

TITLE OF REPORT: Enforcement Team Activity

REPORT OF: Elaine Rudman, Compliance & Regulatory Services Manager – Climate Change, Compliance, Planning and Transport

Purpose of the Report

1. To advise the Committee of the activity of the Enforcement Team since the last Committee meeting.

Background

2. The Enforcement team deal with proactive and reactive investigations in response to Planning, Highway and Waste related matters.

Recommendations

3. It is recommended that the Committee note the report.

Within the date range commencing 05.03.2025 and ending 01.04.2025 the enforcement team has received **140** new service requests. The enforcement team currently has **518** cases under investigation.

TYPE OF SERVICE REQUEST	NEW SERVICE REQUESTS RECEIVED	CASES ALLOCATED TO OFFICER	CASES RESOLVED	UNDER INVESTIGATION	PENDING PROSECUTIONS	FPN ISSUED	CAUTION ISSUED	REFERAL TO OTHER AGENCY
Planning	30	22	49	201	1			
Empty/vacant properties & sites	7	5	16	34	0			
Highways	29	18	25	102	0			

Abandoned vehicles	42	42	55	17	0			
Waste investigations	32	32	35	164	8	1	0	0
TOTALS	140	119	180	518	9	0	0	0

COURT HEARINGS

There have been 2 court hearings in this period.

1. Alexandria WRIGHT failed to attend South Tyneside Magistrates Court on 11 March 2025 following prosecution for failing to attend Gateshead Civic Centre in order to provide information relevant to a fly tipping investigation by notice served pursuant to S.108 of The Environment Act 1995, contrary to S.110(2a) of The Environment Act 1995. The magistrates agreed to proceed in her absence. The magistrates found the matter to be proven and a fine of £660, £264 surcharge and £288 costs were awarded (£1212 in total).
2. Stanley MILLER – attended South Tyneside Magistrates Court on 25 March 2025 in respect of appeal hearing against Community Protection Notice served in relation to condition of site at premises owned by him, namely MGM Engineering, Newburn Bridge Road, Blaydon. Initially he requested adjournment, which was refused. Appeal proceeded and appeal dismissed. Magistrates stated that he had not taken responsibility for his own site, he had not taken steps to release frozen funds to pay for works on the site and that the site was having a detrimental effect on those in the locality. Costs of £1181 were awarded to the Council.