

					<p>manage this</p> <p>In this case to say that t payment. A stopped. In there was n the payment</p> <p>On a number landlord on complainan solicitors the Officers bel these he wo a conclusion Council cou she had dor £700 and ha</p>
3.	Planning and building control	That the Council failed to enforce planning conditions preventing the removal of a wall.	No maladministration	19.04.06	<p>An old flint v which, in his amenity val concerned a the adjoining wall, which remove the</p> <p>The compla for the deve contained tw wall had to were unenf which was t the wall dur conditions v perpetuity. collapsed b was left with and there w</p> <p>The ombud legal opinio planning co not expedie in the public</p>
4.	Planning and building control	That the complainant wanted to carry out works to a tree, which was the subject of a tree preservation order.	No maladministration	31.10.06	<p>The ombud entirely clea dealing with explained th concerning complainan recent even complainan wished to c preservation</p> <p>The ombud</p>
5.	Planning	That the Council did not demonstrate adequately how it	No	24.04.06	This compla

	and building control	decided to discharge a planning condition.	maladministration		<p>place opposed stated that, her amenity of maladmin</p> <p>The ombud condition wa not mean it complainan</p> <p>The compla demonstrat condition an detail and re unrealistic.</p> <p>The ombud</p>
6.	Planning and building control	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Council failed to take enforcement action 2. That the Council failed to keep the complainant informed about what it was doing, or respond to the complaint in a timely way 	No maladministration	05.10.06	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The stor con dw <p>Officers est in May 2005 suggests. I position to r gathered ph reach a dec as officers o she had be had receive ombudsmar aspect of th</p> <p>As far as th ombudsmar discretion a utterly unre</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Finally, th been a dela an inordinat
7.	Planning and building control	That the Council failed to take enforcement action after it became aware of evidence of a breach of a planning condition.	No maladministration	29.03.07	<p>This compla complaint n report on al season of a would have</p> <p>The Council breaches ha significant o enforcement</p> <p>At a premis information breached d its decision</p>

				<p>information.</p> <p>When considered by Council has a complainant defined by paragraph significant harm further evidence.</p> <p>The ombudsman not to take account that the complainant evidence the disturbance reconsidered.</p> <p>The ombudsman maladministration.</p>
8.	Planning and building control	That the Council approved a planning application for a new dwelling, without taking account of the fact that the site lies in the countryside; development was therefore contrary to policy.	No maladministration	<p>07.09.06 The Council advertised a dwelling at a complainant application. committee members Officers stated been fully aware countryside plan. Officers been helpful of the application with that view.</p> <p>The ombudsman consideration was the impact committee on likely impact amenity. However the process.</p> <p>Subsequently sought to suggest recommendation considered refuse the application second motion refusal reasons the committee. The officer stated that, reasons for view, it was February month ombudsman the merits of.</p> <p>The ombudsman any injustice.</p>

9.	Planning and building control	That the Council granted planning permission for the permanent retention of acoustic screens during the rehearsal and performance period of an open air music festival, without due regard to PPG2 or proper consideration of neighbour amenity.	No maladministration	29.03.07	<p>This complaint n... granted plan... festival. Th... acoustic scr... Council gra... condition. T... screens we... trees and o... black rectan... considered... have on nei... such that it</p> <p>The ombud... a different v</p>
10.	Planning and building control	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Council negligently approved a lawful use application in 1995, because the evidence it relied on was obviously fraudulent 2. That the Council failed to regulate the site, in that the complainant suffered from noise and fumes. 	Ombudsman's discretion	30.11.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in 1... gar... con... that... min... bec... • the... and... had... had... oml... told... acti... for
11.	Planning and building control	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Council failed to enforce planning conditions relating to an ancient dew pond, thus depriving the complainant (and others) of a local amenity 2. That the Council failed to respond to requests for information and refused to take the complainant's complaint to stage three of its internal complaints procedure 	Ombudsman's discretion	22.01.07	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In M... for... One... that... rein... par... con... con... not... size... enf <p>The plannin... occupation... condition wa... to remove th... application, yet complet</p> <p>The ombud... decision no... the conditio... condition, w... also said th... the Council... the injustice... was not sig</p>

					evidence that caused significant damage to the property.
					2. The complainant's property became damaged due to the further development of the site.
12.	Planning and building control	That the Council failed to control the non-residential uses at a property opposite the complainant's home, so the intensification of use of the site adversely affected the complainant's amenity.	Ombudsman's discretion	29.03.07	<p>1. This reference to the site is temporary.</p> <p>The ombudsman found that the Council's decision was greater than the planning permission and he was satisfied that it was reasonable.</p> <p>2. A balance of convenience was struck in favour of the complainant.</p> <p>The ombudsman found that the Council's decision was not a good reason for the grant of consent. He considered that the Council's decision was not a reasonable reason to interfere with the complainant's amenity.</p>
13.	Transport and highways	That the Council removed and destroyed the complainant's daughter's car, which was parked in an off-road private parking space and displayed a valid SORN notification.	Ombudsman's discretion	05.05.06	<p>In November 2005, the complainant's daughter's car was parked in an off-road private parking space and displayed a valid SORN notification. The Council's decision to remove and destroy the car was not a good reason for the grant of consent. He considered that the Council's decision was not a reasonable reason to interfere with the complainant's amenity.</p> <p>Valley Police Station. The Council's decision to allocate an abandoned car to a private parking space was not a good reason for the grant of consent. He considered that the Council's decision was not a reasonable reason to interfere with the complainant's amenity.</p> <p>The Council's decision to remove and destroy the car was not a good reason for the grant of consent. He considered that the Council's decision was not a reasonable reason to interfere with the complainant's amenity.</p> <p>The Council's decision to remove and destroy the car was not a good reason for the grant of consent. He considered that the Council's decision was not a reasonable reason to interfere with the complainant's amenity.</p>

					<p>a response remove the</p> <p>The owner's the vehicle fully investic</p> <p>Officers acc should have rather than officers put checks on a</p> <p>On 24.5.06 to cover wh external val time and the complainan agreement respond, bu discontinue</p>
14.	Benefits	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Council decided the complainant had been overpaid housing benefit, and decided to recover the overpayment. 2. That the Council delayed in reinstating housing benefit and sent letters threatening court action. 	Outside jurisdiction	28.09.06	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The the In th right 2. The the res Cou con
15.	Benefits	That the Council decided that an overpayment of benefit was recoverable from the complainant and then lost the paperwork relating to his appeal.	Outside jurisdiction	22.11.06	The compla independent therefore fe
16.	Other	That the Council awarded a grass cutting contract to a contractor who had quoted a lower specification than that requested from the complainant and did not give the complainant an opportunity to submit a comparable quote.	Outside jurisdiction	19.01.07	The ombud and contract outside his
17.	Other	That the Council entered into a maintenance contract with Oxfordshire County Council and, as part of that contract, to sell advertising space on roundabouts. The Council did not seek the necessary planning permission for the signs but decided not to seek retrospective permission or to take enforcement action.	Outside jurisdiction	29.01.07	The ombud most, of the could see n affected tha outside his
18.	Planning and building control	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Council imposed a condition removing permitted development rights when approving a planning application. 2. That the Council delayed determining a section 73 notice (this is a notice for a variation of a condition). 3. That the Council lost copies of a 1960s planning application, which contained evidence that the complainant did not have to apply for planning permission. 	Outside jurisdiction	11.07.06	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The app con juris 2. The Ins not out 3. By ma bec awa

					per outs
19.	Planning and building control	That the Council should not have granted a premises licence for an open air music festival.	Outside jurisdiction	29.09.06	This compla complaints The compla against the therefore fe
20.	Public finance	That the Council should not have unfairly decided to collect backdated council tax.	Outside jurisdiction	29.11.06	As the comp court, when the ombuds