

**BEST VALUE REVIEW TEAM REPORT.**  
**OCTOBER 2000**

**FINAL STAGE 3 BEST VALUE REVIEW (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) Plus Improvement Plan**

1.0 **PURPOSE**

1.1 The final draft report contains the action plan detailing the proposed service improvement strategy and performance indicators (Best Value Performance Indicators and local performance indicators), with appropriate targets over a five year period for the Development Control service.

2.0 **ACHIEVING SERVICE IMPROVEMENT**

2.1 The Best Value review focuses initially on the comparative analysis of our performance against family group and neighbouring authorities generally in relation to BVPI's in 1999/00 but focuses its service improvement proposals against the proposed 2000/01 BVPI's. The final report also makes proposals for local performance indicators relevant to customer needs and service improvement with appropriate targets.

2.2 The national Best Value performance framework for Development Control relates to four broad issues:-

- (i) Speed - % of applications determined within 8 weeks and average time taken to determine all applications
- (ii) Applicant Satisfaction – BVPI. Number 111. (see Appendix 1)
- (iii) Cost – cost of planning service per head of population
- (iv) Quality – score against a checklist of planning best practice

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CURRENT PERFORMANCE**

3.1 Appendix 2 details the current performance against 99/00 BVPI's in relation to CIPFA family group and neighbouring authorities, highlighting top quartile performance.

3.2 Speed of Application Determination

1998/99 Performance (Summary)

% all applications determined within 8 weeks.

- East Cambs 59.0% CIPFA family average 63.5% Top Quartile 71.6%
- Average time taken to determine all applications - new indicator

CHALLENGE 1: The Council needs to improve the percentage of all applications determined within 8 weeks

3.3 A number of strategies could be employed:-

- 3.3.1
- Reducing the caseload per officer - comparative analysis with CIPFA family authorities shows that those performing significantly above average ie Forest of Dean and South Cambridgeshire have lower number of caseloads per officer (144 Forest of Dean, 166 South Cambs compared to East Cambs 240)

The two available options to achieve this would be an increase in planning officers to achieve 150 per officer would necessitate an additional two FTE posts at a cost of £40K per annum (including on-costs) or utilise external consultancy support to assist with DC caseload.

CHALLENGE 2 : The Council needs to improve the time taken to determine all applications.

- Focus on slower applications, ie. those involving the Planning Committee and Section 106 negotiations which make up some 25% of the caseload and where we have heard considerable

criticism from developers concerned about the time taken from resolution to decision but this delay is not entirely in the Council's court.

- IT system enhancement – see previous comments
- Consultation/negotiation – see previous comments

### Argument

The analysis detailed in Appendix (3) identified a direct relationship between high performance in speed of application and lower performance in terms of appeals upheld. Only one Council in the CIPFA family group (Richmondshire DC) showed higher top quartile performance in both speed and appeal performance in all appeal cases. However, on Section 78 cases alone then Bridgnorth, Forest of Dean, Kennet, Melton, North Kesteven, North Shropshire and South Norfolk perform within the top quartiles on both speed and appeal performance.

Any service improvement strategies to improve the Council's performance in terms of speed of determination will need to be measured against cost, quality and customer satisfaction.

### Recommendations

#### Preferable

- Increased delegation
- Enhanced IT capability

#### Possible

- caseload per officer
- focus in-house resources on slower applications and seek to provide alternative delivery mechanisms to deal with household applications. The District Council is statutorily obliged to determine all

applications submitted – the only option would be to employ consultants to recommend but not determine final decisions on minor applications. The analysis outlined in para. 3.3.1 identifies the costs to reduce caseload to 150 per officer. The costs of external consultants is currently being evaluated but based on Peterborough's recent experience then for minor householder applications the cost uplift is in the order of 10% in round figures. Peterborough still managed the administrative process. We have yet to refine this cost in specific terms relating to an instruction to consultants to manage some 229 householder applications to reduce our internal officer/caseload ratio to 1:150.

- Focus on application type – historical analysis identified that householder applications are determined quicker than more complex applications (see Appendix 4) nevertheless, the Council still performs below the higher quartile for household applications' determinations.
- To improve the overall performance of service, a number of high performing Councils eg South Cambridgeshire and Peterborough have engaged consultants in the past to process minor and uncontroversial householder planning applications and have also employed dedicated case officers on the lower pay scale to concentrate on these applications underpinned by specific individual performance targets.
- Increase delegation – delegated decisions by their very nature are determined more quickly and at significantly less cost because costs escalate as applications move through the Committee process.
- Reduce consultation and pre/post negotiation – this would reduce the time taken for determination of applications.
- Improve IT systems – this will enable more effective and standardised responses throughout the process and ensure more effective monitoring of performance against this BVPI. A detailed appraisal undertaken by SIS on behalf of the Council was reported to Resources Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> July 00.

#### Cost of Service

Appendix 5 details the implications of the 2%, 5% and 10% increase/reduction in costs. Members will note that in order to achieve reduction in caseload to 150 per officer, the increase in budget will be 14% of employee costs on development control and 10% of total Planning Services' costs. This will increase net expenditure per capita which will increase our pc expenditure (note: this has reduced from £4.28 to £3.18 over the last two years) to £3.50 which still remains well below the CIPFA family average of £6.34.

The corporate analysis identifies that the cost of engaging private sector to process minor applications would be prohibitive. Nevertheless, the Council currently utilise external contractors to provide the following advisory and specialist services: for example; urban design, highways, landscaping, retail impact . This activity represents 20% of employee costs for 99/00 (a high year) of the Planning Service. A strategy will be developed to reduce the cost of this service which seeks to replace and complement these externally procured skills with the development of in-house staff in terms of specialist training opportunities

The need for further DC personnel will be reviewed in 2002/03 in the light of the impact IT of enhancements and any liberalisation of fee-setting powers currently the subject of a DETR research project.

### Applicant Satisfaction

2000/01 Survey (Summary)

- 77% overall satisfaction
- 50% informed on progress of their application
- 50% felt that the Council dealt promptly with their queries
- 62% felt they were given the advice and help they needed to submit the application correctly.

The Council's performance is above average in relation to other Councils surveyed although none of these indicators appear as the highest score amongst surveyed authorities (see Appendix 6 ).

CHALLENGE 3 : The Council needs to improve the overall level of satisfaction with the Development Control's service; achieving specific improvements in terms of progress of application, dealing with queries promptly and the clarity of pre-application advice.

A number of recommended strategies need to be employed:-

- email contacts for case officers on application acknowledgement letters
- acknowledgement letters to include period from which applicant should telephone the case officer to receive update on progress of application and the anticipated process and outcome.
- Resolve simple enquiries by telephone where possible
- survey of customer views on the pre-application information currently provided by the service prior to the submission of application.

Quality of Planning Process

Currently, East Cambridgeshire would score against 4 out of the 7 indicators of quality in relation to Development Control.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| • Pre-application discussions on request                               | Yes                                     |
| • % of appeals lower than 40%  | Yes                                     |
| • Delegated more than 70%  | Yes                                     |
| • Published charter setting Development Control stages                 | Yes but needs review.                   |
| • No costs awarded against Council                                     | No (one case involving a partial award) |
| • One Stop Shop covering development related advice                    | No                                      |
| • Policy of equal access to the planning process eg Advice in braille. | Yes/No                                  |

The Council's performance in relation to appeals and level of delegation exceeds the BVPI thresholds set by Government. The review group believes that increasing the level of delegation is a key part of the service improvement strategy and that appeal performance is a key indicator of quality. The service improvement strategy will therefore be developing specific local performance indicators and targets in relation to appeals and delegation.

CHALLENGE 4 : The Council should meet all the quality indicators within BVPI Statutory Instrument 2000 number 896 and seek to maintain, specifically, the top quartile performance in terms of delegation and appeal performance with the development of local performance indicators

A number of recommended strategies need to be employed:-

- A Service Plan / performance management scheme to be configured to match the BVPP/BVPIs.
- Link between increased delegation and appeal performance. – the analysis undertaken by the review team shows clearly that the level of appeals upheld are disproportionate amongst decisions which are referred to Committee.

	Delegated	Non-delegated
% of all appeals	55%	45%
% of appeals upheld	100%	66%

- Level of appeal performance – the Council is at the top of the top quartile of performance, this performance needs to be maintained and well monitored, utilising local performance indicators.
- The level of delegation in the Council exceeds the Government threshold, the Review Group believes that increased delegation is a key part of the service improvement strategy
- New IT systems and software will provide more effective management and monitoring capabilities.

Increasing delegation to officers necessitates addressing current call in procedures for full

Planning Committee. Proposals include:-

- Objections by Parish Councils will not automatically result in a referral to Committee;
- Objections by a local Member or requests for referral will not automatically result in a referral to Committee;

A proposed procedure is detailed in Appendix 7 which seeks to provide a process for mediation between local interests members and planning officers. These restrictions on the call-in process apply particularly in the case of minor household applications.

- Planning costs awarded against the Council are adverse indicators of the quality of the planning process – historically there are few cases where costs have been awarded at East Cambs. However, when considering appeal performance we can only infer that increased delegation will therefore result in minimising the risk in the number of cases where costs are awarded against the Council.
- One Stop Shop approach to development – the amalgamation of Planning and Building Control and developing the service in this way will result in immediate improvements in this area. However, the single consent regime has implications across the organisation in more complex cases which involve recommendations and decisions from several internal and external technical experts. We intend to arrange a development team approach to the major application caseload and this will be developed in reaction to this quality performance indicator. Some interesting views came from the first meeting of the Consultative User Group meeting. (see Appendix 8). The Review Group recommends further specific actions:-
  - a review of Section 106 procedures which impact on speed of application and impact on quality criteria for the One Stop Shop approach.

- IT systems effectively integrating Planning, Building Control, Environment Services and Legal Services and accessible by our customers remotely through e-mail and web site developments.
  
- Access to the planning process – public speaking to Planning Committee will be reviewed in 2002 and other initiatives to promote equality will be developed and discussed with the Council’s Equal Opportunities Group. The recent appointment of an Access Officer co-ordinating our response to the needs of the disabled is a positive move forward.

#### Other Service Improvement Strategies

The District Council have undertaken a study examining ‘Probity in Planning’ within the council. The Review Group are committed to their implementation. Probity within the planning process is a key indicator of the quality of the planning process. The recommendations arising from this work will be included as local performance indicators. Two further pieces of research have informed our best value process – a Parish Council survey (see Appendix 9) and an internal staff survey (see Appendix 10). Finally, we are awaiting the outcome of a consultation with Service Managers and this will be reported when available.

**APPENDIX 1**

**PROPOSED BEST VALUE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS/TARGETS AND LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS/TARGETS**

BVPI's based on 2000/01 (information on current performance based on 1999/00 figures).

BVPI's	Current Performance	Target
% of applications determined within 8 weeks	59%	80% by 2006 (5% improvement year on year)
Average time taken to determine all applications.	Need to insert	Top 25% quartile of districts by 2006
% of applicants satisfied with the service received.	77%	By 2003 – 82% By 2006 – 87%
Score against a checklist of planning best practice	4/7	7/7 by 2006  Service Plan / reconfigured accountabilities by April 2001  one-stop-shop focused development team approach formalised by March 2002  Review of Section 106 process to be completed by March 2002.  Review of public speaking at Planning Committee by March 2002.  (See local performance indicators)

**PROPOSED LOCAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

	Current Performance	Target by 2006
% of cases delegated to responsible officers	80%	90% (2% increase per annum)
% of appeals upheld	20%?	20% (or higher if outside 25% quartile)
Probity in Planning – action plan	Refer to report	Refer to report

Integrated IT system in place by March 2001

**Current performance of the comparator group**

<u>AUTHORITY</u>	<b>% 8 WKS 98/99</b>	<b>% 8 WKS 99/00</b>
<b>Bridgnorth</b>	82%	82%
<b>Forest of Dean</b>	81%	82%
<b>Kennett</b>	77%	77%
<b>Melton</b>	74%	73%
<b>South Cambs</b>	73%	73%
<b>Babergh</b>	72%	71%
<b>Malvern Hills</b>	72%	64%
<b>North Shropshire</b>	71%	73%
<b>Forest Heath</b>	71%	68%
<b>Mid Suffolk</b>	70%	70%
<b>West Oxfordshire</b>	69%	71%
<b>South Norfolk</b>	67%	73%
<b>Richmondshire</b>	67%	61%
<b>West Lindsey</b>	66%	59%
<b>North Kesteven</b>	64%	73%
<b>East Northants</b>	64%	42%
<b>Breckland</b>	62%	68%
<b>Mid Devon</b>	61%	61%
<b>Hambelton</b>	60%	61%
<b>East Cambs</b>	59%	59%
<b>Cambridge City</b>	59%	55%
<b>Tynesdale</b>	58%	61%
<b>Suffolk Central</b>	57%	61%
<b>Daventry</b>	50%	62%
<b>Harborough</b>	40%	49%
<b>Wychavon</b>	31%	33%

Figures are DETR published end year statistics for 1998/99 and 1999/2000

Table shows Authorities ranked by % applications determined within 8 weeks. Top quartile = 71.6%

<u>AUTHORITY</u>	<b>% 8 WKS 98/99</b>	<b>% 8 WKS 99/00</b>	<b>% APPEALS ALLOWED (S78)</b>	<b>% APPEALS ALLOWED (ALL)</b>
<b>Bridgnorth</b>	82%	82%	20%	29%
<b>Forest of Dean</b>	81%	82%	26%	31%
<b>Kennett</b>	77%	77%	15%	26%
<b>Melton</b>	74%	73%	25%	30%
<b>South Cambs</b>	73%	73%	46%	37%
<b>Babergh</b>	72%	71%	47%	34%
<b>Malvern Hills</b>	72%	64%	23%	21%
<b>North Shrops hire</b>	71%	73%	30%	22%
<b>Forest Heath</b>	71%	68%	53%	29%
<b>Mid Suffolk</b>	70%	70%	20%	24%
<b>West Oxfordshire</b>	69%	71%	35%	17%
<b>South Norfolk</b>	67%	73%	33%	16%
<b>Richmondshire</b>	67%	61%	29%	17%
<b>West Lindsey</b>	66%	59%	43%	42%
<b>North Kesteven</b>	64%	73%	26%	31%
<b>East Northants</b>	64%	42%	20%	29%
<b>Breckland</b>	62%	68%	22%	14%
<b>Mid Devon</b>	61%	61%	30%	34%
<b>Hambelton</b>	60%	61%	53%	44%
<b>East Cambs</b>	59%	59%	9%	5%
<b>Cambridge City</b>	59%	55%	29%	26%
<b>Tynesdale</b>	58%	61%	9%	33%
<b>Suffolk Central</b>	57%	61%	33%	30%
<b>Daventry</b>	50%	62%	24%	29%
<b>Harborough</b>	40%	49%	39%	39%
<b>Wychavon</b>	31%	33%	46%	27%

Appeal success figures are DETR (S78) and Audit Commission (all) statistics for 1998/99 as final figures for 1999/2000 are unpublished.

Table shows Authorities ranked by % applications determined within 8 weeks. Top quartile = 71.6%

Top quartile appeal = 22.7% all; 22.5% Section 78

**PLANNING DECISIONS BY LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES**  
**(SPEED/TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT)**

National Average (98/99)		East Cambridgeshire (98/99)	East Cambridgeshire (99/00)
All major developments	27%	28%	23%
All minor developments	54%	47%	50%
All householder developments	74%	77%	74%
Top quartile average	XX%	XX%	XX%



EAST  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
DISTRICT  
COUNCIL

APPENDIX 5  
Development  
Control  
BEST VALUE  
REVIEW  
Budget Extract



**BUDGET  
2000-2001**

**Best Value Review 2000**

**Development Control**

**Applicant Satisfaction Survey**

	<b>All Authorities (11)</b>			<b>East Cams</b>
	<b>Average</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>	
<b>Statement</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Advice & help needed	62	77	50	<b>62</b>
Kept me informed	52	61	32	50
Dealt promptly with queries	59	70	40	<b>59</b>
Dealt helpfully with queries	66	76	50	<b>66</b>
Understand reasons for decision	81	93	64	<b>83</b>
Treated fairly	69	84	52	<b>73</b>
Satisfied with service	76	87	60	<b>77</b>
Application Granted	91	96	86	<b>92</b>

These results are based on the quarterly survey for July – September 2000 for the following eleven authorities, conducted on behalf of the Council by QCL Market Research:

North Devon  
North Lincs  
Harrogate  
East Cams.

Mole Valley  
Mid Sussex  
Surrey Heath  
Mid Beds

Congleton  
Suffolk Coastal  
Derby

## APPENDIX 7

### Householder application mediation process

Fast track process for Householder planning applications.

Briefly, our existing system automatically brings planning applications to Planning Committee if a member uses the call-in process or if our recommendation is contrary to the views of a Parish Council. The challenge is how to mediate at the Committee trigger point and make a delegated decision. Here are some options for consideration:

1. PM/PDCO decide and explain reasoning post-decision.
2. PM/PDCO decide with Committee Chair and explain post-decision.
3. PM/PDCO decide with Committee Chairman and ward member(s) (who have expressed concerns?) and explain to Parish Council/local residents.....
4. PM/PDCO decide after round-table discussion with all interested parties and explain.....

Option 3 is preferred for further detailed consideration although option 4 is the best form of mediation/arbitration process but will have significant logistical/resource implications and will not improve performance in speed of decision.

**Development Control Best Value Review**

**Key points from the Consultative User Panel meeting.**

Participants: Andrew Fleet (Architect). David Wyatt (Reason Homes). Sue Reynolds (Cambs CC dc liaison officer). Jackie Wilson (CALC rep). Philip Ambrose (Chartered Surveyor Cheffins). Catherine de Winter (local residents' interest). John Abbott (Chairman Planning Committee). David Archer/Nigel McCurdy/Rachel Almond.

Key points:

AF: References/agenda copy availability/pre-application discussions essential.

DW: as above and earlier discussions on S106 agreements/time taken post draft decision no time scale and takes too long. Consultation focus on minority interests rather than the community interest.

SR: More feedback when decisions taken against recommendation.

JW: S106 is a minefield for Parish Councils – concerns about non-completion to avoid payments! More feedback when decision contrary to PC comments. Training. More info when application sent out – especially major schemes. Site meetings helpful but delaying decisions.

PA: Consistency – recommendations and decisions. (fees!). Informal advice needs to follow through. Application format . Local Plan review need to bring forward sites which are genuinely available. S106 process – as above and need integrated work programme including CCC/AW/IDB etc.

CdW: Lack of knowledge of the Planning process. Only 2 days notice to speak at Committee/copy of agenda essential/who to ask for detailed advice.

JA: LPA are considerably constrained by Planning law/regulations – cannot do what we like.

JW: Suggests a material planning considerations checklist issued with each planning application.

DA: in summary some key points: communication/understanding/quality/not heard much about speed (s106 issue?)/pre-application briefing and post-decision feedback important to all and:

- Some issues over internal liaison
- One-stop-shop/development consent regime
- Local Plan realistic context for decisions
- Quality affected by time and resources.

David Archer Planning Manager 3<sup>rd</sup> Feb 00.

(PS: two letters subsequently received from Philip Ambrose building on the points raised at the meeting.)

**Best Value Review 2000**

**Development Control**

**Local Councils Survey – Top 3 Priorities for Improvement**

**Recurring Issues:**

- Give more notice/time to parishes
- Reassurance that representations are taken account of by officers and Planning Committee
- Improved communication
- Correct clear plans submitted by applicant
- More consistency on decisions

**Other issues raised:**

- Longer consultation on amended plans
- Greater liaison between Development Control and Building Regulations
- Quicker action on derelict properties, particularly in Conservation Areas
- Consultees should have local knowledge
- Empathy with the village
- Education in planning law/material considerations
- Better post-approval monitoring of development
- Action from the enforcement to be more detailed and formal
- More decisions to be determined by Members
- Progress reports on applications and likelihood of commencement
- More rigor in dealing with and accepting retrospective applications
- Plans more accessible to the public
- Improving access to officers
- More community involvement
- **Consideration on impact to community**

**List of Appendices:**

- APP 1 Applicant satisfaction survey.
- APP 2 Current decision performance.
- APP 3 Decision and appeal performance.
- APP 4 Decision performance all applications : householder.
- APP 5 Budget summary.
- APP 6 Applicant satisfaction survey comparison against all LA's.
- APP 7 Householder application mediation process.
- APP 8 Consultative User Panel notes of first meeting.
- APP 9 Parish Council Survey.
- APP 10 Staff Survey.

Statistical sources – information derived from DETR national statistics/CIPFA/Customer surveys and our in-house computer processing system.

**Best Value Review Team Development Control:**

- Cllr John Abbott. Chairman Planning Committee.
- Cllr John Brooks. Member Planning Committee.
- Cllr Phillip Lewis. Chairman Monitoring Panel.
- John Hill. Acting Chief Executive.
- David Archer, Planning Manager.
- Nigel McCurdy, Principal Development Control Officer.

THE END? NO only the beginning.....

OCTOBER 2000.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BEST VALUE IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2001 - 2006**

Objectives	Resources	Lead	Action	
<p><b>1. Improve decision performance from 59% in 8-week statutory period by 5% annual improvement to reach 80% or top quartile of Districts by 2006.</b></p>	<p>1. new IT system in place 2. +0.5fte post (cost £15K) 3. upgrade SO1 post to SO2 by June 01. (cost £5K)</p>	<p><b>EDDS/ PDCO</b></p>	<p>1. Cttee and Delegated decisions on resources. 2. Full DC team by June 01. 3. New IT system running caseload management reports. 4. Parish Council training refresh programme in place through the cluster programme</p>	<p><b>B<sup>V</sup></b></p>
<p><b>2. . Improve the average time taken to decide all applications from 12 weeks to reach the top quartile by 2006.</b></p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>As above.</p>	<p>As above.</p>	
<p><b>3 To maintain our outstanding performance on planning appeals at not more than 15% allowed.</b></p>	<p>1. DC team includes flexible working p/t dedicated Appeals Officer. 2. Training budget and programme in place for members. 3. Officer training of PC's as Pref. Mgt Scheme.</p>	<p><b>EDDS/ Appeals Officer</b></p>	<p>1. Liaison with case officers over refusal reasons. 2. Officer/Member training up to date. 3. Parish Council training refresh programme in place through the cluster programme. 4. Local Plan up to date with PPGs/SPGs. 5. Maintain negotiated outcomes process.</p>	<p><b>I</b></p>

Objectives	Resources	Lead	Action	
<b>4. To increase the % of delegated decisions from 80% to 90% by annual 2% increases by 2006.</b>	As 1 above.	EDDS / PDCO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increased delegation to officers.</li> <li>new mediation process in place by March 2002.</li> <li>Moderated call-in powers used by members.</li> </ol>	LB (ie cas del
<b>5. To publish a service plan explaining the processes measures and resources which will deliver this service improvement plan by April 2001.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Officer training in project management and service planning by IPF and SOCITM.</li> <li>Develop internal capacity to deliver this project.</li> </ol>	EDDS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attend training and workshop sessions by end March 2001.</li> </ol>	LB
<b>6. To review the public speaking scheme by March 2002 capturing the 'right to reply' issue.</b>	PDCO/TLPA project	EDDS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation /survey of speakers and Members completed.</li> <li>Report /adoption by Pl. Cttee</li> <li>New protocol.</li> </ol>	LB (ne pro in
<b>7. A review of the Section 106 Planning Obligations process by March 2002.</b>	Legal Services	EDDS / EDLaDS	Captured by the Legal Services best value review completed by March 2002.	Ne Sec 106 pro in
<b>8 The adoption of the LGA Planning Users Concordat.</b>	PDCO/PFPO/TLPA project.	EDDS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report to Strategic Development Committee following adoption in principle.</li> <li>Implementation plan detailing actions over years 2 – 5.</li> </ol>	Im tat pla pla

Objectives	Resources	Lead	Action	
<b>9. Complete the implementation of 'Probity in Planning' action plan by 2002.</b>	<b>EDDS/EDLaDS PDCO/TLPA Member training programme and budget (cost £2000)</b>	<b>EDDS</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Instigate member training programme following DETR modular approach by October 2001. (on-going - Recs 1 – 4 refer)</b></li> <li><b>2. Research overturned recommendations on planning applications by Pl.Cttee</b></li> <li><b>3. Review members' protocol as R2.</b></li> <li><b>4. Public Register of Planning Officers' interests in place</b></li> <li><b>5. Substitute Planning Cttee members named.</b></li> <li><b>6. Review monitoring system to meet R5 .Reports on commuted sums received to Strategic Development Cttee.</b></li> <li><b>7. Final statements sent to developers will be an outcome of the new monitoring system.</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1.</b></li> <li><b>2.</b></li> <li><b>3.</b></li> <li><b>4.</b></li> <li><b>5.</b></li> <li><b>6.</b></li> <li><b>7.</b></li> </ol>
<b>10. Implement an upgraded and integrated IT system by March 2002</b>	<b>SOCITM (PID) refers. Corporate IT capital costs – in addition to in-house resources used to implement the project so far.)</b>	<b>EDDS</b>	<b>1. Implement PID project plan.</b>	<b>Mile PID succ achie</b>
<b>11. To improve our score of 6/10 from the checklist of planning best practice to 10/10 by 2006</b>		<b>EDDS</b>		<b>BVP</b>

Objectives	Resources	Lead	Action	
<b>11a. An up to date Local Plan – Yes adopted June 2000 to the year 2006 – yes.</b>	As Development Services Service/Improvement/Change Plan	PFPO		BV
<b>11b. Local Plan indicators and targets and monitoring performance.</b>	As above	PFPO	First annual monitoring report by end December '01	BV
<b>11c. Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Local Plan policies – yes.</b>	As above	PFPO		BV
<b>11d. Pre-application discussions – yes.</b>	As above	PFPO / PDCO	Publicise availability of advice service in guidance notes and web.	BV
<b>11e Publicised charter setting out targets for the development control process and monitored</b>	As above	EDDS		BV
<b>11f. % appeals allowed lower than 40% - yes.</b>	As above	TLPA / Appeals Officer	Review Inspectorate and policy trends and report to Officers/ Members 6 monthly	BV
<b>11g. 70% or more delegated decisions – yes.</b>	As above	EDDS / PDCO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. increased delegation to officers.</li> <li>2. new mediation process in place by March 2002.</li> <li>3. Moderated call-in powers used by members.</li> </ol>	BV
<b>11h. Minimise planning costs awarded/adverse ombudsman reports/successful judicial reviews – yes.</b>	As above	EEDS / PDCO	Review trends with Pref. Review Officer Member/Officer training	BV
<b>11i. One -Stop-Shop service on development related consents – three key elements: single point of advice/pre -application discussions covering all the development related consent regimes/co-ordinating nominated case officer</b>	As above IT & Accommodation costs	Mgt. Team	Process Manual Resource Review (personnel & accom.)	BV

Objectives	Resources	Lead	Action	
<b>11j. Implementation of an equal access policy to the planning process eg. Advice in ethnic minority languages/Braille and an accessible service to different groups in the community.</b>	<b>Corporate consultation strategy/budget</b>	<b>Mgt. Team</b>  <b>EDDS</b>	<b>Customer survey of requirements</b>	<b>BV</b>
<b>12. Web site development</b>	<b>Corporate IT strategy/budget</b>  <b>IT &amp; Planning staff</b>	<b>EDDS / ED(HRIT )</b>	<b>As Development Services Change Plan</b>  <b>To include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Linkages to guidance sites</b></li> <li>• <b>FAQ's</b></li> <li>• <b>Electronic application forms</b></li> <li>• <b>Office structure/contacts</b></li> <li>• <b>Viewable proposal drawings</b></li> <li>• <b>Interactive consultation</b></li> <li>• <b>Electronic payments</b></li> </ul>	<b>BV</b>