

Minutes of the meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held on  
THURSDAY 02 DECEMBER 2021

**Present:** Councillors Baume, Bowyer, Cryer-Whitehead, Exon, A Geary, Legg, Marlow (substituting for Cllr Lancaster), McLean, Priestley, Reilly, Trendall (Substituting for Councillor Alexander) and Taylor.

**Officers:** J Palmer (Head of Planning), C Nash (Development Management Manager), E Palmieri (Commercialisation – Lead for Property), S Peart (Conservation and Archaeology Manager), P Harrison (Parking and Sponsorship Lead), C Lycett (Principal Planning Officer), S Dudding (Senior Planning Officer) N Sainsbury (Head of Placemaking), N Weeks (SMT), G Cox (Head of Highways (Interim)), V Barrett (Team Leader - Planning Enforcement), P Van Geete (Tariff Programme Manager), E Gineikiene (Senior Solicitor - Planning & Highways) P Brown (Head of Democratic services)..

**Apologies:** Councillors Alexander and Lancaster.

**Also Present:** Councillor P Geary, Councillor Middleton and approximately 8 member of the public.

**DCC39 INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed members of the public and councillors, advising that the meeting was being held both at the Civic Offices and remotely and would be broadcast live on YouTube, further explaining the procedures to be adopted.

**DCC40 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Priestley asked that it be noted that in respect of application 21/02246/FULEIS, she was the Ward Member for the site of the application to be considered at the meeting. In that capacity she had met with the developers, however she remained open minded in respect of the application and would consider it on its planning merits.

Councillor Trendall asked that it be noted for transparency that during the Afghan Relief Project a donation of toys and clothing had been made by the applicant of application 21/02246/FULEIS he had however not discussed the application and would approach the matter with an open mind and judge the application on its planning merits.

Councillor Baume asked that it be noted that in respect of application 21/02246/FULEIS, she was previously the Cabinet Member for the Economy. In that capacity she had met with the developers, however she remained open minded in respect of the application and would consider it on its planning merits.

Councillor Taylor asked that it be noted that in respect of application 21/02246/FULEIS, he had previously expressed a view at the Cabinet Advisory Group for Planning that he favoured High Density Living, starting with the redevelopment of Central Milton Keynes, however he was not predisposed in favour of the application and remained open minded in respect of this application and would consider it on its planning merits.

Councillor Marlow asked that it be noted that in respect of application 21/02516/DISCON, she was the Ward member for the site, she had registered to speak in objection to the application and would therefore step down from the Committee during consideration of the Item.

Councillor A Geary asked that it be noted for transparency that he had travelled to the meeting with Councillor Marlow, who would be speaking in objection to application 21/02516/DISCON, he had however not discussed the application with her.

#### **DCC41                    MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED –

That the minutes of the meetings of the Development Control Committee held on 4 NOVEMBER 2021 and 9 NOVEMBER 2021 and the minutes of the Development Control Panels held on 21 OCTOBER and 18 NOVEMBER 2021 be agreed as accurate and signed by the Chair as such, subject to;

The Minutes of Development Control Committee held on 9 November 2021 be amended to read Tuesday 9 November in the title of the minutes, and,

The Minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 4 November 2021 be amended to include apologies received from Councillor Priestley.

#### **DCC42                    PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

##### **Questions**

No questions from the Public had been received.

## DCC43

### REPRESENTATIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Councillor Thomas, (Central Milton Keynes Town Council), spoke in objection to application 21/02246/FULEIS, Erection of two blocks (Block A up to 34-storeys, and Block B up to 3-storeys) to the rear of Saxon Court and the refurbishment and upward extension (up to 3-storeys) to Saxon Court, to provide up to 288 residential units (built to rent and discount market rent), office employment, co-working & flexible workshop space, restaurant, café, retail and leisure space (all Use Class E), community space (Use Class F2), central public open space and associated infrastructure including hard and soft landscaping at land at Saxon Court, Avebury Boulevard, Central Milton Keynes, Milton Keynes.

Councillor Middleton spoke in support of the application.

The Applicant's Agents Mr S Eccles and Mr M Jones exercised the right of reply.

Councillor Marlow, (Loughton and Shenley Ward) and Councillor Z Nolan (Loughton and Shenley Ward), spoke in objection to application 21/02516/DISCON, Details submitted for approval to condition 6 (Watling Street/Dansteed Way) of permission ref. 18/00010/FUL, related to minor amendments at WEA Area 10-1 - 10-3, Watling Street H3 To H4, Milton Keynes.

The Applicants Agents Mr S Taylor exercised the right of reply.

## DCC44 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**21/02246/FULEIS ERECTION OF TWO BLOCKS (BLOCK A UP TO 34-STOREYS, AND BLOCK B UP TO 3-STOREYS) TO THE REAR OF SAXON COURT AND THE REFURBISHMENT AND UPWARD EXTENSION (UP TO 3-STOREYS) TO SAXON COURT, TO PROVIDE UP TO 288 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (BUILT TO RENT AND DISCOUNT MARKET RENT), OFFICE EMPLOYMENT, CO-WORKING & FLEXIBLE WORKSHOP SPACE, RESTAURANT, CAFÉ, RETAIL AND LEISURE SPACE (ALL USE CLASS E), COMMUNITY SPACE (USE CLASS F2), CENTRAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING AT LAND AT SAXON COURT, AVEBURY BOULEVARD, CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES, MILTON KEYNES FOR MK GATEWAY LIMITED.**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Committee noted that an update paper had been published.

The Committee heard that the recommendation remained to grant the application on the terms detailed within the Committee report as amended by the Published update paper.

The Committee heard from the representative of Central Milton Keynes Town Council who expressed concerns in respect of the number of new residencies being built both on the site being considered and previously approved applications in the area that all relied on street parking and suggested that the residents parking scheme needed to be amended and asked that the Committee consider the additional conditions suggested by the Town Council as detailed within the published late papers.

Councillor Middleton told the Committee that he supported the application that would provide much needed housing. He stated that he appreciated that there were likely to be concerns in respect of parking provision but believed that there were adequate public parking spaces in the area taking account of the trends for vehicle ownership that were being seen during the pandemic.

Councillor Middleton further told the Committee that, speaking as a Cabinet member, he believed the investment of £180m in Central Milton Keynes would play an important part in the post pandemic recovery being driven by Central Government.

The Applicant, having given an overview of the application, in exercising the right of reply, stated that he believed that there was adequate parking provision within the vicinity as detailed within the case officers report to Committee.

Councillor Taylor stated that he was concerned that there was little detail in respect of whether the property was to be serviced apartments or long/short term leases. The Head of Planning explained the principles of 'build to rent' and 'affordable housing' as applied to the development and the definition of build to rent in PlanMK.

It was further explained that in respect of the concerns raised by the Town Council the view of Officers was that there was no evidence to justify allocating s106 funding to the resident parking scheme as the development was not believed to be likely to cause harm.

Councillor McLean, in response to comments from the applicant relating to charitable donations, asked that it be noted he had been involved in activities related to one of the charities, but had not known of the connection with the applicants. He asked that it be noted for transparency and that it would not influence his decision.

Councillor Legg, seconded by Councillor McLean, proposed that subject to the application not being called in by the Secretary of State following referral to the national Planning Casework Unit (PCU), and the completion of a section 106 (s106) agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) securing the obligations and terms set out in this report; permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report as supplemented/modified in the accompanying written update paper together with the informative as detailed therein.

In the event that the s106 agreement/MoU is not completed within 28 days following the Committee's resolution, the Head of Planning be delegated authority to extend the period for completion of the s106 agreement, or, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs, refuse permission.

Councillors A Geary and Bowyer, stated that the additional conditions suggested by Central Milton Keynes Town Council, as detailed in the published update paper, should be considered.

The Development Management Manager told the Committee that the condition in respect of the parking permit zone would not pass the tests required for a condition to be applied as there was no evidence to support the need and therefore it would be deemed as unnecessary. There was also likely to be difficulties in Planning enforcing a condition of that nature as a breach would cross into the realms of Highways Enforcement.

The Head of Highways also advised the Committee that to create a zone there would need to be a consultation process which could result in objections, therefore there would be no way to guarantee being able to discharge the condition.

It was recommended that should the Committee wish to see the parking zone created then a referral to Cabinet was the appropriate way to address the matter.

Councillor A Geary, seconded by Councillor Bowyer proposed that a condition to read, 'Prior to the first occupation of the development, a strategy for the ongoing management of the community space identified on plan SW-RSH-00-DR-A-P-00100 - Proposed GA Plan - Ground Level shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy will set out the following: Hours of operation of the space; Management of access; Terms of public use; and Circumstances and days (if any) in which the space will be closed. The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the terms of the approved strategy and the proposed community space once completed and thereafter shall be used, managed and made accessible by the public in full accordance with the terms of the approved strategy.

Reason: To ensure adequate public benefits from the scheme are retained.' Be agreed;

And;

That a referral to Cabinet be made to request that consideration be given to establishing a new parking permit zone between South Eighth Street and South Tenth Street for the exclusive use of existing residents, prior to the first occupation of the development and for the life of the development.

On being put to the vote the motion to amend the motion to include the additional condition and make a referral to Cabinet in respect of the creation of a permit parking zone was carried unanimously.

Members of the Committee raised the following points;

- It was acknowledged that the term 'Build to Rent' was open to interpretation, to ensure residences are built to provide for the number of people moving to Milton Keynes by 2050, these units should be restricted to long term residential accommodation rather than transient occupation. There were a significant number of other properties in Central Milton Keynes which were already used for short term transient occupation.
- The requirement for a parking permit zone suggested that there should be adequate parking provision as part of the scheme.
- Relying on street parking in other 'blocks' of the centre may result in later shortage of parking if or when those blocks are developed.
- The scheme was innovative and provided a good gateway to Central Milton Keynes.
- Providing Parking and encouraging cars was not the way forward to tackle climate change.
- The inclusion of the original part of Saxon Court recognised the heritage of Central Milton Keynes.

- The developers had worked with the Community to address issues raised and deliver a scheme that was widely supported.
- A development of a 34-storey block was not in keeping with what Milton Keynes stands for, the founding principles having been for low rise, low density green open space.
- The development would assist in providing the government target for the provision of 100k dwellings for the Oxford – Cambridge arc.
- The part of the development referred to as ‘the shed’ has a 1960’s industrial look about it, it was hoped that the building materials would enhance it, and the conditions in respect of building materials needed to be strictly adhered to.

The Development Management Manager told the Committee that in respect the concerns over the retention of rental properties Paragraph 7.19 of PlanMK provided assurance that the Council will retain long term control over the build to rent element of the development.

On being put to the vote the proposal to grant the application was carried with Councillors Baume, Cryer-Whitehead, Exon, Legg, McLean, Priestley, Reilly, Taylor and Trendall voting in favour and Councillors A Geary and Marlow voting against.

RESOLVED –

1. That Planning permission be granted subject to the application not being called in by the Secretary of State following referral to the national Planning Casework Unit (PCU), and the completion of a section 106 (s106) agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) securing the obligations and terms set out in this report, and subject to the conditions set out in the Committee report as supplemented or modified in the accompanying written update paper together with an additional condition to read;

'Prior to the first occupation of the development, a strategy for the ongoing management of the community space identified on plan SW-RSH-00-DR-A-P-00100 - Proposed GA Plan - Ground Level shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy will set out the following: Hours of operation of the space; Management of access; Terms of public use; and Circumstances and days (if any) in which the space will be closed. The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the terms of the approved strategy and the proposed community space once completed and thereafter shall be used, managed and made accessible by the public in full accordance with the terms of the approved strategy.

Reason: To ensure adequate public benefits from the scheme are retained.'

Together with an informative in respect of tree root protection as detailed within the published update paper.

2. In the event that the s106 agreement/MoU is not completed within 28 days following the Committee's resolution, the Head of Planning be delegated authority to extend the period for completion of the s106 agreement, or, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs, refuse permission
3. That, (unconditional to the grant of permission), a referral be made to the Cabinet to consider establishing a new parking permit zone between South Eighth Street and South Tenth Street for the exclusive use of existing residents, prior to the first occupation of the development and for the life of the development.

**21/02516/DISCON**

**DETAILS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL TO CONDITION 6 (WATLING STREET /DANSTEED WAY) OF PERMISSION REF. 18/00010/FUL, RELATED TO MINOR AMENDMENTS AT WEA AREA 10-1 - 10-3, WATLING STREET H3 TO H4, MILTON KEYNES FOR REDLAWN LAND LTD - PART OF L&Q GROUP.**

Councillor Marlow, having declared an interest, stood down from the Committee during consideration of the application.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the application with a presentation.

The Committee heard that an update paper addressing late representations had been published and that the recommendation remained that the details submitted pursuant to condition 6 (details of V2 grid road extension) of planning permission ref. 18/00010/FUL be approved.

The Committee heard from objectors who, in summary, commented that;

- The pedestrian crossing that would provide access to Hazeley Academy, proposed to be on the new section of road, was unsuitable and presented a significant road safety risk.
- Milton Keynes generally sought to provide safe crossings where fast moving vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists were separated, and those principles should be adhered to in that instance.
- Putting a crossing at street level would encourage people to cross the road along the stretch of road as well as at the marked crossing point.
- The Highways Officers, in the report, stated that the road needed to be built in accordance with the manual for roads and bridges and therefore the speed limit could be changed by the Committee.
- The road should have a 30mph speed limit applied if the crossing outside the school, as proposed, was built.
- The school was attended by a high volume of pupils who travel by bicycle.
- Despite the mitigation proposed for noise further work should be done to properly assess the impact.

The Applicant's agent told the Committee that the design was a technical submission that had been put together by civil engineers based on industry standards. The redway was wider than average to accommodate and encourage pedestrian and cycle use which was anticipated to be significant at peak periods.

It was further commented that the main pedestrian access was via a footpath to the south of the site and was served by an underpass at that location.

The road would be given 'Clearway status' which would prohibit any stopping on the highway.

The applicant's agent told the Committee that the proposed speed limit had been set by the Council in accordance with the policies applied to grid roads, but confirmed that the developers would not object to a lower limit.

Councillor Legg, seconded by Councillor Exon, proposed that that the details submitted pursuant to condition 6 (details of V2 grid road extension) of planning permission ref. 18/00010/FUL be approved.

Councillor Cryer-Whitehead expressed concern that the report made no reference to the Walnuts School which was for pupils all of whom are on the Autistic Spectrum and was situated opposite Hazeley Academy.

Members of the Committee recognised the comments by objectors in respect of Grid Roads being separated from pedestrians and cyclists and commented that the proposals were contrary to those principles.

Councillor Taylor, recognising the significant risk to road safety, asked that a recorded vote be conducted when deciding the application.

Councillor A Geary concurred with the comments and remarked that the design and proposals did not meet the general principles applied to a Grid Road and therefore he could not support a discharge of the condition to submit plans for a grid road.

Councillor Trendall reminded the Committee that some Grid Roads were in close proximity to housing and schools but agreed that where the inclusion of the pedestrian crossing was not compatible with the general principles, there was a requirement for a foot bridge.

Councillor McLean expressed concern that should an underpass or footbridge be considered there remained an option for people to seek the shortest route and attempt to cross the road unless there was 'Harris Fencing' down the centre of the road.

The Head of Highways told the Committee that the proposals had been safety audited and therefore the design parameters and design speed were considered acceptable in Highways terms.

The Senior Planning Officer reminded the Committee that the layout of the grid road had been approved and that the application was in respect of specific element. In respect of safety, the proposals had been assessed against a Highway Safety Audit. The Senior Solicitor advised the Committee that the technical advice identified the technical details as being satisfactory, and if there was no other technical advice, the council could be vulnerable for costs in any appeal.

On being put to the vote the proposal to discharge the condition was lost with Councillors Exon, Legg, Reilly and Trendall voting in favour and Councillors Bowyer, Cryer-Whitehead, A Geary, McLean, Priestley and Taylor voting against.

Councillor Baume abstained from the vote.

The Chair adjourned the meeting to allow Officers to consider the views of the Committee and make a recommendation in respect of which policies within PlanMK would be appropriate reasons for refusal.

On resuming the meeting, the Chair, invited Councillor A Geary to propose a motion.

Councillor A Geary, seconded by Councillor Taylor, proposed that, notwithstanding the evidence and information, both written and spoken, before the Committee, The Committee remained unconvinced that the proposal met the necessary highway safety levels that it would wish to see and therefore was in conflict with policies CT2 and CT8(d) of PlanMK. The final wording of the notice being delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Committee.

On being put to the vote the proposal was carried with Councillors Bowyer, Cryer-Whitehead, A Geary, McLean, Priestley and Taylor voting in favour and Councillors Exon, Legg, Reilly and Trendall voting against.

Councillor Baume abstained from the vote.

RESOLVED –

1. That the Application to discharge Condition 6 (Watling Street /Dansteed Way) of permission ref. 18/00010/FUL, related to minor amendments at WEA area 10-1 - 10-3, Watling Street H3 to H4, Milton Keynes be refused as the Committee does not consider that the scheme meets the necessary highway safety standards and is therefore in contravention of policies CT2 and CT8(D) of Plan:MK.
2. That the final details of the refusal decision notice be delegated to the Director of Planning and Placemaking in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Committee.

**DCC45                    ENFORCEMENT UPDATE RELATING TO PINK PUNTERS AT THE PINK PUNTER, 2 WATLING STREET, BLETCHLEY, MILTON KEYNES**

Councillor Marlow re-joined the meeting.

The Committee considered a report, introduced by the Development Management Manager in respect of the ongoing enforcement actions at 2 Watling Street, Milton Keynes.

The Development Management Manager gave the Committee an overview of the report and the planning and enforcement history of the premises.

It was noted that since the last report an additional enforcement notice in respect of some containers situated on the site has been served, and was being appealed by the landowner. The Committee also heard that a Breach of Condition notice had also been served in respect of cycle storage.

The Development Management Manager explained that Officers were trying to get to a position where they could work with the landowner to rectify existing breaches and move forward in compliance with normal planning processes, to date that had been met with a degree of resistance by the landowner.

The Chair thanked the Development Management Manager for an in-depth comprehensive report.

Councillor A Geary also thanked the author of the report but expressed a degree of disappointment at decisions not to enforce after the landowner has failed to respond to requests for retrospective applications where work has been carried out without any permission. He did however understand the conclusions that Officers had reached in respect of those decisions.

Councillor A Geary also expressed concern that no action had been taken by Highways Officers in respect of the security hut and asked that the Development Management Manager relay the Committee's disappointment to the Head of Highways in the strongest terms and ask that a report be provided to the Committee.

Councillor McLean repeated the thanks extended for the comprehensive report and expressed disappointment at the Landowners reluctance to engage with the Council, he stated that the landowner needed to understand that the Committee and Planning service wanted to work with him to regularise the works that had been conducted and that any future applications would be treated fairly and with no preconceptions.

Councillor Legg, seconded by Councillor Exon, proposed that the report be noted, and the actions and timescales set out in the report be agreed.

Councillor A Geary proposed that an addition motion to read 'The Committee expresses disappointment with the position it finds itself in and encourages active engagement with the Landowner in the future' be agreed. This was seconded by Councillor Bowyer.

Councillor Trendall stated that the Committee needed to make it clear that the use of 'expediency' to avoid planning laws was no longer an acceptable position, however he did not support the inclusion of the statement proposed in the resolution.

Councillors Reilly and Legg both concurred with the view expressed by Councillor Trendall.

Councillor A Geary stated that he recognised the concerns raised and withdrew the motion.

The motion proposed by Councillor Legg was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED –

1. That the report be noted, and the actions and timescales set out in the report be agreed.
2. That a report be provided to the Committee in respect of the Security Hut and proposed action by Highways Officers.

**DCC46 EXTENSION OF MEETING**

RESOLVED –

That the meeting be extended to conclude the business

**DCC47 2021-12-02 6 MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT**

The Committee considered the 6 Monthly Development Management Performance report presented by the Development Management Manager.

The Committee heard that resourcing the team had proven a significant problem, which was a picture seen throughout the Country. This had naturally had a negative impact on performance and targets.

It was however, noted that the percentage of approvals was good and was supporting the Growth aspirations for Milton Keynes, this was being achieved by working closely with applicants at pre-application stages.

Planning Appeals remained at a low level relative to the high number of applications that were received and dealt with. Of those about 50% were allowed.

The report also set out details of Planning Enforcement work and it was noted that for the most part target timescales were being met.

It was noted that a significant number of enforcement complaints that were received related to non-planning matters or permitted development, neither of which were matters that the Enforcement Team could act on. Work was being conducted to seek to put better explanation on the Council Website but also to work with Parish Councils to improve the understanding of what were planning breaches the Enforcement Team were empowered to deal with.

It was also noted that a new Enforcement Team Manager had been appointed and would be seeking to make further improvements to the process.

The Committee heard that an audit of planning decision notices had been undertaken and deficiencies, as detailed in the Committee report, had been identified. It was recognised by the Planning Service that the findings were not good, a procedure had been established to avoid erroneous decision notices being issued, however due to the negligence of an individual, who had failed to follow the set process had led to a significant number of erroneous notices being issued. Immediate action had been taken in respect of that Officer and work had been conducted to seek to put right the errors wherever possible. It was the case that the majority of omissions on notices did not have a detrimental impact and where they did dialogue and agreement with applicants had been successful in resolving issues.

The Committee heard from Ms A Stainsby, Mr D Stabler and Councillor P Geary during consideration of the Item, who expressed concerns in respect of practices and communication.

It was also commented that, in respect of the erroneous issuing of decision notices, there were systematic failures in the planning service.

The proactive approach to giving members of the Committee details of errors that have been found was a welcome initiative, however the papers demonstrated that there was a need to stop mistakes before they were made before rather than identifying errors after the event.

Members of the Committee recognised the difficulties in recruiting staff, and further it needed to be recognised that mistakes would be made but it was learning from them and improving systems to address them that was of the greatest importance.

It was further commented that the report demonstrated that there was a framework for improvement in place.

In response to a request for additional information in respect of the Planning Improvement Board, the Head of Planning told the Committee that the Board was chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive and was looking at processes that were in place within the Planning Service to seek to identify and address any weaknesses that could be identified. The board was made up of Officers. As an example of the work carried out the Head of Planning referred the Committee to the annex to the Committee report in respect of planning enforcement. The Committee heard that Member's engagement had been through producing an Interim Improvement Plan that had been circulated to Councillors for comment. It was also noted that a peer review was scheduled for early 2022 that would further inform the Board.

Councillor Bowyer asked that consideration be given to circulating minutes from the Board and whether Councillors could attend the meetings, the Head of Planning confirmed that he would make the comments known to the Deputy Chief Executive as the chair of the Planning Improvement Board.

Councillor A Geary stated that he recognised fully the comments from the public speakers, he told the Committee that he was disappointed at the Political interference in the Planning process, he was concerned that an LGA peer review was often timed when things were improving and that past experience had suggested that after a review things did not improve further.

He further stated that he believed as the public facing part of the planning process, the Committee should seek to engender the confidence of the public, including applicants and objectors. He believed that it was clear that the perception of the planning service was at an all-time low, also it ought not to be forgotten that when looking at results of appeals, it needed to be remembered that on occasions it was necessary for Councillors to support the electorate when coming to decisions which may sometimes conflict with planning law.

Councillor Trendall reminded the Committee that everyone was susceptible to making mistakes and the volume of applications handled by Planning Officers was such that mistakes would occur.

Councillor McLean, noting that new procedures had been put in place using IT asked that members be afforded the opportunity to view Officers undertaking the process of issuing a Decision Notice to satisfy themselves that the necessary safeguards were in place.

Councillor Baume stated that she welcomed the improvements that had been made through the Planning Improvement Board and that the LGA Peer Review scheduled for early 2022 was a positive and welcome step.

The Chair stated that he regretted that the planning service had become a political issue but also told the Committee that he was disappointed that the regular public criticism by Members of officers had continued and was demoralising for staff and was not assisting in recruiting new staff who did any research before applying for positions. It was also commented that recruiting was inhibited by private sector opportunities.

Members were invited to submit any written comments in respect of the Enforcement Plan to the Development Management Manager.

RESOLVED –

That the report be noted.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 10:42 PM