunter to speak in support of the application. Mr Hunter thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- The Grange was in disrepair and the development would preserve the building as well as providing new affordable housing.
- The Grange was a special building and would have a renewed purpose.
- The development would provide access to a new public woodland.

The Chair thanked Mr Hunter for his presentation and invited Arron Breedon the Agent to the Applicant to speak in support of the application. Mr Breedon thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- The application had a holistic approach to the development and included the gifting of land.
- The development would use a fabric first approach and would provide a 51.3% biodiversity net gain.
- Demolishing the dilapidated barn and outbuildings would enhance the setting.
- The development had a sense of openness and space and was not a cramped rural scene.
- The Grange would be redeveloped into 6 apartments, with improvements to the roof, walls and windows as well as an internal refurbishment to restore it to its former glory.
- The site would have less volume of buildings than in its current form, and the buildings would be distributed across the site.
- There would be three new lake homes nestled into the topography, these would be bespoke and built to a high standard.
- There would be two homes integrated into the garden walls, and four affordable homes on the boundary line.
- All the properties would be built using a fabric first approach, they would have sustainable technology to reduce energy, air and ground heat pumps, solar panels throughout the development and have an underground drainage system.
- The development would gift land to the Parish Council and back garden space to neighbouring properties.
- The development was a significant improvement to the current setting.

The following Member asked questions:

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Amy Allen
- Councillor Ian Mantle

In response to questions, Mr Breedon advised that:

- The back gardens would be gifted to residents living at 2-14 Kimpton Botton.
- The affordable homes would be built to a high standard off site and brought in by way of a panel system, the homes would have heats pumps to reduce consumption and reduce running costs.
- The affordable homes were located within the southern boundary and would be considered as infill buildings within the greenbelt. These homes would be directly opposite established homes and would continue the ribbon of the street.
- The Paish Council would receive yearly payments for 10 years to maintain the gifted wildlife area. The money would allow the Parish Council to maintain the new wildlife habitats.
- The affordable homes had south facing gardens meaning they faced away from the road. The homes would be obscured by hedgerows and trees.

The Chair thank Mr Breedon for his presentation.

In response to points raised, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- The majority of the proposed felled trees were Category C or U. There were a few Category B trees that would also be felled.
- There would be a 51% Biodiversity Net Gain across the site.
- On balance the benefits of the scheme outweighed the harms as stated in paragraph 4.4 of the report.
- The Parish Council had requested £10K per year for 10 Years for maintenance of the new wildlife areas, the applicant had agreed to this.
- The development complied with paragraph 154 of the NPPF, as the land was previously developed and would be providing affordable dwellings therefore there would be no more than substantial harm to the greenbelt.
- The barn removal improved the openness and views across the site.

Councillor Amy Allen proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Ruth Brown.

The following Members took part in debate:

- Councillor Amy Allen
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Michael Muir
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell
- Councillor Ian Mantle

Points raised in debate included:

- That they did not seem to be any legal reason to object to the application.
- There were concerns that the affordable housing faced into the development instead of towards the road.
- The development was of a high standard and opened up the estate to the public.
- There were concerns that the replacement trees would take decades to develop.
- The Parish Council had not objected to the development.
- There would be planting to obscure the affordable homes.
- There were concerns that the four houses would not be integrated into the street scene.
- There were concerns that the north entrance was gated but the south entrance was not.
- The southern access was merely for the four affordable houses and their refuse collection. There was no access through the site.

In response to points raised in debate, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- Officers summarised that the benefits of this development outweighed the harms.
- The drainage concerns had been addressed by the applicant.
- It would be difficult to justify a condition requiring no gates to the north entrance in the event of an appeal, especially as the site currently had gated access.

In response to points raised in debate, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- The affordable housing details were set out in the Section 106 heads of terms.
- The benefits of the siting of the four houses outweighed the harms.
- The landscaping details for the site had been submitted and were substantial.

- There was no road access between the two sites.
- The site currently had two gated entrances.

Having been proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 22/02675/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

*N.B. Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings and the meeting reconvened at 21:00.*

**90 23/02895/OP LAND ON THE NORTH EAST SIDE OF, THE CLOSE, CODICOTE, HERTFORDSHIRE**

Audio recording – 1 hour 21 minutes 26 seconds

The Senior Planning Officer provided an update regarding the supplementary documents published on the 21 November 2024.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of Application 23/02895/OP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Amy Allen
- Councillor Tom Tyson

In response to questions, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- There was no specialist cycling route into the site.
- There was no other access onto the site however there was a public right of way across the site.
- The strip of green outside the boundary was for illustration purposes and not material, it may be part of the footpath.
- The applicant had submitted illustrated plans for the site, these were merely to show that the development met in principle the criteria and policies required for allocated site CD3.

In response to questions, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- This application was for 42 dwellings, the original Local Plan allocation for this site was for 48 dwellings. Should outline planning be granted the applicant could only build up to 42 dwellings.
- It was likely that the illustrated layout would be indicative of the final plans, mainly due to the topography of the site.
- This application included vehicular access on to the site as this was not reserved for later approval.
- There were various public rights of way proposed within the site, including one that linked to the top northeast corner of the site.

The Chair invited Dan Stokes to speak against the application. Mr Stokes thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- There were 32 objections to this application.
- There was insufficient infrastructure surrounding this application.



- Hertfordshire County Councils Right of Way Officers had conditioned that there should be no footpath diversions during this development.
- There had already been more houses built in Codicote than its original housing allocation in the Local Plan.
- The Highways team changed their objection and claimed that the extra 33 daily trips to the site would not cause any extra harm, this was concerning.
- Recently ambulances had been unable to gain access to the area and this would only be made worse by congestion from construction and then the new homes.
- There were concerns regarding parking spaces which were already limited and any proposed priority lanes.
- The proposed bungalows would have sight into existing properties, additional high level planting would be required.
- There would be impacts on resident insurance premiums and the development would cause loss of light to existing properties.

The Chair thanked Mr Stokes for his presentation and invited Councillor Ralph Muncer to speak against the application. Councillor Muncer thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- The Local Plan had allocated 400 homes to Codicote but had not put in adequate infrastructure. The High Street along with smaller road were already showing the strain of congestion.
- The access to this site was through a residential road and any construction would impact on the residents.
- During winter months residents struggled to access the smaller roads, this would be even harder for construction vehicles.
- The site was already a flood risk, this would be more significant after any development.
- Should the application be granted then ground water run off should be addressed prior to the construction of any homes.
- It was concerning that there was no funding for a GP surgery.
- Any conditions placed on the development should be properly enforced.

The Chair thanked Councillor Muncer for his presentation and invited Lynsey Rigg as Agent to the Applicant to speak in support of the application. Ms Rigg thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including that:

- There had been no technical objections to this application.
- The development had been reduced to 42 dwellings after careful consideration and discussions with Officers and the Parish Council.
- There had been discussions with the Parish Council regarding their concerns.
- There would be contributions to a new play area and to the upgrade of the scout hut and Memorial Hall.
- The development comprised a robust housing mix including 2 and 3 bedroom affordable homes, full details would be confirmed at the reserve matters stage.
- The application was supported by all the statutory bodies and complied to the Local Plan policies.
- The dwellings would be height restricted to no more than two stories and would also compromise of bungalows in the south west section of the site
- Important landscape features would be retained including a category A oak tree.
- There would be a 12 meter buffer between the old and new homes.
- There would be no harm to any local heritage sites.
- Contributions would be made to an upgrade of the play area in Valley Road.
- There would be section 106 mitigation for infrastructure.

In response to a question from Councillor Amy Allen, Ms Rigg confirmed that there was a footpath and not a bridleway through the site, investigations to upgrade this could be made with the Rights of Way team.

The Chair thank Ms Rigg for her presentation.

In response to points raised, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- There was a Construction Traffic Management Condition which included a Construction Management Plan to mitigate any impact on residents.
- Highways deemed the one access point as acceptable subject to Condition 4.
- When consulted the NHS responded that no contributions were required.
- The footpath would be 2 meters wide as agreed by Highways.

In response to points raised, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- This was an allocated housing site in the Local Plan.
- Condition 4 was required prior to commencement of any building work.
- The Enforcement team had been made aware of issues at nearby sites.

Councillor Ruth Brown considered whether another pedestrian access point could be added at the reserved matters stage.

Councillor Ian Mantle proposed to grant the application and Councillor Amy Allen seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 23/02895/OP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager with the removal of Condition 13, the amendments to Conditions 11,12 and 14 as set out in the supplementary document and the relevant renumbering of existing conditions.

“Condition 11:

*Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)*

*‘Prior to commencement of the development, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan shall be prepared, detailing how biodiversity will be incorporate within the development scheme and managed/monitored long-term. This should include details regarding who will have the management responsibilities. The plan shall include details of the landscaping proposed to achieve measurable gains to biodiversity, as well as a graphical plan which sets out the number, type and position of ecological enhancement features to be incorporated into the design scheme. This plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval to demonstrate the expectations of the NPPF and Local Policy in achieving overall measurable net gains for biodiversity. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To ensure sensible working practices which protect ecology on and adjacent to this site, in accordance with Policy NE4: Biodiversity and Geological Sites.*

Condition 12

*Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)*

*No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for biodiversity has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include the following:*

- a) *Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.*
- b) *Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements). This must include:*
  - i. *Best practice measures to ensure the protection of retained vegetation during construction;*
  - ii. *Best practice measures to ensure any invasive species listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 encountered within the site will be removed and disposed of as controlled waste;*
  - iii. *A precautionary working method for hedgehogs.*
- c) *The location and timings of sensitive works to avoid harm to nesting birds.*
- d) *Details of a translocation programme for slow-worms.*

*The CEMP should include a statement to the effect that if any protected species are encountered during any stage of the development, then works must cease immediately and advice be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist on how best to proceed. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved CEMP, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To ensure sensible working practices which protect ecology on and adjacent to this site, in accordance with Policy NE4: Biodiversity and Geological Sites.*

*Condition 13:*

*Lighting Strategy*

*No development shall take place until an external lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme should follow guidance from the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals (2023), and be designed to minimise light spill, in particular directing light away from boundary vegetation to ensure that dark corridors remain for use by wildlife as well as directing lighting away from potential roost / nesting sites. This should be accompanied by a short statement from a suitably qualified ecologist showing how the design meets the level of protection required.*

*Reason: To ensure protected species are not disturbed by the development in accordance with National Legislation (Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)) and Local Planning Policy NE4 – Biodiversity and geological sites.”*

*N.B. Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings and the meeting reconvened at 21:48.*

**91 APPEALS**

*Audio recording – 2 hour 9 minutes 47 seconds*

The Development Management Team Leader provided an update on Planning Appeals and highlighted that:

- There had been one appeal lodged which related to the removal of a condition.
- Two appeals had been dismissed with no discernible issues.
- The Rhee Spring appeal had been postponed with no rescheduled date. This may get upgraded to a public inquiry with additional costs.

## 92 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY REPORT

*Audio recording – 2 hour 12 minutes 40 seconds*

The Principal Planning Officer (Conservation and Enforcement) provided an update on the Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report and advised that:

- The report gave an insight into the work of the Enforcement team.
- Customer engagement was crucial to the department to retain a good reputation.
- Work was ongoing to signpost members of the public and to separate out general public enquires from those that required assistance from the enforcement team.
- There had been website changes which included a frequently asked questions function and a summary of current work.
- It was noted that enforcement work took time and was not a rapid response service.
- From December the website would have monitoring details of section 106 payments and would include a list of contributions received over the last year, what the money had been spent on and a clawback overview.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Ian Mantle

In response to questions, the Principal Planning Officer advised that:

- Information regarding enforcement appeals would be included in the next quarterly update.
- Work was ongoing to set up a sharing network with other districts and the County Council regarding Section 106 payments.

Councillor Ruth Brown advised that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were appointing a Task and Finish Group on Section 106 funding.

## 93 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

*Audio recording – 2 hours 21 minutes 28 seconds*

Councillor Nigel Mason, as Chair, proposed and Councillor Ruth Brown seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the said Act (as amended).

## 94 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT TEAM QUARTERLY UPDATE - PART 2

*N.B. As this item was considered in private session, no audio recording is available.*

The Principal Planning Officer (Conservation and Enforcement) provided an update on the Planning Enforcement Team.

The meeting closed at 10.13 pm

Chair