PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 SEPTEMBER 2016

REPORT OF DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (COMMUNITY DIRECTION) PLANNING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE



WARDS AFFECTED: ALL WARDS

A Borough to be proud of

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide an update to Members on the number of active and closed enforcement cases within the borough.
- 1.2 To provide an update on the current work load that is being handled and managed by the team.
- 1.3 To provide an overview of the performance of the compliance, monitoring and enforcement function within the planning and development management service area

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted.

3. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT CASE UPDATE

Good Friday Caravan Site

3.1 Following the appeal of the enforcement notice to cease the use of the land for the purpose of a caravan site the owners of the site appealed against the Secretary of State's decision to dismiss the appeal in regard to the enforcement notice. Following an appeal to the High Court, the judge determined on the 15 July 2015 that the enforcement notice stands. Therefore, the occupiers of the Good Friday site have to vacate the site by 15 January 2017 and reinstate the land by 15 April 2017. If this is not adhered to the Council has the option to prosecute for failing to comply with an Enforcement Notice or to take direct action. The Council are undertaking a number of options to ensure the successful removal on the date stated above.

Land North West of Cold Comfort Farm, Rogues Lane, Hinckley

3.2 At the beginning of July 2015 it was reported to the Council that an unauthorised gypsy and traveller incursion had taken place on the land. A Temporary Stop Notice was served requiring occupation of the site to cease within 28 days. In addition to this, a formal injunction was also sought and granted from the County Court to prevent any further incursion onto the rest of the land. Following on from this the Council served a full Stop Notice and an Enforcement Notice to remove the caravans from the site. The Council returned to court to seek a further injunction to remediate the breach of planning control. However the Court only granted a further interim Injunction until a decision has been made on the enforcement notice. The owner subsequently appealed the enforcement notice and this appeal was heard at an Informal Hearing on the 7 June 2016.

The Local Planning Authority has now received a response from the Inspectorate; the appeal was allowed and the site has been granted temporary planning permission for five years. The Inspectorate stated that the site is located within the countryside and

will harm the countryside and is also in an unsustainable location away from local services, and considered that the development was contrary to the Council's Core Strategy and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. However, the inspector took into account the fact that one of the occupiers is pregnant and under Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child special circumstances should apply which to take into account the unborn child. He considered that the five year permission will enable the child to attend a local school, the Inspector also went onto state thatwhilst the Council has programmed into its Local Development Scheme (LDS) the completion of a DPD to allocate Gypsy and Traveller Sites he did not believe that this would be done by October 2017 (as set out within the LDS) therefore he considered that the grant of a five year temporary permission would enable the Council to get an up to date document produced.

Newton Linford Lane, Groby (Known as Klondyke)

3.3 On the 7 September 2015, the owner of a piece of land within "Klondyke" submitted an "Application for a certificate of lawful existing use for a dwelling". The application seeks to establish the use of an area within the site as a residential dwelling; the applicant was claiming that the site has been used as a permeant residential dwelling since 1985. This site is particularly well known to the Council and there is an extensive enforcement history on the whole of the site, with previous enforcement notices and Injunctions sought on the land. Based on the evidence provided by the applicant the Council refused the application and subsequently an enforcement notice was served on the 7 January 2016, stating that the dwelling had to be removed. Following the service of an enforcement notice, the applicant has appealed the notice and has been listed for a Public Inquiry between the 18 and 20 October 2016.

Section 124(1) of the Localism Act 2011 inserted new sections into the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to allow enforcement action to be taken in England against a breach of planning control when the time limits for taking enforcement action have expired and the breach has been concealed. Following a number of site visits by the Council, the local authority believes that the dwelling has deliberately been concealed by a person with a view to obtaining a certificate of lawful use.

There have been a number of high profile court cases where owners have sought to deceive the local planning authority in their initial application for planning permission or have concealed the development and then sought to argue that the local planning authority is out of time for taking enforcement action. Where it appears to the local planning authority that there may have been a breach of planning control in its area it may apply to a magistrates court for a planning enforcement order. If the Court makes such an order then the local planning authority may take enforcement action in respect of the apparent breach at any time within a period of one year and 22 days of the making of the order. Following the submission by the Council of a claim for a Planning Enforcement Order, the applicant has appealed against the claim on the basis that concealment has not occurred. The hearing of the case is due to be heard at Leicester Magistrates Court on the 7 October 2016.

Dagleys Farm, Earl Shilton

3.4 On the 3 August 2012, the Planning Inspectorate granted planning permission for the change of use of the land from use as agricultural land to a mixed use as agricultural land and residential use, and the siting of a twin unit mobile home for residential use but only on a three year temporary basis. This time period passed and the unit was

still present and an enforcement notice was therefore issued for its removal. No appeal was lodged and the unit has to be removed by the 11 June 2016.

Further to this the unit has been removed and the enforcement notice has been complied with.

231 Shaw Lane, Markfield

3.5 On the 7 January 2016, the Council issued the owner of a property with an enforcement notice for the use of the land for a dog breeding establishment and the keeping of dogs. The owner appealed the decision and the Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal on the 25 April 2016 giving the owner three months to cease the change of use. Therefore all the dogs at the property needed to be removed by the 25 July 2016.

Following a site visit, all dogs on the property have now been removed and the enforcement notice has now been complied with.

Ellis Taylor, Leicester Road, Hinckley

3.8 Two Enforcement Notices were served, one in regard to the creation of hard standing for the parking of non-agricultural vehicles. The second Enforcement Notice served on the site was in regard to the change of use of land from agricultural use to the storage of non-agricultural waste and equipment.

An appeal was made and an Informal Hearing took place on the 29 September 2015. The Inspector's decision was received on the 2 October 2015 which dismissed the two appeals. Therefore the whole site should have been cleared by the 2 May 2016. The two enforcement notices have not been complied with and the Council are now taking prosecution action against the owner for failing to comply with the notices. This has been listed at Leicester Magistrates Court for the 7 September 2016 and a further update will be provided in due course.

152 Wolvey Road, Burbage

3.9 At the above mentioned property the owner had erected a 2 metre high fence surrounding a residential property, with the fence fronting the highway. Therefore, the fence required consent from the Local Planning Authority. An application was submitted in an attempt to regularise the situation however this was refused by the Council. The owner then appealed the refusal which was then dismissed by a Planning Inspectorate.

The Council then issued an enforcement notice on the 23 June 2016 for its removal. The owner has subsequently removed the fence and the notice has been complied with.

Greenacres, Ashby Road

3.10 On the highway verge of the above property there was a constant problem with a number of advertisements being displayed on the side of the road. The Council took enforcement action for there removal, by the period of time the advertisements were still in place. However, the advertisements were not removed and the Council undertook direct action for there removal.

S215 - Untidy Land Notices

3.11 Within the period from 1 June 2016 to the 31 August 2016 the Local Planning Authority were made aware of 10 untidy properties. Eight of the properties still under investigation are affecting the public amenity of the area and appropriate steps are being taken to ensure that the properties are tidied to a more acceptable level with certain Section 215 Notices to be issued in necessary.

Out of the other untidy properties 2 cases were closed off as these properties were not affecting the public amenity of the area. Two successful stories can be reported to members; one in regard to 41 Jacqueline Road, Markfield where the front garden was very overgrown; after discussing the issue with the owner the site has now been tidied and is to an acceptable standard. A further site which has been tided up following successful negotiation is the old St Peters Scout Hut, Sunnyhill South, Burbage this site was very overgrown and adjacent to a playing field and public footpath this site has now been tidied up and is no longer adversely affecting the amenity of the area.

The team are still working on a number of other untidy property cases within the borough and hope to provide more updates in the future where successful action has been taken to restore land to an acceptable visual standard.

4.0 WORKLOAD & PERFORMANCE

4.1 The following tables show the current work load the team is managing in respect of current enforcement investigations. Table 1 demonstrates the number of cases that have been opened within that period and how many cases have been closed. This table demonstrates the number of cases that the team is managing. The team ensures that enforcement cases are closed off as expediently as possible. Table 2 shows in more detail how the cases were closed. This table demonstrates that the majority of cases that the team have closed are either through negotiation, or by retrospective planning applications being received. As of the 24 August 2016 there are 236 enforcement cases; however a number of these are currently dormant i.e. awaiting further information or subject to ongoing monitoring to collate evidence. The team is taking a proactive approach to ensuring cases are resolved and closed as promptly as possible.

Table 1: Number of Enforcement cases opened and closed

Period of time	Number of cases opened	Number of cases closed
1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016	59	22
1 April 2016 to 30 June 2016	74	68
1 January 2016 to 31 March 2016	76	64

Table 2: How the enforcement cases were closed

Period of time	Total Cases	Case closed	Case closed	Cases closed
	closed	by resolving	by not being	by being
		breach	a breach	Permitted

				Development
1 July 2016 to 31 August 2016	22	9	9	4
1 April 2016 to 30 June 2016	68	22	43	3
1 January 2016 to 31 March 2016	64	27	31	6

4.2 On the 9 March 2016, Council approved an updated Planning Enforcement Protocol as set out in Appendix 1. The Planning Enforcement Protocol has been updated to be in accordance with the NPPF and to also set out how the Council will proactively manage enforcement issues within the borough by monitoring the implementation of planning permissions and ensuring conditions are fully complied with. As part of a review of the protocol, in order to be more proactive in our investigations, time scales for carrying out a site visit in response to an alleged breach have been reviewed. The previous protocol set out that a site visit would be undertaken within 15 working days. This target time has been shortened to ensure visits are done within 7 working days. Currently the enforcement team are hitting this target at 100%. The second performance indicator is in regard to acknowledging complainants within 3 working days and this target is being met at 100%.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [TF]

5.1 Currently a cost of £11,268 has been incurred for the Newton Linford Lane, Groby appeal. This and any other costs for appeals will be met from within existing budgets.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS LEGAL IMPLICATIONS [MR]

6.1 None

7. CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS

This document contributes to Strategic Aim 1 of the Corporate Plan

Creating a vibrant place to work and live.

8. CONSULTATION

None

9. RISK IMPLICATIONS

It is the Council's policy to proactively identify and manage significant risks which may prevent delivery of business objectives.

It is not possible to eliminate or manage all risks all of the time and risks will remain which have not been identified. However, it is the officer's opinion based on the information available, that the significant risks associated with this decision / project have been identified, assessed and that controls are in place to manage them effectively.

The following significant risks associated with this report / decisions were identified from this assessment:

Management of significant (Net Red) Risks			
Risk Description	Mitigating actions	Owner	
None	None		

10. KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY - EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS

This report is for information purposes to update Members on the progress of recent enforcement cases. As this report is not seeking a decision it is envisaged that there are no equality or rural implications arising as a direct result of this report.

11. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

- Community Safety implications
- Environmental implications
- ICT implications
- Asset Management implications
- Human Resources implications

- Voluntary Sector

Contact Officer: Craig Allison, Planning Enforcement Officer ext. 5700

Executive Member: Cllr Stan Rooney