

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 17TH MARCH 2004

Report of the Head of Planning Services

ITEM 7 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PERFORMANCE

1. Purpose of the Report

To report development control performance.

2. Background

The Environment Scrutiny Committee agreed at the meeting in February 2001 a form in which development control performance should be reported to the Committee on a quarterly basis.

The table below includes the quarter to the end of December 2003, together with figures for January. The volume of planning applications has increased significantly over the last two years or so and is showing little sign of abating. January, normally a ‘quieter’ month, saw a 17% increase over January 2003.

In terms of deciding applications, the ‘major’ decisions figure for the last quarter was excellent, albeit on the basis of only a small number of decisions. The trend for the future may be seen from studying the figures more closely. There have been high numbers submitted over the past year or so, but fewer determined, so the number outstanding has grown. As we make efforts to reduce the backlog, and the final adoption of the Local Plan has cleared the way for much of this, it seems inevitable that the figure for January will be replicated.

The performance for ‘minor’ applications dipped a little, but was still up on the norm for last year. We continue to do well with ‘other’ decisions. January is often a poorer performing month as it follows the Christmas/New Year break, during which deadlines can be missed.

Now that national figures are available for two quarters since the basis for assessing the amount of Planning Delivery Grant each Council receives was announced, it will be noted that a trend is developing of quite marked improvements in ‘performance’ overall, as well as in Charnwood.

As this Committee has previously observed, that is not necessarily an indication that planning’s customers are now being better served. A number of national commentators have since emphasized that these are not true indicators of performance; indeed, there are some signs that the importance of moving away from these and towards more qualitative indicators is being appreciated in the highest quarters.

Performance on planning appeals, albeit on a very small number of decisions, saw an improvement over the previous quarter with 33% of appeals (planning

and enforcement) being successful and 'half of those being in respect of an appeal against certain conditions of an approval.

One redeeming feature, in view of the current high level of application work, is that the number of appeals is relatively low. Five appeals were withdrawn during the period, but not before some considerable staff time had already been spent on statement preparation, etc. During the quarter, only five further appeals were lodged.

The effect of this is that less time is taken from the main business of dealing with planning applications.

One point of interest, on the enforcement appeals front, is that the Council has now sustained its position on the last 12 occasions (at least) on which a notice has been challenged on appeal.

As members are probably aware, it has been decided that information on the Council's menu of performance indicators should be reported to the Scrutiny Committees in the new standard format, as from the next meeting of this Committee. Accordingly, the Committee needs to decide whether it wishes to retain all, or elements of, the more detailed format as currently presented.

3. Background Papers

None

Officers to contact: Dave Hankin (01509 634761)
dave.hankin@charnwoodbc.gov.uk
Stuart Moffat (01509 634730)
stuart.moffat@charnwoodbc.gov.uk

DC Performance Monitor

	1997/1998	1998/1999	1999/2000	2000/2001	2001	2001	2001	2002	2001/2002	2002	2002	2002	2003	2002/03	2003	2003	2003	2004	2003/04
	Total	Total	Total	Total	Apr to Jun	Jul to Sept	Oct to Dec	Jan to Mar	Total	Apr to Jun	Jul to Sept	Oct to Dec	Jan to Mar	Total	Apr to Jun	Jul to Sept	Oct to Dec	Jan	Total
Fees Income	£436,012	£349,742	£387,516	£416,983	£122,826	£130,437	£121,387	£139,965	£514,615	£150,241	£189,297	£222,368	£112,293	£674,200 (14% fees increase)	£197,345	£188,030	£154,530		
Planning Applications Received	1423	1523	1467	1572	478	451	384	524	1837	468	499	428	507	1902	504	511	500	170	
Major										11	25	18	16	70	29	26	18	10	
Minor										86	106	106	114	412	126	121	118	35	
Other										371	368	304	377	1420	349	364	364	125	
Planning Applications Decided	1343	1482	1414	1471	425	447	437	382	1691	492	439	493	433	1857	467	540	436	171	
No Major Applications decided	46	42	47	35					48	16	14	20	18	68	20	8	11	6	
%age Major Applications decided in 13 weeks (National Target =60%)	52.20%	33.30%	46.80%	28.60%					33.30%	25%	29%	45%	33%	33.80%	40.00%	62.50%	72.50%	33.33%	
<i>National Performance</i>												42%	44%	43%	50%	52%			
No Minor Applications decided	414	437	447	444					392	99	88	115	108	410	93	139	110	31	
%age Minor Applications decided in 8 weeks (National Target =65%)	42.50%	44.80%	56.60%	57%					54.10%	47.50%	45.00%	38.80%	52.80%	45.80%	62.40%	59.70%	55.50%	58.06	
<i>National Performance</i>												55%	55%	54%	59%	62%			
No Other Applications decided	881	997	910	985					1251	377	337	358	307	1379	354	390	293	134	
%age Other Applications decided in 8 weeks (National Target = 80%)	60.40%	62.30%	69.60%	72.30%					73.60%	81.40%	78.30%	73.50%	77.20%	77.60%	82.10%	86.60%	84.40%	78.35%	
<i>National Performance</i>												72%	73%	72%	78%	78%			
Number decided in 8 weeks	713	825	897	968	281	298	297	267	1143	356	306	310	198	1270	350	420	330	125	
Percentage decided in 8 weeks (Target is 70%) (Former BVPI 109)	53.10%	55.70%	63.44%	65.81%	66.10%	66.70%	68.00%	69.90%	67.60%	72.30%	69.70%	62.90%	68.80%	68.40%	74.90%	78.20%	75.70%	73.09%	
<i>National Performance</i>			62.50%	63%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%	68%	65%	67%	67%	67%	72%	73%			
Number Granted	1225	1342	1341	1375	408	411	408	345	1572	456	402	446	384	1688	437	474	390	140	
Percentage Granted	91.20%	90.50%	94.80%	93.50%	96.40%	91.90%	93.40%	90.30%	92.90%	92.70%	91.60%	90.80%	89.10%	91.10%	91.60%	88.20%	88.40%	81.87%	
<i>National Performance</i>			87.80%	87%	88%	87%	86%	86%	87%	87%	86%	85%	85%	85%	85%	84%			

Appeals decided between 1st October and 31st December 2003

Enforcement No: E/01/0034 **Decision Date:** 19/11/2003

Appeal Procedure: Informal Hearing **Decision:** Dismissed

Type of Appeal: Enforcement

Appellant: Mr. Carroll

Location: 570 Fosse Way, Thrussington

Proposal: Unauthorised use of the land for the storage of vehicles, haulage and removal depots, the creation of hardstanding and earth bunds, the erection of a storage building and the erection of a store with toilet and shower.

Decision maker: Plans Committee, in accordance with officer recommendation.

Application No: P/02/1875/2 **Decision Date:** 14/10/2003

Appeal Procedure: Informal Hearing **Decision:** Dismissed

Type of Appeal: Planning Appeal

Appellant: Mr. D W Skinner

Location: Rear of 15 Cemetery Road, Sileby

Proposal: Retention of use of land for a temporary period of ten years from former allotment land to builders storage yard.

Decision maker: Officer delegation

Application No: P/02/2109/2 **Decision Date:** 21/10/2003

Appeal Procedure: Public Inquiry **Decision:** Allowed

Type of Appeal: Planning Appeal

Appellant: William Davis

Location: Land corner of Valley Road & Woodbrook Road, Loughborough

Proposal: Demolition of workshop buildings and erection of 19 two-bedroom flats (including 3-storey) with 24 parking spaces.

Decision maker: Plans Committee, against officer recommendation

Application No: P/02/3300/2 **Decision Date:** 18/11/2003

Appeal Procedure: Informal Hearing **Decision:** Dismissed

Type of Appeal: Planning Appeal

Appellant: Mrs. Crawley

Location: Land to rear of Peashill Cottage, 215 Ratcliffe Road, Sileby

Proposal: Change of use of residential outbuilding to a single dwelling.

Decision maker: Officer delegation

Application No: P/03/0261/2 **Decision Date:** 22/10/2003

Appeal Procedure: Written Representations **Decision:** Dismissed

Type of Appeal: Planning Appeal

Appellant: Mr. W Kelly

Location: 18 Highfield Street, Anstey

Proposal: Erection of dormer window to rear roof of terraced dwelling.

Decision maker: Officer delegation

Application No: P/03/1171/2

Decision Date: 10/11/2003

Appeal Procedure: Written Representations **Decision:** Allowed

Type of Appeal: Planning Appeal against conditions imposed

Appellant: Mrs. D Clark

Location: 4 Blackthorn Drive, Syston

Proposal: Change of use of open space to garden and retention of 2m high fence to part side and rear boundary and erection of two-storey side extension.

Decision maker: Officer delegation

This appeal was against three conditions: one requiring the removal of an unauthorised front and side fence (front was removed and Inspector found removal of side fence unwarranted); the second requiring the access to be widened (with which the Inspector agreed) and the third being the standard landscaping condition (the Inspector found it too detailed for a house extension, so he simplified it)

N.B. Appeals against conditions will not feature in the national Performance Indicator for 2004/2005.

Summary

Number of appeals decided between 1st October and 31st December 2003: 6

Outcome of appeals		Allowed	Dismissed
Against decisions of a Plans Committee	in accord with recommendation:		1
	contrary to recommendation:	1	
Against decisions of the Head of Planning Services		1	3

Number of appeals decided between 1st July 2003 and 30th September 2003: 13

Outcome of appeals		Allowed	Dismissed
Against decisions of a Plans Committee	in accord with recommendation:	-	2
	contrary to recommendation:	3	1
Against decisions of the Head of Planning Services		2	3