

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 12<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2013  
title: 2012/2013 YEAR-END PERFORMANCE INFORMATION  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES  
principal author: MICHELLE HAWORTH – PRINCIPAL POLICY AND PERFORMANCE OFFICER

### 1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 This is the year-end report of 2012/2013 that details performance against our local performance indicators.
- 1.2 Regular performance monitoring is essential to ensure that the Council is delivering effectively against its agreed priorities, both in terms of the national agenda and local needs.
- 1.3 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
  - Community Objectives – Monitoring our performance ensures that we are both
  - Corporate Priorities – providing excellent services for our community as well as
  - Other Considerations - meeting corporate priorities.

### 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Performance Indicators are an important driver of improvement and allow authorities, their auditors, inspectors, elected members and service users to judge how well services are performing.
- 2.2 A rationale has been sought for maintaining each indicator – with it either being used to monitor service performance or to monitor the delivery of a local priority.
- 2.3 The report comprises the following information:
  - The outturn figures for all local performance indicators relevant to this committee, reported by for each of the quarters of 2012/13. Some notes have been provided to explain significant variances either between the outturn and the target or between 2012/2013 data and 2011/2012 data. A significant variance is greater than 15% (or 10% for cost PIs).
  - Performance information is also provided for previous years for comparison purposes (where available) and the trend in performance is shown.
  - Targets for service performance for the year 2012/2013 are provided and a 'traffic light' system is used to show variances of actual performance against the target as follows: Red: Service performance significantly below target (i.e. less than 75% of target performance), Amber: Performance slightly below target (i.e. between 75% and 99% of target), Green: Target met/exceeded.
  - Targets have been provided for members to scrutinise for the following three years. A target setting rationale was sought from each Head of Service.

- 2.4 These tables are provided to allow members to ascertain how well services are being delivered against our local priorities and objectives, as listed in the Corporate Strategy.
- 2.5 Analysis shows that of the 5 indicators that can be compared to target:
- 40% (2) of PIs met target (green)
  - 60% (3) of PIs close to target (amber)
  - 0% of PIs missed target (red)
- 2.6 Analysis shows that of the 24 indicators where performance trend can be compared over the years:
- 66.6% (16) of PIs improved
  - 4.2% (1) of PIs stayed the same
  - 29.2% (7) of PIs worsened
- 2.7 Where possible audited and checked data has been included in the report. However, some data may be corrected following work of Internal Audit and before the final publication of the indicators on the Council's website. In addition, some of the outturn performance information has not been collected/not yet available before this report was produced.
- 2.8 Indicators can be categorised as 'data only' if they are not suitable for monitoring against targets – these are marked as so in the report.

### 3 GENERAL COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE AND TARGETS

- 3.1 In respect of PIs for Development Control, John Macholc, Head of Planning Services, has provided the following information regarding performance and targets:
- Annual indicator in relation to new homes built on previously developed land which gives a target of 85% I now consider this to be no longer appropriate as it is not a national indicator and although national planning policy encourages Local Planning Authorities to seek development on brownfield sites, it is no longer an indicator. Previously there was a target in the Regional Spatial Strategy which has now been revoked. I also consider that the target is unlikely to be met given the lack of appropriate brownfield sites and the preference of greenfield sites by developers on the basis of these sites being a more viable option.
  - PI code number of new homes constructed – I consider that the target should be reduced to reflect the current economic market. Despite planning permission being granted it is clear that in many instances developers wish to hold on to their consents on the basis of a possible economic recovery at a later date. It has recently been recorded at national level that there is a significant number of excess of sites that have permission and have not commenced work.
  - In relation to the processing of planning applications and in particular the statistics regarding the processing of major applications it is clear that the target has not always been met over the recent quarters. This reflects the complexity of applications and in many respects an unrealistic timeframe of 13 weeks to determine major proposals. Many applications require a Section 106 Agreement which consistently mean that despite an application being resolved to approve within the time period, subsequently goes over the deadline. In order to improve the situation, measures have been taken to no longer require Section 106 Agreements

in certain instances and also consider the use of post planning agreements which allows for an extension of time which will then exclude the applications from any performance target. In relation to both minor applications and other applications the targets have not always been met due to the need to focus resources on other workloads including the recent upsurge of major planning appeals.

- Indicator in relation to planning appeals allowed – the failure to meet the target has often been the result of appeals in which it has been decided to go against the officer recommendation and these have subsequently been allowed.
- Planning appeals received – it is interesting that there is no target in this box and in some respects this is just for information but it is clear that there has been an increase in appeals received which is often a result of the willingness for developers and individuals in the case of householder appeals, to appeal against the original decision. It is often the case that the additional costs of appealing is minor in relation to the possible benefits of obtaining a consent.
- Appeals determined – There is no target in relation to this section and it is often the case that the Planning Inspectorate will establish the type of appeal. In recent years there has been a significant increase in the number of public inquiries but as this indicator only relates to determined inquiries, it is not a true reflection of the amount of inquiries that have been submitted. It is clear that planning inquiries are often used when they are large complex cases or have significant public involvement. In recent years there have been numerous such examples.

#### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources - None
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None
- Political - None
- Reputation – It is important that correct information is available to facilitate decision-making.
- Equality & Diversity - None

#### 5 CONCLUSION

##### 5.1 Consider the 2012/2013 performance information provided relating to this committee.

**Michelle Haworth**  
PRINCIPAL POLICY AND  
PERFORMANCE OFFICER

**Jane Pearson**  
DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

REF: MH/planning and development committee/12.09.13

For further information please ask for Michelle Haworth, extension 4421

PI Status		Long Term Trends	
	Alert		Improving
	Warning		No Change
	OK		Getting Worse
	Unknown		
	Data Only		

## Annual Indicators

PI Code	Short Name	Type	2011/12	2012/13		2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Current Performance	Trend
			Value	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target		
PI PL5 (BV188)	% of planning decisions delegated to officers	Percentage	78.95%	89.75%						
PI PL1 (BV106)	New homes built on previously developed land	Percentage	98.00%	81.00%	85.00%	Amended to data only				

## Half Yearly Indicators

PI Code	Short Name	Type	2011/12	H1 2012/13		H2 2012/13		2012/13		2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	Current Performance	Trend
			Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target		
PI PL10	Number of new homes granted planning permission	Number	722	301		476		777						
PI PL11	Number of new homes constructed	Number	147	59	42	113	43	172	85	Amended to data only				

## Quarterly Indicators

PI Code	Short Name	2011/12	Q1 2012/13		Q2 2012/13		Q3 2012/13		Q4 2012/13		2012/13		2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	Current Performance	Trend
		Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target		
PI PL3	Applications refused by committee but recommended for approval	8	2		3		0		0		5						
PI PL4	Applications approved by committee but officers recommended for refusal	4	0		2		2		0		4						
PI PL14a (N157a)	Processing of planning applications: Major applications	33.33%	27.27%	35.00%	33.33%	35.00%	36.36%	35.00%	42.86%	35.00%	34.96%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%		
PI PL14b (N157b)	Processing of planning applications: Minor applications	46.07%	43.18%	62.00%	56.41%	62.00%	65.22%	62.00%	51.79%	62.00%	54.15%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	62.00%		
PI PL14c (N157c)	Processing of planning applications: Other applications	64.45%	78.38%	80.00%	79.63%	80.00%	80.29%	80.00%	73.96%	80.00%	78.07%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%		
PI PL14d	Processing of planning applications: Number of applications received	866	225		200		227		201		853						
PI PL14e	Processing of planning applications: Number of applications determined	768	249		192		217		159		817						

PI Code	Short Name	2011/12	Q1 2012/13		Q2 2012/13		Q3 2012/13		Q4 2012/13		2012/13		2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	Current Performance	Trend
		Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target		
PI PL14f	Processing of planning applications: Number of applications withdrawn	37	15		11		11		16		53						
PI PL14g	Processing of planning applications: Number of applications determined under delegated powers	605	202		170		203		143		718						
PI PL14h	Processing of planning applications: Number of applications approved	619	206		162		149		117		634						
PI PL14i	Processing of planning applications: Number of applications refused	149	43		30		57		36		166						
PI PL2 (BV204)	Planning appeals allowed	39.5%	12.5%	24.0%	20.0%	24.0%	57.1%	24.0%	44.4%	24.0%	33.5%	24.0%	23.0%	23.0%	23.0%		
PI PL2a	Planning appeals received - householder appeal	19	2		5				1		9						
PI PL2b	Planning appeals received - written representation	20	10		5				10		31						
PI PL2c	Planning appeals received - Inquiry	1	1		1				2		4						
PI PL2d	Planning appeals received - Hearings	1	0		2				0		2						
PI PL2e	Planning appeals determined - Householder appeal	18	4		4				0		12						

PI Code	Short Name	2011/12	Q1 2012/13		Q2 2012/13		Q3 2012/13		Q4 2012/13		2012/13		2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	Current Performance	Trend
		Value	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Value	Target	Target	Target	Target		
PI PL2f	Planning appeals determined - written representation	17	4		6				7		19						
PI PL2g	Planning appeals determined - Inquiry	2	0		0				0		1						
PI PL2h	Planning appeals determined - Hearings	1	0		0				1		2						