

 <p>Reigate & Banstead BOROUGH COUNCIL Banstead Horley Redhill Reigate</p>	TO:	PLANNING COMMITTEE
	DATE:	24 January 2018
	REPORT OF:	HEAD OF PLANNING AND PLACES
	AUTHORS:	Andrew Benson
	TELEPHONE:	01737 276175
	EMAIL:	Andrew.benson@reigate-banstead.gov.uk
AGENDA ITEM:	13	WARD: All

SUBJECT:	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT Q3 PERFORMANCE
PURPOSE OF REPORT:	To inform members of the Q3 Development Management performance against a range of indicators
RECOMMENDATION:	To note the performance of Q3 of 2017/18

Planning Committee has authority to note the above recommendation

BACKGROUND

1. Development Management encompasses a wide range of planning activities including pre-application negotiations and engagement; decision making on planning applications through to compliance and enforcement.
2. It puts the Council's locally adopted development plan policies into action and seeks to achieve sustainable development.
3. It is a non-political, quasi-judicial system with all Development Management functions falling under the responsibility of the Planning Committee in the Council's Constitution. As such it is a non-Executive function falling outside the scope of the quarterly corporate performance reports that are presented to the Executive and Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
4. Development Management performance has always been monitored and reviewed in line with statutory and local targets with quarterly reports sent to the Department for Communities and Local Government. However, given that all functions of the Council as Local Planning Authority fall under the responsibility of the Planning Committee, the performance information has also been shared with the Planning Committee Chairman. This report enables the performance indicators to be noted by the Planning Committee itself.
5. This report is the third quarterly report of the 2017/18 municipal year and provides the quarterly performance at Table 1. Also provided at Table 2 is the requested performance measure, relating to the time taken in total days from receipt of a valid application to its registration.

PERFORMANCE

	Performance measure	Target %	2016/17	Q1	Q2	Q3
	Applications determined (in 8/13 weeks or agreed ext of time)					
1	Major applications	60%	90%	67%	82%	89%
2	Minor applications	65%	78%	87%	91%	88%
3	Other applications	80%	87%	91%	90%	93%
4	Householder applications	85%	86%	92%	92%	94%
5	Average days to decision	73	76	72	67	67
	Appeals					
6	Appeals Received	-	118	14	27	12
7	Appeals Decided	-	110	28	21	23
8	Appeals Allowed	30%	34.5%	15%	29%	30%
	Enforcement					
9	Reported Breaches Received		679	136	126	118
10	Cases Closed		698	154	105	117
11	On hand at end of period		154	153	188	179
12	Cases over 6 months old (no notice)		27	29	28	29
	Application Workload					
13	On hand at beginning		409	409	338	326
14	Received		1634	393	335	394
15	Determined		1659	460	354	382
16	On hand at end of period		337	323	306	322

Table 1 - Development Management performance

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
15	14.7	15.8	16.6	10.8	5.7	5.4	4.9	5.3	7.3	6.5	6.5

Table 2 – Time taken from receipt to registration (days)

6. All performance targets (reflecting the Government’s own targets) for the determination of all types of planning applications are met or exceeded. The average days to decision has been brought down to 67, so bettering the local target of 73 days.
7. 23 appeal decisions have been received this quarter with 70% of these being dismissed (30% allowed).
8. Enforcement cases are consistent although the number of cases over six months old has crept up slightly and will be kept under review to ensure cases are progressed where they can be. It may be of interest to note that the recently received statistics for 2016/17 showed Reigate and Banstead BC to have served more enforcement notices than any other Surrey Authority in the year and be 15th overall out of all 201 District Authorities in the country, demonstrating the commitment to action where appropriate.
9. A higher number of planning applications were received compared to the previous quarter. This is potentially in advance of the increase in planning

application fees nationally, which is scheduled for 17th January 2018 and may further impact on workload/performance over the start of Quarter 4.

10. Table 2 provides the performance measure as requested by Members, to report how long in total days applications have taken on average from receipt to registration (if valid on receipt) across a number of months. It shows applications are now being registered on a consistent basis within a week of receipt by the Council which is pleasing and compares well to other Surrey authorities and the nationwide picture. Work is ongoing to ensure this speed of registration is maintained. A channel shift in this and other areas, particularly around encouraging representations to be made online, would help free resources within the team to maintain or improve performance in registration and other administrative tasks.

3rd PARTY CORRESPONDENCE

11. At previous meetings the time taken for receipt of representations to appear online has also been requested as a performance measure. It is acknowledged that this is an important aspect of the process for many residents who submit representations outside the 'preferred' (and immediate) online submission method.
12. Work has been ongoing with assistance from IT to consider a means of capturing the time taken from receipt of representations in order that this can be reported to the Planning Committee. Within the current data capture processes there is no current means of generating an automatic report on this measure and with over 5,000 representations received annually it is likely that additional data capture to record this would be a significant resource burden.
13. The department does have an internal performance target of ensuring that all representations are uploaded online within 5 working days of receipt and this is generally met with a mean upload time of around 3 working days. It is measurable by working to the oldest representation within a 3rd party correspondence work-tray and ensuring that nothing within this is older than 5 working days old.
14. If any resident is unsatisfied that their correspondence has not been uploaded online within this timescale then they are invited to discuss with the Development Manager. Often there are good reasons for this such as:
 - Where posted, delivery has been delayed due to the postal service
 - It has been emailed to an individual who is on leave
 - The representation contains no address information
 - The representation is libellous or is kept off the web for other reasons
15. In order to ensure the most efficient means of handling 3rd party representations, submission via online form is encouraged which is an automatic and immediate process. Neighbour letters have been amended to drive submissions towards this and provide an explanation of the time taken for web-upload. Further improvements have been made such as providing an auto-reply on emails received, to confirm receipt as well as Officers being encouraged to proactively reply to confirm receipt where applicable.

16. Comparison is regularly made with the processes, procedures and pitfalls of other local planning authorities and improvements taken on board. Sometimes such improvements rely on upgrades to the 3rd party software used in submitting and managing online representations which is dependent on a fixed schedule.
17. As technology and processes advance further improvements will be considered however all must be balanced against the time and/or cost to deliver these.