
MEETING	PLANNING ENFORCEMENT AD HOC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE	15 DECEMBER 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS HYMAN (CHAIR), DOUGLAS, PIERCE, I WAUDBY AND WISEMAN

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 October be approved as a correct record and be signed by the Chair.

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that nobody had registered to speak under the Councils Public Participation Scheme on general issues within the remit of the Sub-Committee.

7. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCRUTINY - INTERIM REPORT

Members considered a report which asked them to approve the proposed timetable for the remainder of the review and to decide whether they required any further evidence that was not set out in the timetable in paragraph 19 of the officer's report.

The Head of Development Control advised Members that the Planning Department was launching its own review of Planning Enforcement and that a timetable had been put in place to facilitate this. This is attached at Annex A to these minutes. Members agreed that both the scrutiny review and the internal review could run concurrently but did not feel that the internal review ought to cause any delay to the scrutiny process. After further discussion it was decided that the final two meetings for the Planning Enforcement scrutiny review would be Wednesday 4th February 2009 and Wednesday 4th March 2009. The format of these meetings is detailed in the resolution below.

In relation to the Scrutiny Review Members discussed the following:

- The use of the Local Land Charges Register and whether it could be used to flag up buildings where there was an enforcement issue.
- Whether Planning Enforcement in York should be made more public than the current low level approach.
- The need for Parish Councils to have more feedback and be made more aware of Planning Enforcement issues in their area.
- The input Highways have in Planning Enforcement and how much assistance they provide to Enforcement Officers.
- Whether Enforcement Officers have, or should have, any Legal training.

In relation to further evidence, Members discussed the following:

- Annex G of the Officers Report contained Planning Enforcement information from other Authorities. It was noted that no information had been obtained for the City of Bath and figures for Chester needed completing. Members requested that this be followed up.
- Members would like some further information on how quickly comparative authorities complete Planning Enforcement cases.
- Members would like some figures relating to the number of complaints received by the Council in relation to Planning Enforcement Cases and whether any have gone to the Ombudsman. These figures should relate to the past 3 years.

RESOLVED: (i) That the proposed timetable for the remainder of the review as set out in paragraph 19 of the Officers report be approved with the following changes to dates:

4 February 2009	To receive ideas and possible actions gathered from the Assistant Director (Planning & Sustainable Development) and Head of Development Control.
4 March 2009	To receive a draft final report.

(ii) That further evidence, as detailed above, is required.¹

REASON: To ensure compliance with scrutiny procedures, protocols and work plans.

Action Required

1. Obtain further information as requested by Members.

GR

Councillor Hyman, Chair

[The meeting started at 1.00 pm and finished at 2.10 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank

Development Control Review of Enforcement and Support ServicesProposed Timetable

Tasks	Start Date	Done By
Initial Meeting		19.12.08
Identify Current Processes	22.12.08	16.1.09
Process Review Workshops	19.1.09	23.1.09
The Way Forward	2.1.09	13.2.09
Round up meeting		16.2.09
Report published		28.2.09
Start changes	9.03.09	
Track/measure benefits	1.06.09	

This page is intentionally left blank