

Responses to the questions asked by Mr Goff Welchman at the Scrutiny committee Meeting held on "5 November 2024

Response to Question 1:

No, as the Council has adhered to the constitutional rules. The Cabinet made their decision at the meeting of Cabinet on the 12 November, and the decision had not been called into Scrutiny within the required timeframe.

Response provided by the Vice-Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee.

Response to Question 2:

The draft Enforcement Policy is a robust and thorough document which gives the Authority a firm basis upon which to progress enforcement action – of all types – when it is considered necessary to do so.

It should also be noted that the draft policy was before Scrutiny for noting and that it had already been recommended to Cabinet by the Planning, Policy Advisory Group which had already discussed the draft policy at its October meeting.

Response provided by the Director on Place and Economy.

This page is intentionally left blank

Responses to the questions asked by Mr Paul Elstone at the Scrutiny Committee Meeting held on 25 November 2020

*Thank you for your questions which are answered as follows:*

*Question 1 response: You have highlighted that in one scenario (identified breach with no further action) an outcome is not fed back to the original complainant. Thank you for highlighting this – the point will be put before Cabinet for them to discuss the inclusion of this complainant feedback loop for this scenario – which was intended to be included. No other issue could be identified within the flow diagram and, as such, there is not considered to be a need to re-draft the flow diagram. Also; the report was for noting by Scrutiny, it having already been recommended to Cabinet for approval by the Planning Policy Advisory Group (PPAG).*

*Question 2 response: It is not considered that the application of a scoring mechanism for planning enforcement would materially assist in the processing of enforcement cases; the risk/categorisation of planning enforcement cases can be subject to change during the life of a case and so scoring may quickly become out of date requiring re-scoring. Furthermore, each planning enforcement investigation is unique due to a number of factors including location, harm and breach reported and so it is considered that the development of a universal scoring system would be problematical. Conversely, the 'high, medium, low' rating quickly allows officers to identify the risk category of a case and make subsequent adjustments. The approach set out is therefore considered to be effective and efficient and a change to a scoring system is not considered necessary.*

Responses provided by the Director of Place and Economy.

This page is intentionally left blank