
MEETING	WEST & CITY CENTRE AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	10 JANUARY 2013
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS WATSON (CHAIR), FUNNELL, GALVIN, GILLIES (VICE-CHAIR), JEFFRIES, LOOKER, ORRELL AND SEMLYEN
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR REID

39. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following sites were inspected before the meeting.

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
Manor Farm Intake Lane Acaster Malbis	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
296 Bishopthorpe Road	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
Sunnydene, Moorlea Avenue	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
Car Parking Area, Holgate Road	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
15 Dewsbury Terrace	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	At the request of Cllr Brian Watson.
Foundation Housing, Bowes Morrell House, 111 Walmgate	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	At the request of Cllr Brian Watson

2A Lendal	Councillors Galvin, Gillies and Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
-----------	--	--

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they might have in the business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

41. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That the Members of the Press and Public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the annexes to Agenda item 6 (Enforcement Cases Update) on the grounds that they contain information that if disclosed to the public, would reveal that the Authority proposes to give, under any enactment or notice by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person or that the Authority proposes to make an order or directive under any enactment. This information is classed as exempt under Paragraph 6 of Schedule 12A to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

42. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the West and City Centre Area Planning Sub-Committee held on 15 November 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

43. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under Council's Public Participation Scheme on general issues within the remit of the Committee.

44. PLANS LIST

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development) relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and advice of consultees and officers.

44a Sunnydene, Moorlea Avenue, York, YO24 2PA (12/03373/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Mike Moore for the erection of a dwelling (resubmission).

Officers circulated a photograph which had been taken at the site visit which showed the site under water.

Representations were received from Mrs Somerville, a neighbour, in objection to the application. She raised the following issues:

- flooding is a major issue with the site – there is little information in the application on how surface water drainage would be dealt with.
- the site just needs tidying up rather than building on.
- the proposed fence on the driveway would be unsightly and offensive to look at from her living room – it would also affect light to this room.
- the new house would be visible and overbearing when viewed from her property

Members agreed that surface water drainage was an issue and that without further information regarding this, the application should not be approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: Insufficient information has been submitted with the proposal to firmly establish that the site can be safely and securely drained without causing material harm in the form of increased flood risk for neighbouring properties taking account of the significant and demonstrable surface water drainage problems at the site, contrary both to the terms of Policy GP15a) of

the York Development Control Local Plan and Central Government Planning Policy in respect of Planning and Flood Risk outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103.

44b Car Parking Area, Holgate Road, York (12/03132/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Experian Developments Ltd for the erection of a 3 storey block of 6 no. apartments.

Officers advised that Micklegate Planning Panel had responded to the consultation and had no objections to the application. However a further four objections had been received from numbers 82 and 86 The Mount and 34 and 69 Holgate Road which raised the following concerns:

- Amenity
 - Amendments made to the scheme do not address concerns over the size of the proposed building and its impact on neighbours. The building would be over-bearing and it would lead to over-shadowing and loss of light. (The building would be 3-storey & within 14m of 82 & 86 The Mount).
 - The offices at 86 accommodate a forensic speech and acoustics laboratory. Work involves the detailed analysis of recorded sound and conversation for criminal investigation and judicial purposes. A major part of this entails careful listening in a quiet acoustic laboratory environment. The noise generated during the development of the site would cause substantial disruption to the business.

- Design - Note comments of the conservation officer that the front elevation would be 'uninspiring'. This is worsened by increasing the width of the vehicle access.

- Highway safety
 - No parking for future residents or visitors is unacceptable. The majority of households generally require some parking provision and it is unrealistic to expect a development to operate without space for residents, visitors or servicing.

- Visibility at access inadequate (*Officers note that the visibility at the entrance will be no worse than it is at the moment.*)
- Servicing
 - Servicing vehicles would be unable to access the site (waste collection for example). Those that can are likely to either block the access of leave vehicles being unable to leave the site in a forward gear.

(Officers note that the strategy for waste collection will be the same as the majority of Holgate, and the additional development in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority would not have a material impact on highway safety.)

- Air quality – The site is within the air quality management area – the development would worsen the air quality for existing residents, by adding to the enclosed nature of the street. It is suggested that air quality has worsened in this particular area due to the re-location of the traffic lights. It is added in the same objection letter that it would be naive to have a car free residential development in this location.

Representations were received from Councillor Gunnell, Ward Member for Micklegate Ward, who had called in the application for determination by committee due to concerns over the scale of the proposed development and the impact on the amenity of surrounding occupants. She explained that she had visited the site and had been in dialogue with residents regarding the proposals. She expressed concerns regarding the planning process and with the developer and made the following points.

- Lack of consideration has been given to the listed buildings at the back of the site.
- Original proposals were not sympathetic to area – these are still not sympathetic
- Site location – plans shows incorrect footprint
- Development introduces a degree of overlooking
- Mature trees have been removed without consent – these provided screening – residents have requested trees are replanted along the boundary wall.
- Issues with the drains

Representations were received from Peter French, a joint owner of business premises at 86 The Mount, a two storey building backing onto the site, and owner of the leasehold of four of the parking spaces. He raised the following concerns:

- Privacy and Overshadowing – the bulk and height of the building would lead to problems of overlooking to our windows and loss of light to the back of our building and yard.
- Inadequate parking – it is imperative that adequate provision is made for parking of vehicles belonging to residents of proposed flats. The provision of zero spaces per resident is unrealistic.
- Visibility splay at entrance is in contravention with council policy.

Representations were received from Clive Burns, a local resident of Holgate. He raised concerns regarding parking as follows:

- Availability of parking - it is naive to expect that the owners of the new flats will not have cars and visitors to the flats may have cars too. It is already a constant battle for local residents to find spaces to park their own cars in the residents parking zones. There is no more space.
- Safety - as the car park is hidden behind the arch, visitors will only realise that there is no room to park their car once they have driven in. As there is no room to turn around they would have to reverse back out through the arch onto a busy road.

Representations were received from John Howlett, a planning consultant acting on behalf of the applicant. He made the following comments:

- the development is car free - this fits in with the site's location in the city centre with amenities close at hand – car free developments are not unusual in York.
- site is located in a conservation area.
- Re impact of the property on the amenity of local occupiers – rear garden is defined by a 2m wall – considers this relationship to be acceptable.

In response to a question by the Chair, Mr Howlett agreed that it would be possible to erect a sign outside the archway to advise people there was no parking available.

Officers confirmed that there was sufficient space to turn a car round in the parking area if anyone turned into it so there was no reason why they couldn't enter and leave forwards.

Members accepted that accommodation of this type was needed in the city and acknowledged the need to encourage people not to use vehicles but that this had to be balanced against changes to the street scene. One Member stated she was uncomfortable about building more one bed flats as this failed to address the strategic housing needs assessment.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to a Section 106 agreement, the conditions listed in the report and the addition of an informative asking the applicants to erect a sign at the entrance to the arch to inform people that no parking is available for the flats.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on heritage assets, residential amenity and highway safety. As such the proposal complies with Policies HE2, HE3, HE10, GP1 and H4a of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

44c Plot 15, Great North Way, Nether Poppleton, York (12/02991/REMM)

Members considered a reserved matters application from Mr Garry Barker for approval of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of development of light industrial/storage and distribution units (B1, B2 and B8 Use Class) following previous approval of outline application 06/00518/FUL on 23.10.2006.

Officers advised that revised plans had been submitted which showed alterations to the landscaping scheme. Subsequent comments have been received from the CYC Landscape Officer, the CYC Ecology Officer, and National Grid stating they have no objections to the scheme. As such, the wording of Condition 1 had been revised to take account of the revised plans and an additional condition covering landscaping would need to be added.

The applicant, Mr Gary Barker, was present at the meeting and had agreed to answer any questions members had but none were put forward.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended and additional conditions below.

Amended Condition 1

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:-

- Drawing Number: Proposed Site Plan PP03B received 2 January 2013
- Drawing Number: Landscaping Plan PP07B received 2 January 2013
- Drawing Number: Elevations Units 1-6 PP05 received 10 October 2012
- Drawing Number: Units 7-8 PP06A received 17 December 2012;

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Additional Condition

The approved landscaping scheme (Drawing Number Landscaping Plan PP07B received 2 January) shall be implemented within a period of six months of the completion of the development. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless alternatives are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended and additional condition above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to siting, access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, T4, GP9 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan; and national planning guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

44d Foundation Housing Bowes, Morrell House, 111 Walmgate, York, YO1 9UA (12/03635/LBC)

Members considered an application for Listed Building Consent from Ms Eileen Ronan for internal alterations including replacement of partition walls to ground floor, infill existing opening to rear and installation of serving hatch on first floor.

Officers advised that English Heritage had confirmed that they had no objections to the proposals. A response had also been received from the Guildhall Planning Panel who had raised concerns about the “misleading nature of the application” and expressed the view that it was an inappropriate use of the historic building.

Members acknowledged that they had found it beneficial to visit the site and noted that no structural work was to be carried out. They agreed that it would be an acceptable use of the building which would allow the building to remain in use.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the amenity, special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II* listed building. As such, the proposal complies with Policy HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (2005) and national planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

44e 15 Dewsbury Terrace, York, YO1 6HA (12/03313/FUL)
Members considered a full application from Mr Robert Wyke for a single storey side extension following the demolition of an existing car port.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the appearance of the listed building, conservation area, and residential amenity. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, H7, HE3 and HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

44f 15 Dewsbury Terrace, York, YO1 6HA (12/03314/LBC)
Members considered an application for Listed Building Consent from Mr Robert Wyke for internal and external alterations including a single storey side extension.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the special interest of the listed building. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

44g Lendal Cafe, 2A Lendal, York, YO1 8AA (12/02802/FUL)
Members considered a full application from Mr Kaya and Mr Broome for a change of use of York Antique Centre (Class A1) to restaurant (Use Class A3) with installation of three condenser units at the rear.

With regard to the extraction system, Officers advised that comments had been received from the Environmental Protection Unit in relation to an internal attenuation system with an air intake and output via louvred openings in existing windows on the side elevation facing the side passageway between the Graduate and Zizi's. This revised system would replace the originally proposed external extraction flue on the side elevation parallel to the existing flue for Zizi's.

Officers confirmed that the Environmental Protection Unit would support the high level flue in preference to the revised internal system for amenity, efficiency and cost reasons. There is a door to a residential annex of the Graduate Pub opposite the louvres; the alleyway is quite enclosed which will also result in the kitchen air inlet recycling the exhaust air. The high level flue type of extract system is promoted by EPU, if installed correctly it effectively resolves potential cooking odour issues by venting accelerated exhaust gases into the atmosphere to dissipate naturally. This also has a cost benefit in most cases to the applicant as these systems are much cheaper to install and have a much lower running/maintenance cost.

Officers explained that the installation of a second high level flue would increase the level of visual intrusion on the listed building, particularly when viewed from Wellington Row on the opposite bank of the river, from the riverside promenade, and from the conservation area.

Members were asked to consider the impact of both methods of extraction and if all other matters of consideration were acceptable with the change of use application, they were asked to delegate authority to officers to approve the planning application subject to resolving the extraction system in line with Members' views.

Representations were received from Raymond Barnes, the agent in support of the application. He made the following points:

- The property had been on the market since it was vacated by the Antique Centre two years previously- The only interest has come from food and drink users - retailers have not shown interest due to the lack of a shop window - believe this is an acceptable use of the building.
- Applicant prefers high level extraction option

- The flue will not be particularly visible from Wellington Row – you would have to look very hard to see it.

Members acknowledged that the building would struggle to function as retail and were happy to support the change of use. They discussed the extraction flue and expressed the opinion that the higher flue would work better and be better for health and the environment. They did not believe this would be unduly obtrusive from the opposite bank of the river.

RESOLVED: That delegated authority be given to officers to approve the application subject to resolving the extraction system in line with Members' views and subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, and any other relevant conditions relating to the extraction system, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the vitality and viability of the City Centre; the character and appearance of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area; and the amenity of surrounding residents. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, S6, and HE3 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (2005) and national planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

44h Lendal Cafe, 2A Lendal, York, YO1 8AA (12/02803/LBC)
Members considered an application for Listed Building Consent from Mr Kaya and Mr Broome for internal alterations including part removal of an internal wall, insertion of a new partition wall and a new ceiling over the dining area and external alterations including an internally illuminated sign over the door on the front elevation, two internally illuminated menu boxes; alterations to two side windows to include louvers; and three condensers at the rear.

RESOLVED: That delegated authority be given to officers to approve the application subject to resolving the extraction system in line with Members'

views and subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposals, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the special interests of the Listed Building. As such, the proposals comply with Policies HE4 and HE8 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (2005) and national planning guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

44i 296 Bishopthorpe Road, York, YO23 1LG (12/03131/FUL)
Members considered a full application from Yorbuild@JRK Properties Ltd for the erection of two four storey dwellings with garages following the demolition of an existing workshop.

Officers advised Members that Councillor Merrett had called in the application for consideration by the committee in view of the forward location of the building relative to other buildings on the same side of the road and its consequent prominence relative to the Terry's factory listed buildings and conservation area opposite.

Representations were received from Melissa Madge, representing the Ashcroft Residents Company, on behalf of local residents, in objection to the application.

- Application site is in a prominent position at gateway to the city – the area is characterised by its feeling of openness with existing buildings set back from the road.
- Removal and replacement of building is accepted as necessary but proposed building is too large and too close to the highway. It will detract from the listed buildings and the conservation area.
- Proposed design is not right – the roof style is not found anywhere nearby and therefore conflicts with the local roofscape.
- Proposals are for a large proportion of the rear of the building to be glazed – this faces onto the protected copper beech tree – this will restrict the amount of light received by the window and is likely to result in pressure to remove the tree

- Proposals will affect the amenity of Ash House – height of proposed building will throw the house into shadow. The proposed building would be overbearing

Representations were received from David Robinson, the architect, on behalf of the applicant. He circulated a photograph showing the site from above and made the following points:

- Density of site – two units on a brownfield site is appropriate.
- The design is of good quality – the applicant is mindful of adjacent residents.
- A full tree survey has been undertaken.
- Acknowledge comments made re light – a comparative daylight and sunlight study has been undertaken by a specialist company based on existing and proposed building – result shows very little difference in its effect on Ash House. The significant factor is the beech tree – this impacts more on the light to Ash House than anything else.

Members acknowledged that the building had been brought forward of the building line of the adjacent development in order to protect the beech tree which is subject to a tree preservation order. They noted that further down Bishopthorpe Road the building line was closer to the road.

Members accepted that the developers have done as much as possible with the design to mitigate residents concerns. They agreed that the proposals would provide two family homes and enhance the area.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and a Section 106 Agreement.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to impact upon the visual amenity of the wider street scene, impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbouring property, impact upon the neighbouring protected tree and potential site contamination. As such the proposal complies with Policies HE2, H4a), L1c), NE1 and GP1of

the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

- 44j Manor Farm, Intake Lane, Acaster Malbis (12/03436/FUL)**
Members considered a full application from Mr & Mrs Roger Raimes for a Change of Use of three agricultural buildings to light industrial (Class B1c) and installation of portable office building (retrospective) and (Proposed) Change of Use of one agricultural building to light industrial, and installation of second portable office building.

Officers advised that Environmental Protection Unit had responded with detailed comments in relation to the proposal. These indicated that during day light hours the level of noise arising from activities at the site arising from maintenance, loading and unloading activity falls below the general level of background noise and that harm to amenity or a form of nuisance would not therefore occur. However, during the late evening, night time and early morning period the level of background noise drops significantly and a problem of loss of amenity and the potential for a nuisance therefore arises. It is therefore recommended that a condition be appended to any approval to regulate the operating hours of the site. This is dealt with by draft amended Condition 2.

Officers also advised that they had received a further letter from the applicant raising concern in respect of the proposed restrictions on hours of operation and in particular the proposed restriction on Bank Holiday and Sunday working, and at the same time raising concerns in respect of a number of responses that have been received. Officers explained that these restrictions were necessary in order to safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and an amended version of the recommended condition that would restrict activities other than vehicle movements to or from the site was outlined below.

Officers advised that a further letter of representation has also been received from a neighbouring resident but that this did not raise any further issues over and above those already covered in the committee report.

Officers advised that condition 2 should be amended as follows:

“No items associated with the use hereby authorised shall be loaded or unloaded, sorted, repaired, washed or otherwise

maintained within the application site, outside of the hours of 08:00 to 20:00 Monday to Saturday. No such operation shall be undertaken within the application site on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason:-To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and to secure compliance with Policy GP1 of the York Development Control Local Plan.”

Representations were received from Julian Cripps on behalf of local residents living to the east side of Acaster Malbis who face Manor Farm and the site, in objection to the application. He raised the following concerns

- Large number of vehicles (trailers and support vehicles) accessing the site and high number of staff proposed to work on the site.
- Company has not provided information on hours of work.
- There is nothing to guarantee the amenity of residents
- Condition 2 is unclear and could be interpreted in different ways.

The Planning Officer re-read amended condition 2 for the benefit of the speaker.

Representations were also received from Richard Monaghan, Managing Director and owner of Papakata, in support of the application. He explained that he had lived in Acaster Malbis for the last three years, with his wife's family having lived in the village for 20 years. He made the following comments:

- Papakata has always had same hours of operation for Warehouse 10 with no complaints
- 95 percent of villagers have not objected – objections come as a surprise as we have been very open about plans and consulted with residents, holding a drop in meeting at the village hall.
- No work would take place between 10pm and 7am.
- Requested that vehicle movements were not restricted – 7am start is necessary to be able to leave early to avoid traffic build up on motorway.
- Suggested making conditions specific to Papakata so as to allay villagers fears about what may happen if use of the site changes in future.
- Site is convenient for us due to its location – we want to stay there.

In response to a question, he explained that the company was planning to invest £70,000 in 2013 to duplicate its fleet of trailers in order that one set of trailers can be loaded during the day ready to leave the following morning to avoid the need to reload late at night when trailers return to site as bad weather/road conditions often delays return.

Councillor Semlyen moved, and Councillor Looker seconded, a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the report but with the hours specified by officers in amended condition 2 being changed to 07:00 to 20:00 and to allow work on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Councillor Galvin moved, and Councillor Orrell seconded, an amendment to approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the report but with the hours specified by officers in amended condition 2 being changed as follows:

- Monday to Friday – 08:00 to 20:00
- Saturday 08:00 to 18:00
- No work to be undertaken on Sundays or bank holidays
- Permission to be temporary for a period of 12 months.

Councillor Gillies asked Councillor Galvin to consider changing his amendment to allow the applicants to start work at 7am but he declined due to concerns over the amenity of local residents.

On being put to the vote, the amendment proposed by Councillor Galvin, and seconded by Councillor Orrell, was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended conditions below.

Amended Condition 1

This use shall cease by 14 January 2014 unless prior to that date a further planning permission has been obtained to extend the period of the permission.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may assess the impact of this use upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Amended Condition 2

No items, associated with the use hereby authorised shall be loaded or unloaded, sorted, repaired, washed or otherwise maintained within the application site, outside of the hours of 08.00 to 20.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 18.00 on Saturdays. No such operation shall be undertaken within the application site on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and to secure compliance with Policy GP1 of the York Development Control Local Plan.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended conditions above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to impact upon the open character and purposes of designation of the Green Belt, impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, the sustainability of the use from the application site and impact upon the safety and convenience of highway users on the adjoining network. As such the proposal complies with Policy YH9 and Y1C of The Yorkshire and Humber Plan, policies GB1, GB3 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and Government policy contained within paragraphs 79 - 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

45. ENFORCEMENT CASES UPDATE

Members received a report which provided them with a continuing quarterly update on the number of enforcement cases currently outstanding for the area covered by the Committee.

One Member raised concerns that the enforcement cases update report is often considered at the end of a long agenda. They discussed alternative possible ways of receiving updates on enforcement orders which would allow them to devote more time to them.

RESOLVED: (i) That the report be noted.

(ii) That the Chair liaise with officers regarding possible alternative ways of presenting the information to members in future.

REASON: To update Members on the number of outstanding Enforcement cases within the Sub-Committee area.

Councillor B Watson, Chair
[The meeting started at 3.00 pm and finished at 5.40 pm].