

WIRRAL COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

25 OCTOBER, 2011

SUBJECT:	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE
WARD/S AFFECTED:	ALL
REPORT OF:	ACTING DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION, HOUSING & PLANNING
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO HOLDER:	COUNCILLOR PHIL DAVIES
KEY DECISION?	NO

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 As part of the move towards better performance management Members have received quarterly reports on speed of decision in Development Management since 2007. This report sets out Development Management Performance under Central Government's data requirements for the first and second quarters of 2011/2012. This period covers 1 April 2011 to 30 June 2011 (First Quarter) and 1 July 2011 to 30 September 2011. This report covers the performance for all applications, i.e. Majors, Others and Minors.

2. Development Management Performance – Speed of Determining Applications

- 2.1 The determination of planning applications in Development Management remains a key performance indicator for the Authority. From April 2011, the Development Management Division targets for determining applications are set at determining 60% of all Major applications within 13 weeks, 81% of all Minor applications within 8 weeks and 88% of all Other applications within 8 weeks.
- 2.2 For information, the definition of what constitutes major, minor and other applications is set as follows, for information:

MAJORS

- 10 or more dwellings, or the site area for residential development is 0.5 hectares or more
- 1000 sqm or more, or the site is 1 hectare or more

MINORS

- less than 10 dwellings, or the site area for residential development is less than 0.5 hectares
- less than 1000 sqm, or the site is less than 1 hectare

OTHERS

- Changes of use, householder development (development within the curtilage of a residential property), adverts, listed building consents, conservation area consents, lawful development certificates, agricultural notifications, telecommunications, etc.

- 2.3 The Service Manager (Development Management) receives weekly performance figures around these targets in order to reinforce the performance culture and to continue to raise the performance standard.
- 2.4 Performance figures for the first and second quarters of 2011/12 are set out in the tables below.
- 2.5 In the first quarter there were 341 applications determined, with performance in each category as follows:

FIRST QUARTER

Month	Majors Target 60% within 13 weeks	Minors Target 81% within 8 weeks	Others Target 88% within 8 weeks
Apr 11	75.00%	78.57%	88.30%
May 11	-	72.00%	88.29%
Jun 11	-	85.71%	98.46%
Q1 Performance Apr – Jun 11	75.00%	77.61%	90.74%

- 2.6 295 applications (87%) were approved in the first quarter with 32 refused (9%). 14 applications were withdrawn. 93% of applications were determined under delegated powers with 7% of applications being considered by the Committee. The average time to determine applications was 7.26 weeks.

There were 4 Major applications determined in the quarter (but none in May or June).

- 2.7 In the first quarter there were 358 applications determined, with performance in each category as follows:

SECOND QUARTER

Month	Majors Target 60% within 13 weeks	Minors Target 81% within 8 weeks	Others Target 88% within 8 weeks
Jul 11	50.00%	91.67%	83.52%
Aug 11	50.00%	95.83%	88.66%
Sep 11	100.00%	85.71%	75.58%
Q2 Performance Jul – Sep 11	62.50%	90.79%	82.85%

- 2.8 323 applications (90%) were approved in the first quarter with 25 refused (7%). 10 applications were withdrawn. 92.7% of applications were determined under delegated powers with 7.3% of applications determined by the Committee. The average time taken to determine applications was 8.49 weeks. There were 8 majors determined in the quarter.
- 2.9 It is perhaps worth noting the way in which the figures in the tables above have been arrived at, particularly having regards to the figures set out for the quarterly performance as a whole. The performance figure for the quarter is not taken as a simple average of percentages of the three months that make up the quarter but is based on an accurate figure arrived by dividing the number of applications determined within target by the total number of applications determined and then times by 100 to give the percentage. By way of example, if you took an average for Minors by dividing the total performance returns for April, May and June by three, you would get a return of 78.76%. However, the exact total number of applications determined in the first quarter was 67 whilst 52 were determined within target. Therefore, $\frac{52}{67} \times 100 = 77.61\%$.

3.0 Conclusions

- 3.1 Members will note from the above returns that performance against the speed of determining applications remains on target, although there is a small dip in the performance of Other applications for the second quarter. Members may be reassured by the following table which shows that performance to date is back above target for the first two weeks of the third quarter.

	Majors Target 60% within 13 weeks	Minors Target 81% within 8 weeks	Others Target 88% within 8 weeks
1 Oct 10 to 12 Oct 11	66.67%	84.83%	88.91%

3.0 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION/S

- 3.1 The contents of the report are for noting and to inform Members of performance in relation to performance targets with regards to the determination of planning applications.

4.0 BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

- 4.1 As part of the move towards better performance management Members have received quarterly reports on speed of decision in Development Management since 2007.

5.0 RELEVANT RISKS

- 5.1 None identified.

6.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 6.1 None applicable.

7.0 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 None applicable

8.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH GROUPS

- 8.1 There are no implications relating to voluntary, community and faith groups arising from this report.

9.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: FINANCIAL; IT; STAFFING; AND ASSETS

- 9.1 There are no implications relating to financial, IT, staffing or assets arising from this report.

10.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

11.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no Equalities implications arising from this report.

11.2 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

- (a) Is an EIA required? No
(b) If 'yes', has one been completed? N/A

12.0 CARBON REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There are no Carbon Reduction implications arising from this report.

13.0 PLANNING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

13.1 There are no Community Safety implications arising from this report. This report details the performance in relation to the determination of planning applications.

REPORT AUTHOR: Matthew Davies
Service Manager (Development Management)
telephone: (0151) 606 2246
email: matthewdavies@wirral.gov.uk

APPENDICES

REFERENCE MATERIAL

SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)

Council Meeting	Date
IMPROVING THE PLANNING SERVICE & DC PERFORMANCE REPORT	PLANNING COMMITTEE 29 May, 2008
DC PERFORMANCE REPORTS	PLANNING COMMITTEE 26 April, 2011 21 October, 2010 21 July, 2010 22 April, 2010 10 September, 2009