



PLANNING COMMITTEE

3rd September 2025 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Hasthorpe (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Emmerson, Hudson, Humphrey, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Mickleburgh, Parkinson and Shutt.

Officers in attendance:

- Jonathan Cadd (Senior Town Planner)
- Lauren Birkwood (Senior Town Planner)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Highway Development Control Officer)
- Hannah Steer (Solicitor)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Locum Lawyer)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Harness (Humberston and New Waltham Ward Councillor)

There were fourteen members of the public and no members of the press present.

P.24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received for this meeting from Councillor Pettigrew.

P.25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Humphrey declared a pecuniary interest in P.26 Item 6 DM/0317/25/FUL as his spouse worked for the agent.

Item 1 - DM/0396/25/FUL – 2 Vivian Avenue, Grimsby

Ms Birkwood introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Birkwood stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Norris spoke in objection to the application. He said that he was speaking at the meeting on behalf of the community. Mr Norris said that no one was in favour of the proposed development and residents felt that the area was unsuitable for a children's care home on a number of grounds. He stated that what was proposed was all for profit with no consideration given to the children. Mr Norris stated that the area was exclusively a residential area with no businesses around and no facilities. He said that almost everybody in the area was classed as senior. Mr Norris said that despite how it may seem, there was a lot of anti-social behaviour in the area as well as issues with drugs, serious assaults and arson. He said that there were also existing issues with traffic and parking. Mr Norris said that whilst the applicant had said there would be a parking spaces for up to five vehicles, the property was developed in 2017, and there were only parking spaces for two vehicles and there had been no change to that. He said that it was proposed that there would be eleven members of staff along with visitors which would mean a lot more vehicles in that specific area. Mr Norris said that residents were worried about noise from the traffic and there was also an extremely dangerous junction in the area and there had been accidents at the roundabout. He said that Weelsby Road was also extremely busy. Mr Norris said that the proposed development would also be overlooking his garden.

Mr Skiba spoke on behalf of the applicant for the application. He said that he understood that any development like the one proposed could raise concerns. Mr Skiba said that he believed that the proposed development would not only be an asset to the children it would serve but also to the neighbourhood. He said that a meeting had taken place last night with residents and he had come out of that meeting feeling positive and felt that the meeting had been very valuable. Mr Skiba said that it was not the company's first children's home and was instead their third and very similar concerns had been raised at the time when the applications for those homes were being considered. He stated that none of the concerns raised at the time, had come to fruition and in fact one of their properties had recently received a rating of outstanding in all areas. Mr Skiba said that that showed the commitment the company had to providing the best quality care to the children they cared for. He said that the staff would work on a rota basis and there would not be eleven members of staff there at the same time. Mr Skiba said that the children would use the local amenities just like any other children in the area. He said that staff would always be transparent with the neighbours. Mr Skiba

said that he understood the concerns regarding traffic, but there was space for five vehicles, and whilst those vehicles might block each other, that would be something managed internally. He said that he was confident that the children's home would have a positive impact on the community, and would provide a nurturing home for the children, investing in their future and society as a whole.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that whilst it was a shame that residents had issues with anti-social behaviour in the area, they were existing issues, and the children's home was not there at present, and he wasn't sure that they were material planning considerations. He said that the trouble was that when people talk about children's homes, people have a vision of large buildings with lots of children living there, but what was proposed was a children's home for four children. Councillor Mickleburgh said that he would listen to the rest of the debate, but housing children out of the borough was very expensive, and if more children could be housed within the borough, that should bring the costs down.

Councillor Parkinson said that people did sometimes get the wrong idea about children's homes. He said that they were not for children who were in trouble but were for vulnerable children. Councillor Parkinson said that what had been proposed had proven to be successful over the years in other areas. He stated that there hadn't been problems with similar children's homes in other areas in the borough. Councillor Parkinson said that he thought they would be able to get three or four cars onto the premises without any problems, but most of the time they wouldn't need that many vehicles there.

Councillor Lindley said that all committee members were corporate parents and had a duty of care. He said that children's homes did get stigmatised but if people knew where they were located, they would be surprised. Councillor Lindley felt that if the application were to be approved, anti-social behaviour wouldn't go through the roof as a result. He said that it would just be that a larger home was being put to good use. Councillor Lindley said that were the application to be refused, the house would be used for normal residential purposes and that would likely mean three or four cars using the driveway anyway. He said that people wouldn't object to a foster family living in the property and that could mean the same number of children living there. Councillor Lindley stated that he saw no reason to refuse the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with most of what had been said. He asked whether a covenant was a material planning consideration or more of a civil matter.

Ms Lovejoy responded that it was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Bright sought clarification on a previous planning application from 2017 and that concern was raised by the Highways Department at

the time with a condition added to the application requiring that adequate parking and turning facilities were provided within the site.

Ms Hattle responded that without looking at back that application, the condition might have been included if the access was proposed to be altered.

Councillor Bright said that it was an application for extensions to the property as well as an extension to the garage.

Ms Hattle responded that the condition might have been added in error as the road was not a classified road, so the requirement for turning was not needed.

Councillor Bright said that he thought the vehicle movements would be more than what a normal residential house would have, and whilst he accepted that the Highways Department had no concerns, he did think there would be more vehicle movements, and we needed to be more honest about that.

Councillor Shutt said that he was a Ward Councillor for Heneage Ward and the way Mr Norris had put forward the issues, he thought it described a very different place to the one he recognised. He said that he hoped Mr Norris had reported those issues, but if not, he had his contact card, as he was concerned at the issues raised, but that was not a consideration for the planning application. Councillor Shutt said that he understood residents' concerns, and they put forward why they had concerns, but no one ever came forward with where they thought an appropriate place would be. He said that was a challenge he faced and that he as a Councillor was a corporate parent but there also was a shared responsibility as a community. Councillor Shutt said that regarding cost concerns, it costed double to look after children outside of the borough and that's also why there was an urge to have children live within the borough. He was pleased that there had been dialogue between the applicant and residents. Councillor Shutt said that he could not see a reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he did not think a children's home would cause anti-social behaviour, but he was concerned that the children living there might be more vulnerable to be drawn into existing anti-social behaviour issues.

Councillor Shutt seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED - That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 2 - DM/0518/25/FUL - 12 Welholme Avenue, Grimsby

Ms Birkwood introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Birkwood stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Carrie spoke on behalf of the applicant. She said that the application sought to change the use of a property from a residential dwelling to a children's home. Ms Carrie said that the application was not simply about bricks and mortar, but about the local authority fulfilling its statutory duty as a corporate and community parent for the children in our care. She said that more importantly it was about ensuring that our children who were amongst the most vulnerable in our community had access to safe, stable and nurturing homes in the borough. Ms Carrie said that the council needed to increase the number of local children's homes to prevent children having to live far away from their friends, family, schools and support networks. She said that the proposed children's home would operate in every practical sense as a family home and no external alterations were proposed. Ms Carrie stated that the proposed children's home would blend seamlessly into the existing character of the area. She said that Welholme Avenue was an unadopted road, and all homes in the area were equally responsible for the upkeep of the shared access. Ms Carrie said that the Highways Department were satisfied that any additional parking demand that might be generated from time to time, could be comfortably accommodated. She said that the property was within the Welholme Conservation area but as there were no external changes to the property proposed, the character of the property would be maintained. Ms Carrie said that the property was located within flood zone three and therefore additional flood warning and evacuation plans had been included with the application. She said that the council managed other children's homes across the borough in areas with the same flood level with no cause for concern. Ms Carrie said that concerns had been raised about anti-social behaviour, and whilst the concerns were understandable, they were unfounded. She said that evidence from existing children's homes showed no evidence in an increase to anti-social behaviour. Ms Carrie said that the children's home would be staffed by trained professionals, and OFSTED would regulate and inspect the home. She stated that the children's home would be held to the highest standards in care and safety. Ms Carrie said that she wanted to emphasise that the children's home was not an institution, institutions did not serve as homes for children, and the application was not seeking to establish an institution. She said that the application was to enable the council, as corporate parents to create a supportive home for vulnerable children in the borough. Ms Carrie said that children in our care, deserved all the same opportunities as any other children. She asked that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that whilst it was a change of use application from a single residential home to a children's home, it would still be used as a family home. He said that that area was badly served by public

transport and he thought a petition was currently going around the community about that.

Councillor Lindley agreed with what Ms Carrie had said about councillor's responsibilities as corporate parents. He said that this application was different to the previous application as the property was smaller and it was the council providing the care rather than an alternative provider but other than that, they were very similar applications. Councillor Lindley said that at night, there would be three children and two adults in the home which was no different to a family home. He said that looking at the objections raised, he didn't see that any raised were relevant and he didn't think any of those issues would arise simply because the application was approved. Councillor Lindley said that he saw no reason to refuse the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with what had been said and he thought the application should be approved. He said that the vehicle movements and the number of cars that would be at the property as per the operation statement were not the same as what would be at a typical house, but he understood the Highways Department were happy with what was proposed.

Councillor Shutt said that we must always try to understand our responsibilities as corporate parents and the community's responsibilities. He said that in the last application, there had been some good dialogue between the applicant and residents, and he was sure that the applicant for this application would be looking to build relationships with residents for any issues that did arise.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he thought that there were good bus services in the specific area. He said that he thought the location was a good place for a children's home to be. Councillor Kaczmarek seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 3 – DM/0435/25/FUL – 240 Station Road, New Waltham

Ms Birkwood introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections as well as an objection from New Waltham Parish Council. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Birkwood stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Wilde spoke in objection to the application. He said that the council was not the applicant for the application and instead it was a private company's application known as Keys Group Ltd. Mr Wilde said that they were owned by a private equity firm and had a turnover of £280 million and had taken a fortune off councils. He said that Keys Group Ltd had a children's care home in the area and charged the Council £5,235 per child, per week. Mr Wilde said that he hoped that one day, all children's homes would be run by the council. He said that if the application were approved, it would be the fourth children's home between Cardiff Avenue and Tollbar roundabout. Mr Wilde said that the care homes on Station Road were all bungalows and appeared to be accommodating young people with disabilities. He said that he accepted the need for these types of care homes and if this application was for a similar set up with the parking and safety issues overcome, he wouldn't be objecting. Mr Wilde said that Station Road was very busy and there had been numerous collisions around the nearby roundabout and the seller of the property knew this as they had objected on the grounds of safety issues for a different planning application in relation to a neighbouring property. He said that he had lived next door to the property for twenty-six years and in all that time, the maximum number of cars there had been was two. Mr Wilde said that it was wrong for people to say care homes were no different to regular residential homes regarding the comings and goings of people and vehicles. He said that whilst he agreed it was possible for a family at the property to have more than two cars, there was no space for a third vehicle to turn in the driveway, so the driver of that vehicle would have to reverse out onto the road. Mr Wilde said that it could be said that staff and visitors would park in nearby streets, but in reality, people tended to park their vehicles where they were working or visiting. He said that Station Road was not a safe place for vehicles to be parked on the street and nearby streets had limited space. Mr Wilde said that there would be an increase in noise from the increase in the comings and goings at the property. He said that the Planning Department had acknowledged objections regarding anti-social behaviour but had responded that the property should operate as a family home. Mr Wilde said that a Freedom of Information request had shown that the police had been called out to 120 incidents at children's care homes in North East Lincolnshire in the past two years. He stated that Keys Group Ltd had not consulted with residents about the application. Mr Wilde said that it was rare for a care home to accommodate just two children, which therefore made him assume it would be children living there with the most complex needs. He said that Keys Group Ltd website made reference to children they had accommodated in the past, and there was no mention of orphaned children, or children with disabilities, but instead criminals, gang members and children who had been criminally exploited. Mr Wilde said that there were other areas better suited and he had added examples to the planning portal. He said that the applicant hadn't responded to resident's concerns.

Ms Carter spoke on behalf of the applicant. She said that she welcomed the planning officer's report and the recommendation to approve the

application. Ms Carter stated that Keys Group provided support to children and young people in the area. She said that they had a successful provision on Waltham Road. Ms Carter said that the proposed new home would be for two young people under the age of eighteen with care provided by up to three members of staff during the day and two members of staff during the night. She said that the needs of each child would be assessed on an individual basis. Ms Carter said that ninety four percent of Keys Group homes were deemed good or outstanding by Ofsted. She said that risk assessments were undertaken for each child. Ms Carter said that the council's highways officer supported the application. She said that the management of the proposed home would fall under Keys Group in the first instance, with Ofsted undertaking regular inspections. Ms Carter said that there would also be monthly visits from an independent visitor. She said that it was appropriate for children to live in their local community and the proposed children's home would not be dissimilar to a family home, with the only difference being that the staff wouldn't live at the property. Ms Carter said that the recent approval of a children's home at 3 Buddleia Close was a material consideration in the determination of this application, as they were similar applications. She said that there would be no external changes to the property, no adverse impacts on the character of the area or neighbours and there were no highways objections. Ms Carter stated that councillors were corporate parents and by approving the application, they could provide forty placements for children.

Councillor Harness spoke as Ward Councillor for the Humberston and New Waltham Ward. He said that he was present to support Mr Wilde who had presented his objections to the application. Councillor Harness said that he wanted to focus on one area. He said that applications for care homes did alarm residents, and he had experienced such scenarios where residents had genuine concerns that their coexistence with their immediate neighbour may change, which in most cases were proven to be misguided. Councillor Harness stated that there were children's homes which were well run and fitted seamlessly in with the community. He said that the applicant had in this case failed to consult with residents, ward councillors and the parish council. Councillor Harness said that perhaps there was not a legal obligation for the applicant to do so but he thought it was bad practice, as it was good to talk, good to consult and good to reassure neighbours. He stated that on the basis of lack of consultation he would support the application being refused.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that Councillor Harness was correct about consultation and if carried out, it can allay people's concerns. He asked whether the costs referred to were correct. Councillor Mickleburgh also sought clarification regarding the application being refused previously.

Mr Cadd responded that he couldn't confirm if the costs referred to were accurate, but that costs were not a material planning consideration. He added that the previous refused application was a certificate of lawful use application. Mr Cadd said that the applicant had put forward that a change of use application was not needed, but it was deemed by officers

that it was. He said that this led to the certificate application being turned down and the present application being submitted.

Councillor Lindley said that the application was slightly different to the previous applications. He said that the application was for a children's home for two children, which was slightly less than the previous two applications. Councillor Lindley said that he was pretty much in full support of the application, but what did jump out to him was comments on the credibility of the company. He said that Children Services didn't seem to have any concerns, but they had only submitted one sentence within the agenda papers, and it would have been nice to have more than one sentence from them. Councillor Lindley said that if there were concerns about the company, then the Planning Committee should be made aware, and whilst he thought Children's Services were saying within that sentence that they didn't have any, he would have liked more assurance. He thought he was in support of the application but would listen to the rest of the debate.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that there had been mention of concerns about communication and whilst the Planning Committee could not compel people to talk to each other, he thought it would be an idea to defer the application and encourage the applicant and residents to sit down and talk. He said that might alleviate concerns and would also provide Children's Services with an opportunity to provide more of a statement. Councillor Kaczmarek proposed that the application be deferred.

Councillor Hudson said that he would support the proposal of deferment to let the company know that the Planning Committee expected more of them and residents expect more. He seconded the proposal of deferment.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred.

(Note – the committee voted 8 for and 2 against for the application to be deferred.)

Item 4 – DM/0436/25/FUL – 88 Stallingborough Road, Healing

Ms Birkwood introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of objections received. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Birkwood stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Carter spoke on behalf of the applicant. She said that she welcomed the planning officers report and the recommendation to approve the application. Ms Carter stated that Keys Group, had an excellent working relationship with Children's Services. She said that they already had a

successful provision on Waltham Road. Ms Carter said that the proposed new home would be for two children, and there would be three members of staff providing care during the day and two members of staff at night. She said that the needs of each child would be assessed on an individual basis. Ms Carter said that ninety four percent of Keys Group homes were deemed good or outstanding by Ofsted. She said that all Keys Group homes were subject to location risk assessments provided by Ofsted and risks were managed accordingly as part of the process. Ms Carter said that risk assessments were undertaken for each child. She said that the council's highways officer supported the application. Ms Carter said that the proposed home would be managed by Keys Group in the first instance, with Ofsted undertaking regular inspections. She said that there would also be monthly visits from an independent visitor. Ms Carter said that it was appropriate to integrate young people into their local community and the proposed children's home would not be dissimilar to a family home, with the only difference being that the staff wouldn't live at the property. She said that there were no proposed external changes to the property and there was car parking available for up to five cars. Ms Carter said that there would be no impact on the character of the area, no impact on neighbours and no highways objections. She said that councillors were corporate parents, and she hoped they would approve the application.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that there wasn't the same concern regarding this application as the previous one. He said that there had also been no objection from the parish council and no concerns raised regarding consultation. Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Bright said that he was not sure that consultation had taken place, but he saw no reason to refuse the application. He said that it was disappointing that the applicant had not provided any information about consultation in their statement.

Councillor Shutt asked what would happen if the applicant wished to house more children within the property.

Ms Birkwood referred to condition four within the agenda papers and informed committee members that were the applicant to want to house more children in the property, they would have to submit a planning application to vary that condition.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 5 – DM/1065/24/FUL – Former Bursar Primary School, Bursar Street, Cleethorpes

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee as it represented a departure from the local plan. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Cadd stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Patrick spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that he had lived in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire most of his life and considered himself part of the community. Mr Patrick said that he was the founder and owner of the company. He said that the company had been developing properties nationally, similar to the proposed development and had delivered over six hundred homes and won various awards for standards. Mr Patrick said that his company believed in the redevelopment of brownfield sites. He explained that he went to Bursar Street two years ago and recognised the potential of the site. Mr Patrick said that his company was chosen to develop the site, and the proposed scheme had taken into account all factors such as heritage, cost, building control, planning policy and the people of Cleethorpes. He said that he had chosen not to over intensify the scheme and instead focused on larger units, led by design, heritage and the existing space and paired this with parking and outdoor spaces. Mr Patrick stated that the proposed development represented a multi-million-pound investment into the heart of Cleethorpes and would provide benefits such as local employment opportunities. He said that he hoped the Planning Committee would support the application and that he believed in the proposed scheme, the community and that his company was the right fit to develop the site.

Councillor Bright said that he liked the proposed development and liked that a brownfield site would be brought back into use. He said that he was pleased that concerns raised regarding parking had been listened to and more spaces had been added to the scheme. Councillor Bright stated that he thought it was an excellent development.

Councillor Emmerson asked whether the double yellow lines and the 'school keep clear markings' would be removed now the school was no longer there and whether parking bays would be put in.

Ms Hattle responded that the 'school keep clear markings' would be reviewed by the council's Traffic Team in due course. She said that regarding double yellow lines, loading and unloading could take place, but she expected that to now take place within the site as the access was to be widened as part of the scheme.

Mr Brockbank stated that the Traffic Team would assess the markings that were currently there. He said that there may be scope to provide additional parking, but that would be reviewed in due course.

Councillor Emmerson said that it was good use of a brownfield site, and the site could attract anti-social behaviour if left. He said that he would like to see the development up and running.

Councillor Lindley said that at one point the site was earmarked for alternative provision, but that hadn't happened, and the site had remained empty. He said that buildings like the ones on the site were targets for anti-social behaviour, including arson. Councillor Lindley said that it was good to see buildings being brought back into use and he was pleased that the applicant had taken on board concerns about parking and had worked to address that, by reducing flats and providing more parking on site. Councillor Lindley said that he couldn't believe the road markings were still there but once removed that would also help with the need for parking. He said that it was a good application and proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Hudson said that he welcomed the investment and that the old buildings would be preserved. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Councillor Parkinson said that he liked the scheme and thought it was well executed. He said that it would be great for the area and to find that many houses in the middle of Cleethorpes was tremendous. Councillor Parkinson sought clarification as to whether there was an entrance and exit into the courtyard or did they just face the outside of Frederick Street.

Mr Cadd responded that most of the houses that backed onto Frederick Street did not have a direct access into the courtyard, due to the nature of the tradition school buildings being converted.

Councillor Parkinson said that was a slight downside, but he supposed people would know that when they purchased a home on site.

Councillor Shutt said that it was good to see consultation take place and he could sense the developer's passion to get the scheme right. He sought clarification on bat and swallow boxes, cycle storage and refuse collections at the site.

Mr Cadd said that an ecology plan had been provided and deemed acceptable. He said that the site had been assessed, and bat surveys undertaken but they were not present at the site currently. Mr Cadd said that the landscaping plan had not yet been finalised and there were ongoing discussions with the applicant regarding cycle storage and bin storage, but those matters could be conditioned.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that it was a brilliant application.

Councillor Parkinson asked how many parking spaces there would be on the site.

Mr Cadd responded that there would be thirty-one parking spaces on site.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Councillor Humphrey left the meeting at this point.

Item 6 – DM/0317/25/FUL – Bull Rush Lakes, Tetney Road, Humberston

Mr Cadd introduced the application and explained that it had been brought back before the Planning Committee following the application being deferred at a previous meeting. He referred the committee to the supplementary papers where the application's proposal had been amended with sleeping accommodation at the site removed from the proposal. Mr Cadd outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. He stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that the applicant had done exactly what the Planning Committee had wanted him to do by removing sleeping accommodation from the proposal and that was the reason for the deferral of the application. He proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that it was a case of where a decision to defer an application had achieved the right result. He seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Councillor Humphrey returned to the meeting at this point.

P.27 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure under delegated powers during the period 24th July 2025 – 21st August 2025.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.28 PLANNING APPEALS

The committee received a report from the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure regarding outstanding planning appeals.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.29 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded for the following business on the grounds that its discussion was likely to disclose exempt information within paragraph 6 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

P.30 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee considered any requests from any member of the committee to discuss any enforcement issues.

RESOLVED – That the enforcement issues raised by the committee be investigated further.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 12.15pm.