

a) Planning Enforcement Table 2.2 Shows 2 separate line entries for Breach of Condition 171. Was it intended that one line refers to Section 171 A breaches i.e. related to carrying out development without the required planning permission or failing to comply with any condition. That was it intended that the second line refers to Section s 171 B i.e. breach of planning control such as change in use of a building without planning permission etc.

*The way the system records and produces management information is being looked into each notice will be reviewed to see how best to enter and report them. At the moment the system reports on 2 lines.*

b) "The following table shows stats for enforcement cases over the past few months" What specifically is the period covered. Which calendar months and for which year.

*As with (a) above reporting is being review the period is "as at" being enforcement matters to fall into financial years they are report until closed*

c) The text of the Planning Report Section 2 Enforcement says the following: "Cases outstanding include 334 of which 174 are pre-2022, these are being worked on. Many may not be high priority and can be cleared". Can the MDDC Development Manager please fully explain what "High Priority" means in MDDC planning enforcement terms?

*Please follow the link below - the plan explains this question.*

*The plan is under review with a view to producing an up to date version in the near future*

[local-enforcement-plan-final-280318.pdf \(middevon.gov.uk\)](https://middevon.gov.uk/local-enforcement-plan-final-280318.pdf)

d) Can it be explained why lower priority enforcement cases can apparently be so easily cleared?

*Some allegations can be cleared by desktop investigation each case is reviewed in its own right, also enforcement action is 'discretionary' not 'mandatory'*

*A percentage of logged enforcement cases fall under permitted development, and no breach has occurred. These cases can be cleared quickly. Also, on lower priority cases, the officer must consider 'what is the harm' and 'is it in the public best interest' to consider taking this matter forward.*

*Refer to (c) above.*

e) Of the 41 Enforcement Cases shown as closed out in Table 2 how many of these were classed as "high priority"?

*Of the Notices served 1 was High Priority - Temporary Stop Notice - this was served 19.10.2020 and Complied by 12.11.2020 (20/00233/RURAL)*

*Some are before the Policy of High/Low and so do not have a Target for this.*

f) Did any of the 41 enforcement cases that have been closed out relate to Anaerobic Digesters or associated Silage or Digestate Clamps?

*No.*

g) How many of the 334 cases outstanding relate to Anaerobic Digesters, or associated Silage or Digestate storage clamps and are deemed "high priority"?

*Two AD plants are currently being investigated.*

h) How many of the 334 cases outstanding are considered as “high priority”?

*Officers are targeting what they deem to be matters that need to be reviewed more firmly. However looking at the system, there are 26 cases with highest or high priority.*

i) How many of the 334 cases outstanding are within 12 months of the expiry date permitting enforcement action to be taken?

*3 that I am aware of and these are being actively investigated*

j) How many retrospective planning applications have been received over the last year and how many of these have so far been refused?

*In the east team, 10 retrospective applications submitted within the last year through the enforcement process to regularise, which 4 are still pending. We will check the west and come back to you.*