

DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

2nd AUGUST 2012

REPORT OF APPLICATIONS AND ADVICE MANAGER

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PERFORMANCE 2012/13 (QUARTER 1)

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To advise the Committee, of the Performance Indicator outcomes related to the determination of planning applications for Q1 (April to June 2012), the workload trends currently present and the general performance of the team.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The Committee notes the current performance data.

3. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PERFORMANCE

3.1 BACKGROUND

- 3.1.1 The Performance Management Framework includes the following elements:

- The performance criteria we wish to meet, which are laid down as aims and objectives. These are an integral part of the Corporate Plan, which includes both corporate level objectives, and Local Priority Action Plans. Each Service also draws up its own Service Plan, which includes aims, objectives and targets. Our Community Strategy illustrates our shared vision with partner organisations, and details what we want to achieve together.
- Measures of performance against the above criteria. These include National Performance Indicators and Local Performance Indicators, which together measure our performance against both the promises we make to the local community, and the roles which Government expects us to perform.

3.2 BVPI MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES AND CURRENT POSITION

- 3.2.1 The table below shows the Council's recent and current performance against national and local measures and targets. BVPI measures focus on efficiency and speed rather than the development of the service, the quality of the decisions made and the outcomes secured.

Indicator	2005/ 06	2006/ 07	2007/ 08	2008/ 09	2009/ 10	2010/1 1	2011/ 12	TARGET 2012/13	Q1 April – June 12
157 (a): % 'major' applications determined in 13 wks	75.86 %	71.4 %	79.31 %	66.66 %	64.28 %	53.33 %	83.33 %	60%	50%
157 (b): % 'minor' applications determined in 8 wks	76.63 %	83.84 %	80.32 %	67.39 %	83.5 %	73%	65.59 %	65%	64.81%
157 (c) : % 'other' applications determined in 8 wks	91.63 %	92.43 %	92.87 %	81.28 %	90.23 %	88.86 %	80.71 %	80%	86.56%

LOCAL: % all applications determined in 8 weeks	85.73 %	87.53 %	86.18 %	74.93 %	86.65 %	81%	73.63 %	80%	77.78%
LOCAL: % householder applications determined in 8 weeks	95.89 %	94.01 %	95.65 %	83.00 %	91.98 %	91.49 %	80.77 %	90%	85.48%

3.2.2 Planning application performance for the first quarter has shown performance figures sustained for 'minor' and 'other' applications determined within 8 weeks. Performance for householder application is marginally below target and this will hopefully improve into the next quarter.

3.2.3 Performance for major applications is adequate for the first quarter, there has only been two major applications determined in this quarter and one failed to be determined in 13 weeks. It is hoped that there will be an improvement in this in the next quarter.

3.3 QUALITATIVE MEASURES

3.3.1 The outcome of appeals is regarded as a principal measure of decision making quality, being the means by which decisions are individually scrutinised and reviewed.

Indicator	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	TARGET) 2010/11	Q1 April – June 2010
188: % of decisions delegated to officers	85.85%	87.15%	91.70%	92.89%	89.52%	91.37%	90%	88.89%
204 : %age of appeals against refused applications dismissed	50.00%	55%	46.57%	62.5%	71.43%	58.82%	66.66%	0% (0/0)
219a: no of Conservation Areas in Borough	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
219b: % of Conservation Areas with character appraisal	18 (41%)	21 (48%)	22 (50%)	30 (68%)	30 (68%)	38 (86%)	36 (82%)	38 (86%)
219c: % of Conservation Areas with published management proposals	18 (41%)	21 (48%)	21 (48%)	30 (68%)	30 (68%)	38 (86%)	36 (82%)	38 (86%)
205 : quality of Planning Service checklist	83%	83%	94.44%	94.44%	94.44%	94.44%	94%	94.44%

3.3.2 Planning appeal performance (BVPI 204)

There have been no appeals determined within Quarter 1.

3.4 DEVELOPMENT OF THE SERVICE

The 2012/13 Service Plan has been agreed, reports on progress will feature in future versions of this report.

4 ENFORCEMENT SERVICE PERFORMANCE

4.1 The service plan requires a number of local performance indicators for enforcement. This is the second year that the figures have been collated and it is intended that in future figures will be monitored against past performance. Below are the indicators (and targets) used to assess the performance of the service;

- Planning Enforcement : % cases resolved per month against annual total of all cases (TARGET: 8.3%/month 100%/year)
- Planning Enforcement : cases reaching 'course of action' decision within 8 weeks (TARGET: 70% of cases)
- Planning Enforcement: % appeals against enforcement notices dismissed (TARGET: 100% of appeals)

4.2 There has been no enforcement appeals decided in the last quarter.

4.3 Table of performance:

Indicator	2009/2010 Overall	2010/11 Overall	2011/12 Overall	2012/2013 Q1
No. of Cases Received	231	196	158	60
No. of Cases Closed	238	206	117	34
% Resolved per month against annual total (target 8.3% per month = 100% per year)	8.6% 103% total for the year	8.75% 105% total for the year	7.4% (74% total for the year)	5.7%
Cases reaching a course of action decision within 8 weeks (target 70% of cases)	71.5%	78%	79.25%	85%
Appeals against enforcement notices dismissed (target 100% of appeals)	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A

4.7 The Planning Enforcement Service is below target for this quarter for the % resolved, however, target has been met for decision within 8 weeks. The reason for not obtaining this target is due to the level of on going cases that have yet to be closed within the system. The team has also seen an increase in the number of cases received. The enforcement team should be commended for their efforts.

5 WORKLOAD CONTEXT

5.1 Workload was essentially consistent between 1011/12 and the preceding years in terms of both quantity and profile. The number of applications received in the first quarter is comparable to the first quarter for last year (2011/2012). There has been a very fractional reduction in overall workload (deriving mainly from a reduction in the number of Enforcement cases, which itself is indicative that less pro-active work is possible) but

clearly this has not kept pace with the scale of the reduction in resources dedicated to Development control (approx. 15%) in 2011.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: HOW ARE WE PERFORMING?

- 6.1 This report has shown that in quarter one standards of performance is satisfactory with the majority of targets being met and those that aren't are only marginally below. The team should be commended for their work and efforts.
- 6.2 Some targets have not been met, however, target levels for appeal is not considered to be a realistic measure as we did not receive any appeals in this quarter. The number of householder applications determined was only slightly below target and this will hopefully improve in quarter two. With regards to major applications in this quarter only two major applications were determined with one out of the two being determined in 13 weeks.
- 6.3 The Enforcement Team's figures for quarter 1 are slightly below target, however, given the increase in workload the enforcement team should be commended for their work and efforts.