



Haringey Council

Report for:	Regulatory Committee 30-4-13	Item Number:	Md Final @ 22-4-13
Title:	Development Management (DM) Performance Assessment: Improvement Actions taken December 2012 – March 2013 and Proposals for 2013-14		
Report by:	Marc Dorfman Assistant Director Planning, Regeneration and Economy		
Lead Officer:	Costas Christoforou – Head of Business Development & Technical Support 020 8489 5529 Costas.Christoforou@haringey.gov.uk		
Ward(s) affected: All	Report for Non Key Decisions: Service Management and Performance Report		

1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report updates the Regulatory Committee on the Planning Service's Development Management (DM) Performance and in particular:

Proposed measures to address poor performing Local Planning Authorities (LPAs).

- Government plans to introduce "special measures for poor performing" Development Management (DM) services. The report sets out what the proposed criteria are.

LB Haringey's position in relation to the above criteria

- This reports contains detailed Development Management (DM) performance information over recent years across a number of areas, it includes actions taken over the last 6 months to improve performance and sets out proposals for further improvement during 13/14.

2. Recommendations

2.1 The Regulatory Committee is asked to:



Haringey Council

- a) Note the current Development Management Performance at paragraph 4 and Appendix A, and the summary findings of the Development Management Review 2012 at Appendix B
- b) Note the summary findings of the Development Management Review (2012) at Appendix B and comment on the Draft Proposed Action Plan for 2013-14 at Appendix B

3. Development Management (DM) Function, new “Special Measures” criteria and Performance Indicators

3.1 The Planning, Regeneration and Economy Division Service sits in the Place Directorate and manages economic development; planning policy (Local Development Framework); planning projects; transport planning; low carbon planning; building control – and development management. Development Management deals with Planning Applications and Planning Enforcement:

- A) Processing planning applications: Haringey processes some 2000 per annum. Of these 97% of applications are delegated decisions by officers and the remainder are decided by Planning Committee. There are on average 20 major planning applications a year. Major applications are defined as 10 or more dwellings or non residential developments exceeding 1000 square metres. “Minors” are development of one to nine dwellings or smaller scale non-residential development. “Others” include: householder extensions, changes of use, advertisements and works to buildings in conservation areas and to listed buildings business development and certificates of lawful development for a variety of permitted development schemes (small home/business extensions)
- B) Planning Appeals: If an application is refused, (23% in Haringey - which is a low rate of refusal compared to London Boroughs) the planning applicant can appeal to an Independent Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State - to hear a case for approval. Haringey has 100 per annum with a usual win rate of 65% - the national average. 98 in 2012/13, but the win rate fell to 61%, (see paragraph 6)
- C) Community Benefit: Planning applications are often approved with requirements for community benefits to offset the impact of the development – s106 agreements. The service brings in over a 4 year period some £2m s106 for spend on education; public realm; transport and traffic management – and recently employment – effectively the equivalent of the service’s net costs.
- D) Planning Enforcement: Planning enforcement is a discretionary service but one in high demand, particularly in a community that has considerable growth and churn. 800 enquiries for investigation and remediation per annum.

Proposed measures to address LPA poor performance

3.2 In May 2013, the Government will announce the final criteria for “poor performing special measures planning DM services”, with authorities named in September. The government wants to support growth and economic development and since 2009/10 when national speed indicators were not incentivised and the Localism Agenda was strong, fewer Major Planning Applications



Haringey Council

across the country have been processed on time, (i.e. within 13/16 weeks). This was also true of Haringey's performance. The Government is proposing two types of penalty:

- A) **MAJOR APPLICATIONS:** If less than 30% of Major Applications are processed within 13/16 weeks over an agreed period (likely to be two years – but dates undecided) or 20% or more Major Planning Appeals are lost – planning applicants will be able to ask for the independent Planning Inspectorate, (who currently determine appeals when planning applications are refused), to process their Major Application instead of the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The planning fee, democratic right and reputation would be lost to the LPA, but the applicant would have no right of appeal should the Inspectorate turn down the application. Special Measures would be for minimum of 1 year and would come with central government improvement support from the Planning Advisory Service. Major Application fees generate some £300k pa and £200k pre application and performance agreement income from a total annual fee of £900k-£1m.
- B) **PLANNING GUARANTEE – 26 Week DECISIONS:** If any application takes longer to process than 26 weeks planning fees, (and not in a formal Performance Agreement), may need to be reimbursed on determination.

Development Management Performance & Review

3.3 A full suite of performance indicators relating to DM and Planning Enforcement are set out in **Appendix A** to this report.

- Planning Applications and Decisions: 2008-13
- Planning Applications numbers and resources – major, minor, other: 2008-13
- Processing performance and applications over 26 weeks: 2008-13
- Pre Applications advice and performance agreements: 2008-13
- Planning Appeals: 2009-13
- Planning Enforcement: 2008-13
- S106 Community Benefit Agreements and Expenditure: 2009-13
- Member Enquiries, Complaints and Freedom of Information Requests: 2010-13
- Service Costs, Income and Benchmarking: 2009-13

3.4 During Summer 2012, a review of DM was undertaken. The review coincided with the consultation on new measures being brought forward by the government, as set out above, to address poor performing LPAs.

3.5 The DM review was commissioned from Fortismere Associates and using a diagnostic tool the review showed several areas of concern. A total of 14 key areas of improvement were suggested and these are set out at **Appendix B** together with a full improvement plan to address them. Among the areas of concern highlighted was a lack of adequate performance



management in the area of major applications which had fallen below acceptable levels in recent years. As a result, a series of measures were immediately put in place to address the low performance and these are summarised below.

4. Summary of actions taken to improve DM Performance in 2012/13 and proposals for 2013/14

4.1 This section summarises DM key performance management action in 2012/13 and highlights draft targets for 2013/14. These are set out in more detail in [Appendix B](#) at the end of the document.

- **Staff** - Appointment of Interim Head of Development Management and recruitment of new full time post holder. Recruitment of 3 new permanent DM staff to replace agency staff. **Action will be taken in 13/14 to address key skills gaps and training needs.**
- **Major Applications** – creation of Majors Team charged solely with managing these cases. Once weekly meetings enable staff to review progress and address bottlenecks. Staff have been briefed on how to make use of Planning Performance Agreements for future cases. All new Majors processed in 13/16 weeks or have a Performance Agreement that agree time scales. Performance has increased to 63% in 12/13. All cases are reviewed weekly and put into a performance regime with Director oversight. **2013/14 will see this performance management system embedded and put in place for all other Applications and Appeals.**
- **Strategic Sites** - Creation of a “Strategic Sites Group” to closely examine sites and pre applications and identify issues early on in the process. **In 2013/14 key sites will be tracked on a monthly basis and linked to likely new regulations to make pre application consultation on major sites/applications a requirement.**
- **Backlog** - Four additional temporary members of staff taken on until the end of the financial year to **clear the backlog of old cases. Backlog has been reduced from a case load of 1080 cases with 700 as backlog (out of time) to a caseload of 275 and a backlog of 46. For 2013/14 a target has been set to ensure more applications are processed in a quarter than are received – this should ensure the backlog does not return**
- **Staff Development and delegation** – Increased the number of staff who are authorised to sign off decisions under delegated powers to reduce blockages if one member of staff is away. Put in place new and regular training for staff . **2013/14 will focus on improving IT systems to help track and performance manage applications**
- **Case Handling** – Revision to how cases are initially validated. Higher standard of rejection of applications that have incorrect or inadequate information. Updated and improved planning application conditions for approval and reasons for refusal. Commissioned an update of the DM Procedure Manual. Re established performance management/case conference for DM staff. **2013/14 Update of DM Manual.**



Haringey Council

- **Customer care** – Complaints have increased in 2012/13. The focus has been on “ poor communication and poor feedback from the service to the customer”. However reply times have improved on MEs, FOIs and complaints. The first action has been to reduce the backlog should be the basis for reducing complaints. **A full analysis of reasons for complaints will be undertaken during 13/14 to put significant improvement in place.**

Conclusion

- 4.2 In the latter half of 2012/13 the service has sought to address the most pressing areas of performance improvement. These measures have resulted in improved Major’s performance, a completely cleared backlog and higher quality reporting. Further work is required in 2013/14 and proposed actions are set out at appendix B.
- 4.3 MAJOR APPLICATIONS: As a direct result of the actions taken above, it is unlikely that the council will find itself falling foul of the government’s proposed new measures. The DM service has processed 63% of major applications on time in 12/13, resulting in a two year average of 31.5%. Significantly, the council has not lost any major planning application appeals over the same period.
- 4.4 PLANNING GUARANTEE – 26 Week DECISIONS: The DM service currently has 23 applications undecided over 26 weeks old and of these 5 are major applications. These will be dealt with during the early part of 13/14.

Appendices:

- A. Key Performance Indicators
- B. Key findings from DM Review and Action Plan



APPENDIX A.

Development Management Performance Indicators and Assessment for 2008/9-13

- Planning Applications and Decisions: 2008-13
- Planning Applications numbers and resources – major, minor, other: 2008-13
- Processing performance and applications over 26 weeks: 2008-13
- Pre Applications advice and performance agreements: 2008-13
- Planning Appeals: 2009-13
- Planning Enforcement: 2008-13
- S106 Community Benefit Agreements and Expenditure: 2009-13
- Member Enquiries, Complaints and Freedom of Information Requests: 2010-13
- Service Costs, Income and Benchmarking: 2009-13

Table 1: All Planning Applications and Decisions 2008-13

1.1 The 2 years 2010/12 saw both an increase in planning applications (up by 200 pa) and a reduction of staff. In each year the number of applications received was greater than that determined resulting in a backlog over time. This has now been largely cleared.

Table 1. All Planning Applications & Decisions 2008-13

Applications Received (subject to audit)	2008/9	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
N1.157 (major, minor and other) National Indicator Applications (ie 8, 13,16 week time targets)	2015	1880	1998	2086	1908
All non - N1 157 applications e.g. trees, non-material amendments	267	380	415	377	390
Total number Apps. received	2282	2260	2413	2463	2298
Total number of Apps. Decided	2084	1935	2088	2124	2262
No of Planners (fte)	13	12	11	10	12.5
No of Applications received per fte planner	175	188	219	246	184

Table 2: National Indicator 157 (Major, Minor and Other Applications) 2008-13

1.2 Table 2 shows how with the help of the DM Review in 2012 the **backlog of applications** was reduced from 1080/700 at the beginning of the year 2012/13 to 275/46 for the beginning of 2013/14.



Table 2. Major, Minor and Other Applications & Decisions (National Indicator 157) 2008-13

N.157 Application nos. (subject to audit)	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/13
On hand at start of year	931	863	974	992	1080
Received	2015	1880	1998	2086	1908
Total	2946	2743	2972	3078	2988
Withdrawn	(7%)	(4%)	(6%)	(7%)	(27%)*
Determined	1883	1668	1811	1774	1898
Total on hand at year end –(all cases including Backlog)	863	974	992	1080	275
Delegated	(97%)	(98%)	(98%)	(97%)	(97%)
Determined by Committee	(3%)	(2%)	(2%)	(3%)	(3%)
Refused	(27%)	(26%)	(20%)	(21%)	(23%)

* Withdrawn also includes Not Determined Out of Time/ 2010 Development Management Procedure Order

Tables 3-5: Processing Performance and Applications over 26 Weeks

1.3 The Table below and in more detail at Table 3, illustrate the decline in Haringey’s performance since 2008/09. Following the DM Review (May – Sept 2012), the service established 2 priorities – reduce the backlog of old applications by 2013/14 to create a platform for improvement and improve the speed of processing Major Applications. These have both been achieved. However performance on “minor/other” applications remains low because of the concentration on the backlog. Also there is a concern about the number of applications that are still over 26 weeks old (23). This issue is being addressed in 2013/14 Qt 1.

Table 3. Haringey Planning Decisions Performance Compared to Government National Time Targets (N.I 157) 2008-13

Decisions (Subject to audit)	2008/09	on target %	2009/10	on target %	2010/11	on target %	2011/12	on target %	2012/13	target % on target	Gov Target %
Major (13wks)	21/26	81 %	12/18	67 %	3/11	27 %	0/19	0%	12/19	63%	60%
Minor (8wks)	410/506	81 %	286/375	76 %	302/379	80 %	205/300	68 %	175/309	57%	65%
Others (8wks)	1199/135 1	89 %	1123/1275	88 %	1207/142 1	85 %	1029/1455	71 %	1061/157 0	68%	80%
Total Decisions	1670/1883	87%	1421/1668	85%	1521/1811	83%	1234/1774	70%	1248/1898	66%	



Table 4. NI 157 Decided 2012/13 within 26 Weeks

Year	Apps < 26 weeks	%	Apps > 26 weeks	%	Total
2010/11	1770	98	41	2	1811
2011/12	1700	96	74	4	1774
2012/13	1736	91	162	9	1898

Table 5. NI 157 Pending Planning Applications @ 28 March 2013

TYPE	< 8 weeks	%	< 13 weeks	%	< 26 weeks	%	> 26 weeks	%	Total
Majors	1	13%	2	25%	0	0%	5	63%	8
Minors	39	66%	4	7%	4	7%	12	20%	59
Others	187	90%	8	4%	7	3%	6	3%	208
Total	227	83%	14	5%	11	4%	23	8%	275

Table 6: Pre Application Planning Advice (PAPA) and Performance Agreements

1.4 2012/13 saw a big increase in pre applications and performance agreements projects – but particularly focused in the second six months after the DM Review identified this as a failing of the service. £260k was earned in the year from 89 pre apps and 5 performance agreements.

Table 6. Pre application Planning Advice (PAPA) 2008-13

Year	Number of Cases	Income (£)	Average income per case (£) k
2008/09	16	15,300	956
2009/10	19	23,850	1,255
2010/11	54	46,600	863
2011/12	65	44,140	679
2012/13	89	84,120	945
Total	243	214,010	881

Table 7: Planning Appeals

1.5 For the previous 3 years 2009/2012 the service performance was better than the National and London averages. However in the last quarter of 2012/13 (Jan/Feb) the number of Planning appeals allowed has risen. The service is currently analysing the reasons for this sudden increase in appeals upheld. The majority relate to :



Haringey Council

- a) householder applications for extensions – particularly where refusals for large extensions were refused by Haringey because they were not “sufficiently subordinate” – but were subsequently allowed by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS)
- b) conversions and refusals based on car parking

Table 7. Planning Appeals 2009-13

Decision	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Allowed	38 (31%)	21 (27%)	21 (24%)	38 (39%)
Dismissed	84 (69%)	58 (73%)	68 (76%)	60 (61%)
Total	122	79	89	98
Withdrawn	3	7	7	7
National Average allowed	34%	33%	35%	35%
London Average allowed	32%	28%	32%	32%

Tables 8/9: Planning Enforcement

1.6 2012/13 has seen a significant increase in the enforcement notices issued (116 up from 84 from 11/12 - a 38% increase). Enforcement Appeals lodged increased to 55 from 45 in 2011-12. Planning Enforcement caseload was 846 for the year - an 18% increase on the 718 recorded in 2011-12. There will be an additional report on Enforcement at the next Regulatory Cttee.

Table 8. Planning Enforcement 2008-13

Year	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012/2013
Cases Received	1056	878	758	718	846
Cases Closed	1567	1012	806	673	747
Live cases at year end	425	301	241	280	390
Closed No Breach	571 (37%)	465 (46%)	440 (53%)	363 (54%)	384 (52%)
Closed Remediated (notices, prosecutions)	360 (23%)	215 (21%)	155 (20%)	149 (22%)	214 (29%)
Closed as Immune	209 (13%)	115 (12%)	60 (7%)	43 (6%)	63(8%)
Closed as Not Expedient	427 (27%)	217 (21%)	151 (20%)	118 (18%)	88(11%)
No. of staff (fte)	9	6	5	4	4.5
No of cases per officer (fte)	174	169	161	168	169

Table 9. Enforcement Notices, Appeals, Prosecutions and Fines 2009-13

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Enforcement Notices	64	68	84	87
Appeals	42 (9 allowed 21%)	23 (5 allowed 22%)	43 (4 allowed 9%)	20 (2 allowed



				10%)
Prosecutions		31	15	13
Fines issued	-	£36,900	£59,400	£48,768
Costs awarded		£16,415	£12,477	£6,008
Cautions income	-	£8784	£14,100	£6,600

Tables 11/12: Section 106 Income & Expenditure

1.7 The level of funds negotiated in 2012/13 has fallen and is explained by the rush to beat the introduction of the mayor's CIL, which lead to the increase in agreements during 2011/12. The level of funds received in 2012/13 has increased significantly as projects come online. Education and Streetscene continue to be the main recipients of funds.

Table 10. FEE INCOME

Development Management		
Year	No Applications NI157 received	Fee Income (£000's)
2009/10	1880	1,326
2010/11	1998	952
2011/12	2086	750
2012/13	1908	992 (incl. PPA/PAPA/Enf.)

Table 11. S.106 Expenditure Summary

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Total
S.106 funds agreed (negotiated)	£3,128,036	£907,854	£21,896,711	£3.9m	£30m
S.106 funds received	£1,379,733	£1,560,670	£2,067,933	£4.0m	£9.0m
S.106 funds spent	£3,422,844	£1,701,282	£379,496	£2.9m	£8.4m

Table 12. Actual Spend for 2010-11 and 2011-12 and Projections for 2012/13

Infrastructure Type	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Recreation	20,000	12,148	42,60
Environment	60,000		
Street Scene(incl.Highways)	270,000	184,000	962,746
Education	1,203,282		1,878,470
Traffic Management			8,750
(Administration and Monitoring)	148,000	183,348	63,682



Total	1, 701,282	379,495	2,956,308
--------------	------------	---------	-----------

Tables 13/14: Members Enquiries, Complaints, Freedom of Information Requests

1.8 The number of complaints received by the service has doubled in each of the last 3 years from 10 in 2010 to 22 in 2011/12 to 45 in 2012/13 (March 2013). The main areas of concern are:

- A lack of communication in particular not responding to emails in a timely manner.
- Not responding to telephone calls
- Not keeping clients informed of progress.
- Not taking timely enforcement action
- Failure to carry out Building Control site visits

1.9 The complaints findings correlate with the detailed responses received from the customer satisfaction survey work (2012) which indicated a drop in customer satisfaction in providing advice and keeping clients informed of progress. However the service both received more complaints and dealt with more on time than in previous years.

Table 13. Member Enquires, Complaints and Freedom of Information (FOI) requests

	2010 /11			2011/12			2012/13 (Up to 25 March 2013)			P&S (Feb 13) %	Council (Feb 13) %
	Receive d	Processe d on time	PRE %	Receive d	Processe d on time	PRE %	Receive d	Processe d on time	PRE %		
ME'S	104	79	76	297	204	68	208	176	85	73	77
S.1 Complain ts	10	5	50	22	15	68	45	36	80	82	84
FOI's	32	18	56	70	42	60	78	73	94	79	77

Table 14. Development Management Customer Feedback Survey's (Applicants)

	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Neither	Fairly Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
2008	9 (23%)	19 (47%)	6 (15%)	1 (3%)	5 (13%)
2009	40 (35%)	46 (40%)	6 (5%)	8 (7%)	15 (13%)
2010	78 (62%)	24 (19%)	6 (5%)	9 (7%)	9 (7%)
2011	94 (64%)	17 (12%)	8 (5%)	16 (11%)	11 (8%)
2012	51 (47%)	25 (23%)	4 (4%)	7 (6%)	22 (20%)
Overall	272 (51%)	131 (24%)	30 (6%)	41 (8%)	62 (11%)



% agree and strongly agree with the following statements

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
a) I was given the advice and help I needed to submit my application correctly	60%	68%	66%	72%	76%	62%
b) The council kept me informed about the progress of my application	44%	58%	62%	66%	71%	55%
c) The council dealt promptly with my queries	N/A	53%	61%	76%	73%	65%
d) I understand the reasons for the decision made on my application(s)	65%	85%	80%	86%	85%	87%
e) I felt that I was treated fairly and that my viewpoint was listened to	50%	62%	67%	83%	81%	72%

15. Service Costs, Income and Benchmarking

1.10 “Value for money” is the balance between cost and quality service. Whilst Haringey Development Management (DM) costs are clearly low – the service needs to improve its quality.

1.11 Low Service Costs and Higher Fee Income:

In 2012/13 Service Net Costs reduced by 69% compared to 2009/10. Salaries reduced by 38% and income started to rise – with the £240k increase (to produce a total of £992k in 2012/13) on the 2011/12 figure of £750k, coming from pre application and performance agreement charges. CIPFA and PAS Benchmark figures continue to show the Service to be low cost.

Development Management	Actual			
	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
R11 Revenue Expenditure	2,662,276	2,182,470	1,500,923	1,417,430
R111 Employees	1,420,239	1,245,150	872,518	893,960
R112 Premises- related expenditure	18,026	809	395	479
R113 Transport-related expenditure	7,544	5,060	3,024	9,203
R114 Supplies and Services	650,803	478,623	117,895	204,159
R115 Third Party Payments	664	1,929	991	204



R117 Support Services	565,000	450,900	506,100	309,425
R12 Revenue Income	(1,326,980)	(952,549)	(749,743)	(992,365)
Net Expenditure	1,335,296	1,229,921	751,180	425,065

1.12 Cost Benchmarking – Good....

Planning Advisory Service Benchmarking Projects:

Haringey took part in the 2011 PAS benchmarking survey. The results showed that Haringey planning unit costs were £59 hour with the London average being £65 per hour. Of the 18 London authorities that took part in the study Haringey ranked the 4th lowest in terms of overall costs. A further 2012/13 Benchmark Update is now underway, and full details are to be received in April/May 2013. Early data has found that Planning Unit costs in Haringey are still very low. Total average planning application costs in Haringey appear to be £572 with the Benchmark average being £625. Haringey “householder” application costs of £350-400 are at the benchmark average. Overall the DM Review makes it clear there are further management and productivity efficiencies to be made – and with Haringey’s low cost base this should provide an opportunity to build a “value for money service”

1.13 Service Benchmarking – Average/Poor, but with Planning Enforcement Improving.....

Haringey DM Benchmarking Assessment at November 2012, Using 2011/12 Data:

Comparison between Haringey, Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Waltham Forest, Islington and Hackney.

This Assessment showed that Haringey processed the 3rd highest number of applications per officer, behind Barnet and Islington. The same result held whether the benchmark was on all planning service staff or just DM staff.

Major Planning Applications: Haringey performance was the worst on speed. It was the highest on “approvals”

Minor Applications: Haringey performed the 3rd best on speed and 3rd worst on approvals

Other Applications: Haringey was the 2nd worst on speed and 3rd worst on approvals

Planning Appeals: Haringey performs above the London/England average, (although this has declined in the last Quarter of 2012/13 – this is being investigated).

Planning Enforcement: On a separate London Benchmark (2010/11 – now somewhat out of date), the Borough has an average number of staff but has the smallest backlog of cases and one of the highest “action” output in terms of Notices served and prosecutions. Haringey sits behind Brent, Westminster, Ealing, and Newham.

S106 Planning Obligations: The evidence indicates that the Service receives and spends around £2m per year, over a 4 year period. Education and Street scene are the biggest recipients of funding.



Haringey Council



APPENDIX B.

Development Management (DM) Review and Action Plan: 2012/13 and 2013/14

The DM Review identified 14 main concerns. These are set out below under the four headings of “procedure; performance; leadership and customer focus” .

The matrix below sets out the actions that were taken between December 2012- March 2014. It is also sets out proposed actions for 2013-14.

A. PROCEDURE – EFFICIENT & EFFECTIVE PROCESSES

A1. Procedure Manual and Systems: Manual not up to date

A2. ICT Improvement Strategy: IT System not configured to easily help project manage planning applications or help customers track progress of cases on line. No facility for improving customer service (eg consultation twitter). Lack of data being entered automatically.

A3. Planning “Reasons for Refusal and Approval Conditions”: Reasons and Conditions not up to date

A4. Case assessment, report writing & record keeping: Lack of good standard processes and audit trail on files

A5. Validation & Registration of Applications: Process required greater checking to ensure applications correct/higher standard.

B. PERFORMANCE & RESOURCES

B1. Speed Targets for Applications, particularly Majors declining

B2. Workloads are high for staffing levels. CIPFA and Benchmark shows service to be low cost

B3. Lack of individual and team performance management and target setting. Staff morale low

B4. Large Backlog of cases which prevents improvement and increases complaints and pressure on staff



Haringey Council

C. LEADERSHIP & VISION

C1. Lack of standard management systems

C2. Development management priorities and vision

C3. Lack of service improvement plan. Benchmarking/Review not being used to analyse and drive improvement plan

D. CUSTOMER FOCUS

D1. Customer service charter and standards – no customer charter

D2. Customer service appeared weak with long delays to get through on the telephone



Haringey Development Management Review Action Plan 2012- 13 and 2013-14		
Summary of DM Review Key Concerns/Issues	Short Term Action Completed December 2012- March 2013	Draft Medium Term Action Proposed April 2013 - March 2014
A. PROCESS & PROCEDURE – Efficient and Effective		
A1. Procedure Manual and Systems: Manual not up to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly Staff Update Meetings on “ lessons from appeals; complaints; Cllr MEs; Regulatory/Planning Cttee; policy; good practice and procedure; design panel ” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedure Manual Update in June 2013. Plus six monthly updates 2013/14 - End of year internal audits on basic planning procedure
A2. ICT Improvement Strategy: IT System not configured to easily help project manage cases or help customers track progress of cases on line. No facility for improving customer service (eg consultation twitter). Lack of data being entered automatically.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICT Data Audit on planning data and system capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICT Review and Development Plan - Statutory Registers; Performance Management; Case Tracking and Customer Information and Consultation
A3. Planning Reasons for Refusal and Approval Conditions & Planning Enforcement: Needs updating and “spot checking”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement; introduce “spot checks” for planning applications/conditions compliance
A4. Case assessment, report writing & record keeping: Lack of good standard processes and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff Training on “case assessment; audit trail and report writing”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing “case management/added value” training. Also Community infrastructure levy training and test.



Haringey Development Management Review Action Plan 2012- 13 and 2013-14		
Summary of DM Review Key Concerns/Issues	Short Term Action Completed December 2012- March 2013	Draft Medium Term Action Proposed April 2013 - March 2014
audit trail on files	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on shorter and clearer reports for Cttee. Introduction of “performance agreements” for all majors. Increase in both pre application and performance agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Spot check” case files and officer added value
A5. Validation & Registration of Applications: Process requires greater checking to ensure applications correct/higher standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation Guidance updated. New” triage system” put in place including managers/officers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validation Stage 2 Review – May. Public consultation in June for July Update.
Summary of DM Review Key Concerns/Issues	Short Term Action Completed December 2012- March 2013	Draft Medium Term Action Proposed April 2013 - March 2014
B. PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES		
B1. Speed Targets for Applications - particularly Majors declining	<p><u>Major Applications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major Application Team set up. Weekly tracking and reporting Major Performance in 2012/13 is 12 out of 19 on time compared 2011/12 – 0/19 and 2010/11 – 3/11 <p><u>Minor/Other Applications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Backlog of Applications and manage speed targets. Back log reduced from 1000/700 to 275/46 on 1/4/13. 	<p><u>Major Applications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majors – Nothing over 13/16 weeks without agreement. All Pre Apps and known soft sites contacted regularly through the year to check development plans and timescales <p><u>Minor/Other Applications</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance management regime for all applications (similar to Majors) – June/Sept Performance back to national targets <p><u>Planning Guarantee</u></p>



Haringey Development Management Review Action Plan 2012- 13 and 2013-14		
Summary of DM Review Key Concerns/Issues	Short Term Action Completed December 2012- March 2013	Draft Medium Term Action Proposed April 2013 - March 2014
	<p>Minors 57% on time (target 65%) Others 68% on time (target 80%) <u>Planning Guarantee – Applications to be dealt with in 26 weeks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012/13 - 9% (162) of Decisions over 26 weeks – target is 0 and past 2 years performance has been 4% and 2% • 2013/14 Applications on hand/pending @1/4/13 over 26 weeks is 8% (23) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All non Major applications dealt with between April – June 2013 • All Majors – liaison with applicant and agree timetable
B2. Workloads are high for staffing levels. CIPFA and Benchmark shows service to be low cost.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in staff to deal with “backlog” and to deal with “special measures” issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce agency staff and appoint permanent staff and new Head of DM. Review balance of staff resources (admin/tech/professional) as part of restructure
B3. Lack of Individual and Team performance management and target setting. Staff morale low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly performance information and management system in place for Majors • Praise good performance and address poor performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor/Other applications and Appeals performance management system in place • Weekly performance information and 2 weekly case conferences
B4. Improve Link between policy, pre application, community aspirations and planning application work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New strategic sites meeting established to review pre application process at early stage with Director • New community workshops/presentations on how planning works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider/Pilot new ways to support increased Cttee member early understanding of Cttee/ major applications – (e.g. supervised member briefings/Cttee briefings)



Haringey Development Management Review Action Plan 2012- 13 and 2013-14		
Summary of DM Review Key Concerns/Issues	Short Term Action Completed December 2012- March 2013	Draft Medium Term Action Proposed April 2013 - March 2014
B5. Large Backlog of cases which prevents improvement and increases complaints and pressure on staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backlog reduced from 1000/700 to 275/46 • Improve complaints answering performance as backlog goes down 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure Backlog does not come back. Set target of “more applications being processed in a Quarter than are received”
C. Leadership and Vision		
C1. Lack of standard management systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly DM managers meetings • Regular DM staff meetings, feedback and support/praise for good performance. Internal newsletter • Review appraisal targets to ensure speed , quality and customers service are clear. Major case conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraisals and performance management system for all applications not just Majors. Plus Appeals and S106/CiL • Skills and Training Audit • Monthly “Planning Update” meeting and regular cascade of professional and corporate information
C2. Development management vision and clear priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish New Set of Priorities: “getting the basics right and performance management; design, major sites, s106/CiL, enforcement, customer service” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appoint new Head of DM committed to Priorities • Use 2013-15 Improvement Plan to embed priorities
C3. Lack of Service Improvement Plan. Benchmarking not being used to analyse and drive improvement and development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address immediate priorities – Majors and Backlog. • Carry out Cost and Quality Benchmark (Planning Advisory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using Benchmarking data to create 2013/15 Action Plan – June/Sept 2013 • Review the best method of delivering DM over the medium and longer term



Haringey Development Management Review Action Plan 2012- 13 and 2013-14		
Summary of DM Review Key Concerns/Issues	Short Term Action Completed December 2012- March 2013	Draft Medium Term Action Proposed April 2013 - March 2014
	Service – results April/May)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess increasing Enforcement resources from POCA and application resources from “validation checks” and increased “pre app fees and better customer service”
D. Customer Focus		
D1. Customer service charter and standards		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development a customer charter Improve reception design and service – June/Sept
D2. Customer service weak with long delays to get through on the telephone. Feedback survey shows a decline in satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test telephone answering system and review Continue with feedback surveys Continue Agents Forums and Development Management Forums Continue Annual Monitoring Reports Continue performance reporting to Regulatory Cttee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Haringey planning applications consultation standards - “statement of community involvement” New information leaflets and tour of “How Planning Works” to community organisations and local cllrs.