

London Borough of Haringey

Development Management (DM) Diagnostic Review

Four Themes: “ Process; Performance and Resources; Leadership and Customer Service”

CONTENTS

1. Introduction: A) DM Review Process and B) Summary: Main Findings and Service Response
 2. Diagnostic Themes and Detailed Analysis and Draft Improvement Action Plan Proposals
-

1. Introduction: DM Review Process and Main Findings

A) DM Review Process

Development Management (DM) Diagnostic Review - 4 Themes: “Process; Performance and Resources; Leadership and Customer Service”

- In April 2012 there were concerns about “application project management and time targets; decline in performance management and lack of staff supervision; lack of procedure updates and the arrival of CiL; new planning regulations, the National Planning Policy Framework and likely new planning flexibilities. Also service budgets had been substantially reduced. It was therefore important to take stock”.
- Haringey AD Planning commissioned Fortismere Associates (May-Sept 2012) to work with DM Management Team on a self assessment of the service’s effectiveness and performance.
- The Fortismere Diagnostic is derived from national research for Central Government (DCLG) on assessing the performance of public sector planning services (2004 – “A Benchmark for the Spatial Planning” – Addison Associates).

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

- 1 May 2012 - meeting with Senior Management project team to discuss the review. Prior to this meeting the team were asked to provide evidence and undertake a self assessment using the diagnostic tool and to complete a datasheet.
- Fortismere Associates reviewed key documentation, interviewed staff (25) and reviewed sample files (major, minor, other, pre-application and enforcement). Comments were added to the diagnostic tool from this work.
- Key issues arising from the review were reported to a workshop on 1 August 2012 and improvements considered. Identification of urgent action and key priorities for 2012/13
- 21 September 2012 a further workshop was held with the project team.
- Fortismere Associates set out Review Comments on the 53 Diagnostic Issues. These divide up under **4 Thematic Headings: “process; performance; leadership and customer”**. The “assessment against the issues” has been updated and completed by Marc Dorfman AD Planning, including draft recommendations for service actions to be considered by Staff, Cabinet Member, Director, Regulatory Cttee and Director’s Group. Recommendations are divided into “Business as Usual” (BAU) actions and Improvement/Development actions.
- Nov 2012: Main findings below at 1B) agreed by Fortismere Associates and AD Planning and Regeneration
- Dec 2012 – March 2013: Diagnostic Matrix considered and completed, early actions and priorities implemented - and draft 2013-14 action plan items proposed
- March/April 2013: Director and Cabinet Member Regulatory Report clearance

The Diagnostic and Action Plan headings:

- A. Procedure – efficient and effective processes**
- B. Performance – staff and resources and performance management**
- C. Leadership – management and vision**
- D. Customer Focus – service standards; customer service and feedback**

Documents reviewed

1. Planning & Regeneration Business Plans 2010 - 13
2. Restructuring of the Planning Regeneration and Economy Service (PR&E)
3. Performance stats Q4 2011/12 for Planning and Regeneration
4. Draft Planning Enforcement DPD April 2012 circulated for comment
5. PAS/CIPFA benchmarking report 2011 – dated 13 March 2012
6. Value for Money benchmarking report 2010/11
7. Overview of applications determined by officer 2011/12
8. Applications - Pending by Officer April 2012
9. DC Manual modifications July 2004
10. Planning Obligations (S106) Agreements - Regulatory Committee Report February 2012 and appendices
11. Planning Committee Agenda and papers - 16 April 2012
12. THFC Planning Committee Report February 2012

13. Planning Enforcement Expediency – Regulatory Committee Report – 21 February 2012
14. Sample of planning application files (major, minor and other), pre-application files and enforcement cases
15. Planning Appeals procedure note circulated to staff on 13 December 2011
16. Greening your home
17. Pre-application planning advice – Service Guide from January 2011
18. Draft Development Management Improvement Plan/Work Programme Plan January 2012-January 2013 (March 2012 version)
19. Planning application validity checklist
20. standard letters to consultees
21. Performance Assessment – Planning, Regeneration and Economy: April 2012

B) Summary: DM Review Main Findings, Issues of Concern and Service Response

A. PROCEDURE – EFFICIENT & EFFECTIVE PROCESSES

A1. Procedure Manual and Systems: The review found that standard operations and procedures are not currently set out in an up to date procedures manual. The information available had not been comprehensively reviewed. Stand alone additions for new procedures have been made to the Manual, but not in an integrated and comprehensive way. This means that there are no clear framework of procedures in place owned and controlled by DM management

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Priorities actioned: “clearing backlog of applications and major applications”. Commission update of DM Procedure Manual.

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Manual updated and regular reviews. Planning procedure audit at the end of 2013-14

A2. ICT Improvement Strategy: There was no up to date ICT improvement strategy. Improvements are required in order to track cases on IPlan and ideally there is a need for a document management system

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: ICT Data audit

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: ICT Development Plan

A3. Planning Reasons for Refusal and Approval Conditions: Standard reasons for refusal and conditions for approval need updating. (Note also that there is a requirement from 1 December 2012 to set out in the decision notice a statement re discussions with applicant)

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Reasons and Conditions updated and statements of negotiation implements

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Procedure Manual updated and regular reviews

A4. Case Record Keeping: Record keeping/audit trail is poor, with limited site notes/records of discussion being kept on file. So there is no means for identifying where amendments are sought and cannot see where value added. To some extent this appears in the delegated/committee reports – but it should be clear in the case file.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Staff guidance. Focus on “clearing the backlog and ensuring major applications dealt with on time”

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Staff instruction. Procedure Manual updated and regular reviews

A5. Validation & Registration of Applications: Guidance needs updating. The review found that the current checklist in place does not relate to the information requirements listed on the website. (Note the Infrastructure and Growth Bill is proposing a review of information requirements and it looks likely that there will be a requirement to review every two years). Registration and validation are currently dealt with as two separate processes and further work should be undertaken to see if this could be more efficiently handled as one process.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Validation and Registration updated and integrated. New triage system in place to ensure more professional support

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Further Validation update, including consultation by July 2013. Further staff training on Validation.

B. PERFORMANCE & RESOURCES

B1. Speed Targets for Applications, particularly Majors declining – and whilst case loads are high, standard procedures not being used: Performance in meeting the BV157 time targets on major/minor and other applications has been falling since the beginning of 2010 and the national targets were not met for major or other applications for the 2011/12 period.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: performance management system for major applications in place including bespoke team

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: performance management system for “other and minor” applications and review appeals and enforcement

B2. Workloads are high for staffing levels. CIPFA and Benchmark shows service to be low cost: At the time of the review the caseloads were quite high. (At time of interviews – between 57-97 for each officer). In the last year 2011/12 there were 10-12 planners involved in processing applications and 2100 applications received with an average FTE caseload of 170-190 (compared

to a benchmark figure of 150 applications per officer). Enforcement caseloads at around 200 per officer are high. The PAS benchmarking exercise showed that the Haringey service was low cost.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: increase agency staff to ensure delivery of backlog reduction and major applications. Interim Head of Service

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Review Planning Advisory Service Benchmark study (May 2013) to assess staff/procedure productivity balance. Implement in 2013/14

B3. Lack of Individual and Team performance management and target setting: Although there is regular monitoring and reporting of corporate performance indicators at service level, including to the Planning/Regulatory Committees, there is no strong regular performance monitoring of individual staff or setting of local performance indicators. A performance culture does not appear to be embedded but left to individuals to identify their own priorities and undertake their own performance monitoring.

Lack of Project Management: The review found no real evidence of a project planning approach to handling applications outside of planning performance agreements.

Lack of Key milestones for many cases: Individual applications are not set and monitored.

Low Staff Morale: there was an air of firefighting with performance and morale dropping.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: performance management system for major applications in place including bespoke team. Improve reporting to Regulatory Cttee and Directorate.

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: performance management system for “other and minor” applications and review appeals and enforcement. Improve Appraisal management. Two weekly monitoring and reporting system. Appointment of new full time Head of Service and team building and confidence programme

B4. No strong link between pre application and planning application work: Although the major sites meetings have been recently re-established and will provide a mechanism for a corporate view to be taken this was not reflected at the time of the review with the DM service not always aware of the discussions – this means that this does not always link effectively to the pre-application service. DM is seen as simply as a regulatory service

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: performance management system for major applications in place including bespoke team. Weekly meetings with wider Place group of officers to ensure corporate approach. Also new “strategic sites” meeting with Director set up to ensure horizon scanning on key sites/schemes

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: performance management system for “other and minor” applications and review appeals and enforcement.

B5. Large Backlog of cases which prevents improvement and increases complaints and pressure on staff: There was a backlog of around 500/700 cases at the time of the review. During 2011/12 and the first quarter of 2012/13 more applications were

being received each quarter than were being determined so that the backlog of applications has been growing. The nature of the backlog was not known and there was no clear plan for clearing the backlog in place

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Backlog cleared.

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: performance target adopted of “more applications processed over a quarter than received”

C. LEADERSHIP & VISION

C1. Lack of standard management systems: At the time of the review the DM management team did not meet regularly and the team structure was not functioning well with no clear line management arrangements. Team briefings – professional/corporate not planned to allow management to taken on and action. Failure to address backlog and complaints through Performance Management has meant pressure on the service, low staff morale and inability to improve the service

The Team leader posts needs clearer definition of roles and responsibilities: Need for clear arrangements for delegated decision taking. No consistent team meetings or briefing of staff, (though this in place more for the Enforcement Team).

Lack of permanent staff structure: There is too much reliance on temporary staff and a permanent structure is needed.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Agreed priority focus on backlog and major applications. Team leaders below Head of Service given area and more delegated responsibility. Appointment of Interim Head of Service

Proposed April 2013 - March 2014: Review and consider creation of 2 area teams and one majors team. Appoint up to 5 permanent staff. Reduce agency staff. Consider and agree any increase in delivery of planning enforcement. Appointment of new full time Head of Service and action DM team and confidence building programme

C2. Vision/role of development management/clear priorities – although priorities set e.g major sites, good design, infrastructure contributions and enforcement – these were not translated into priority work streams so that officers are managed to deal with priorities.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Agree priority focus and work streams on clearing backlog and management of major applications

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Review and agree next phase of priorities and work streams – focus on “minor and other” planning applications and sound procedures

C3. Lack of Service Improvement Plan: the current plan was a work programme rather than service improvement plan. It lacked detail and was not comprehensive in its approach. Lack of focus on the customer.

Benchmarking not being used to analyse and to drive improvement plan: The benchmarking work undertaken had not yet been used to evaluate performance and to identify areas for improvement. Appeals performance is good - at 77% dismissed compared to the national average of 65%. The refusal rate at 18% for 2011/12 was around the national average and lower than in many London boroughs. (NB in the last Quarter of 2012/13 Appeal win rate declined – this is under review)

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: performance management system for major applications in place including bespoke team

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: performance management system for “other and minor” applications and review appeals and enforcement. Establish DM stability in terms of structure; staffing and procedures. Use May 2012 Benchmarking to consider future delivery options for DM.

D. CUSTOMER FOCUS

D1. Customer service charter and standards – no customer charter available on the website – difficult to locate service standards and delivery arrangements expected by applicants, objectors and consultees.

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013:

Proposed April 2013- March 2014:

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Priority focus was on “backlog and major applications performance” – dealing with these will enable service to prioritise customer service in 2013-14

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: customer charter/service standards review and upgrade and “getting the basics right” programme

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

Customer satisfaction survey was average and so perhaps did not reflect this. This may be attributable to the Development Management Forum which appears to be working well and the Design Panel input on major schemes. (NB customer satisfaction has however declined over 2 years)

RESPONSE

Dec 2012-March 2013: Priority focus was on “backlog and major applications performance” – dealing with these will enable service to prioritise customer service in 2013-14

Proposed April 2013- March 2014: Phone audit and improvement plan. Customer charter/service standards review and upgrade and “getting the basics right” programme

2. Diagnostic Themes and Detailed Analysis – Fortismere Associates and Marc Dorfman

THEME 1: PROCESS & PROCEDURES: Achieving outcomes effectively and sustainably: Nos 1-22

- Efficient and effective processes
- Effective partnership working
- Delivering sustainable outcomes

THEME 2: PERFORMANCE: People, performance and resource management: Nos 23 - 35

- Capacity and the use of resources
- Performance management
- Learning and supportive culture

THEME 3: LEADERSHIP: Leadership and Corporate Engagement: Nos 36-45

- Vision and direction
- Integration of Policy and delivery
- Decision making and scrutiny

THEME 4: CUSTOMER SERVICE: Customer Focus and community engagement: Nos 46-53

- Transparency of process
- Accessibility
- Responsiveness to service users

DETAIL TITLES OF 53 DIAGNOSTIC AREA

THEME 1: Process & Procedure: Achieving outcomes effectively and sustainably

1A) Efficient and effective processes:

1. Development Management Procedures
2. ICT and Customer
3. Application Project Management and Case Audit
4. Pre Application, Performance Agreements and Policy/Council Priorities
5. Registration and Validation

6. S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy
7. Skills – Business as Usual; Specialist and Training
8. Application Consultation
9. Decision Making
10. Delegation
11. Targets and Committee Meetings
12. Enforcement
13. Appeals

1B) Effective partnership working:

14. Local and London Partnerships
15. Conflict Resolution
16. Customer Feedback

1C) Delivering sustainable outcomes/stewardship:

17. Sustainable Development and Regeneration
18. Sustainability
19. Liveability
20. Community Infrastructure and Affordable Housing
21. Responding to the Local Community
22. Building and Urban Design

THEME 2: Performance - People, and resource management

2A) Capacity and the use of resources

23. Staffing Resource Plan
24. DM Skills Assessment
25. Specialist Skills
26. Recruitment and Retention
27. Training
28. Balance of professional/technical staff

2B) Performance Management

- 29. Performance Management System
- 30. Performance Targets
- 31. Target Monitoring
- 32. Improvement Plan

2C) Learning and Supportive Culture

- 33. Service Relationships and perceptions
- 34. Learning from Good Practice
- 35. Learning Culture

THEME 3: Leadership and Corporate Engagement

3A) Vision and direction

- 36. Leadership
- 37. Service Vision
- 38. Budget
- 39. Value for Money

3B) Policy and delivery

- 40. Local Development Framework
- 41. Corporate Engagement
- 42. Data Management

3C) Decision making and scrutiny

- 43. Delegation and Scrutiny
- 44. Consistent Decision Making
- 45. Member Code and Planning Committee

THEME 4: Customer Service and community engagement

4A) Transparency of process

- 46. Customer Charter
- 47. Customer Information
- 48. Statement of Community Involvement

4B) Accessibility

- 49. Access to Customer Information
- 50. Easy to Understand

4C) Responsiveness to service users

- 51. Respect Diverse population – Access
- 52. Respect Diverse population – service demands
- 53. Customer Feedback and service design

DRAFT

THEME 1: PROCESS & PROCEDURE: Achieving outcomes effectively and sustainably (Nos 1-22)

- 1A) Efficient and effective processes
- 1B) Effective partnership working
- 1C) Delivering sustainable outcomes

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
Theme 1A	Efficient and Effective Processes		
<p>1. DM PROCEDURES</p> <p>Are all standard operations and procedures set out to ensure consistent handling of applications, cases etc?</p>	<p>1.1 Is there an up to date procedures manual major, minor and other applications, listed building consents and conservation area consents, tree applications, enforcement cases and appeals?</p> <p>1.2 When was it last reviewed? How is it kept up to date? Is it electronic or hard copy?</p> <p>1.3 Are management or self checking systems in place to ensure procedures are consistently applied?</p> <p>1.4 Are effective management information cascades in place ensuring all staff are kept informed of relevant changes and relevant information enabling them to effectively carry out their role?</p>	<p>1.1 No. Backlog, Majors and Data Audit priority for Dec 2012-March 2013. DM Manual Update in Q2 2013 + self checking system</p> <p>1.2 Partial Review In 2007, followed by updates on key issues. Electronic.</p> <p>1.3 No. Monthly Updates circulated but insufficient imbedding and checking. See 1.1+ 6 monthly Updates</p> <p>1.4 Regular Monthly Regulation/Legislation to staff. Major change management (eg CiL; fees; Permitted Development) – but not systematic, not led or owned by DM Management. See 1.1</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Update DM Manual and regular updates – owned by DM managers Q 2 - 2013/14</u></p> <p>1.2 <u>ICT Statistics Data Entry & Procedures Audit Q4 2012-13 (BAU)</u></p> <p>1.3 <u>DM Procedure New Staff “Buddy” System (in addition to induction) and monthly staff Updates Q1 2012-13</u></p> <p>1.4 <u>DM procedures Audit Q4 2013-14 (BAU)</u></p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p><i>Review comment</i></p>	<p><i>Standard operations and procedures are not currently set out. The information available is not up to date (and has not been comprehensively reviewed since the original manual produced in 2002). It is not used by staff – this means that there is no consistent approach to the handling of applications. New staff pick up information in an adhoc way. There is no ownership and no system to update procedure/process systems or cascades. In the absence of agreed and up to date approach to the handling of applications it is not possible to see how checking systems are in place.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Procedure Update June/Q2 2013-14. Monthly staff Updates in the Interim. New ownership by DM Management via DM Review Action Plan</i></p>		
<p>Key issues to explore</p>	<p>Diagnostic Questions</p>	<p>Service Response/Progress</p>	<p>Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14</p>
<p>2. ICT and CUSTOMER</p> <p>Is a clear electronic delivery strategy in place and is it delivering efficiencies and quality for the customer?</p>	<p>2.1 Applications/Enforcement/Appeals/Conservation Area Consents/Listed Buildings/FOI/Complaints/ME/Ombudsman</p> <p>- Do customer facing and back office ICT Systems optimise the efficient and effective management of receipt and processing of planning applications delivering speed and quality inc letters, member enquiries and FOI?</p>	<p>2.1 Satisfactory. But no ICT Development Plan to improve application/appeals/enforcement tracking and consultation. Information on Public Registers needs improving (TPOs/S106). Need to prepare for CiL. More automatic information to customer/consultee needed and automatic information transfer to reports to support SMART working</p>	<p>2.1 <u>ICT Review and Annual Development Plan</u> Data capture and records for: case deadlines and targets, Registers, AMR data (eg housing, commercial, s106, EIA, TPO listed buildings, conservation areas, archaeology, contaminated land, nature conservation), CiL, community info, tracking cases, case information transfer and consultation support/eg “tweets”). Plan should also look to support SMART working and be compatible</p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

			with North London Boroughs Q2/3 2013-14
<i>Review comment</i> Sept 2012	<p><i>No up to date ICT strategy has been provided. Improvements are required to enable more information to track cases, enable transfer of information into reports, sign off procedure convoluted. Need DMS system. Not clear how ICT needs are being considered as part of SMART working initiative</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: ICT Data Audit Q4 2012/13 and Development and Improvement Plan Q2/3 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>3. APPLICATION & APPEAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Is a project planning approach taken to handling major and complex minor applications? Is the progress of each major application tracked?</p>	<p>3.1 Information on major, minor and other applications received and profile of major applications?</p> <p>3.2 Are early distinctions made between straightforward and complex/controversial applications?</p> <p>3.3 Are key milestones identified in dealing with major, minor, other applications and appeals targets set for their achievement? e.g. registration/validation within 3/5 days, consultation/notification within 5 days; case officer's site visit in the first week; draft report; delegation/committee date, despatch of decision notices within 24 hours of decision.</p> <p>3.4 Is performance against these milestones and targets regularly monitored (indiv/team/service)?</p> <p>3.5 Are planning performance agreements used for complex major applications?</p>	<p>3.1 Yes</p> <p>3.2 Yes</p> <p>3.3 Information is available, but insufficient project and performance management. Staff not required/supported to meet application process targets. Front end validation not rigorous. Admin processes/time targets satisfactory but not developed/explored to do more. New Project and Performance Regime for Majors and Backlog in place</p> <p>3.4 Staff insufficiently directed. This put in place in Dec 2012.</p> <p>3.5 Not rigorously until Dec 2012</p>	<p>3.1 <u>Majors</u>: Team set up; weekly case conference and tracking report. Development Team Approach + Monthly Strategic Sites Meeting. Extra Planning Cttee meetings as required. Pre App and Performance Agreement system in place – Dec 2012 <u>PM for Minors/Others in Q1/2 2013</u> <u>PM to include 6 week deadline</u></p> <p>3.2 <u>New Performance Management & Appraisals - for individuals and teams</u>. 2 Weekly case management meets with targets</p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	<p>3.6 Systematic development team approach, (pre app to development) ?</p> <p>3.7 How is the progress of each application tracked? i.e. is regular monitoring (weekly or at most fortnightly) of performance on applications carried out at key stages in the process?</p> <p>3.8 How does ICT support the tracking of these applications ?</p>	<p>3.6 Not rigorously until Dec 2012</p> <p>3.7 Majors and Backlog priority to Dec 2012- March 2013. Rest Q1 2013/14</p> <p>3.8 Available but not sufficiently used.</p>	<p>(applications, appeals, enforcement, regulations, procedure, projects) Targets in Appraisals – Q1 2013/14</p> <p><u>3.3 Pilot improvements in Cttee/Clr involvement before final decision (eg draft reports to Cttee/member briefings – Q3 2013/14</u></p>
<p>Review comment – Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Members enquiries, complaints and FOI tracked and reported corporately monthly. Performance figures on planning applications are still maintained on basis of NI157 targets and reported to CLG – performance in 2011/12 declined so that Q4 showed not meeting any of the targets – poor performance on others. No project planning approach to handling applications - and key milestones for individual applications are not set and monitored. Registration/validation generally agreed within target time. No real evidence of a performance management culture. No early review of applications and steer given by senior officers as allocation handled by technical support staff.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Major Applications PM in place Q3 2012-13. Priority focus also on Backlog. PM for other applications and appeals Q1/2 2013-14. Staff Appraisal Targets Q1 2013-14. Validation/Early View process changed to provide senior officer steer Q4 2012-13</i></p>		
<p>4. PRE APPLICATION & PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS, and CASE AUDIT TRAIL</p> <p>Is there a clear</p>	<p>4.1 Are there agreed procedures for pre-application discussions, including guidance that is publicly available?</p> <p>4.2 Are there agreed consultation procedures on pre-applications with statutory consultees and the local communities for large/significant major applications?</p>	<p>4.1 Yes</p> <p>4.2 Pre Application consultation encouraged on Major applications (20 pa). Increasingly local members involved – St Ann’s, Lawrence Rd, St Lukes,</p>	<p>4.1 Training on Case Assessment and Report Writing – Q4 2012/13 and ongoing</p> <p>4.2 <u>Case Audit Trail</u>: review electronic, dated</p>

**Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey**

<p>procedure for pre-application discussions in place and case file audit trail ?</p>	<p>4.3 Are written and retrievable records of advice and the outcomes of discussion at pre-application stage kept and sent to potential applicants?</p> <p>4.4 Do pre application processes achieve 'right first time' applications?</p> <p>4.5 Is there clear guidance available for how to obtain pre-application advice on minor and other applications?</p> <p>4.6 Is the use of ICT maximised for providing pre-application advice?</p> <p>4.7 Are files and records well kept? Is there good record keeping with notes maintained and the completion of stages in the process logged including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre application discussions and consultations? • Dates that consultations are sent out and responses received? • Details of any negotiations and request/ receipt of amendments? • Details of pre-application discussions and site visits? • Telephone conversations and meetings held? • Quality control checks by senior officers? • Delegated/ committee report? • Decision notice? • Supporting evidence for decision? 	<p>Hornsey Depot, Tottenham key Sites.</p> <p>4.3 On formal pre apps and performance agreements. But not always followed thru to application stage.</p> <p>4.4 In most cases. But room for improvement.</p> <p>4.5 Yes, but concern about consistency (complaints) and file notes</p> <p>4.6 Guidance on Web, but no proper development plan</p> <p>4.7 Much of this information is recorded electronically. This has led to "process laziness" – particularly formal recording and senior sign off. With Major Application Management and Backlog completed in 2012/13. Report Writing addressed Q4 2012/13. Case Audit and Instructions in Q1 2013-14.</p>	<p>and written record of progress required on all case files.</p> <p>Customer Advice/information/ pre app on both Major & non Major Update. (Ensure all s106, CiL, Consultation checks – neighbs and stat – appraisals, Build for Life, Sustain, Plan policy and key corporate priority outcomes – eg safeguarding - are being negotiated and recorded on file. Ensure "added value" on file and report) Q1 - 2013/14</p>
---	--	--	---

<p><i>Review comment</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Good clear advice on PAPA service available on website. Not reviewed any files but not clear that performance targets are regularly monitored and service delivered as set out. Key staff from outside the DM service not always included in discussions as appropriate e.g housing officer, policy. Members not currently involved at pre-application stage. Registration/validation staff do not currently link notes from discussions to applications subsequently submitted so reliant on case officer knowledge. Whilst the PAPA service is clear the website could provide more advice/signposting for potential applicants on minor/householder applications.</i></p> <p><i>Record keeping for applications is weak – the files reviewed showed that notes are not routinely kept in IPlan (officers keep their own notebooks). Formal pre-application discussions are maintained in separate paper files but are not routinely linked when a proposal is submitted. Consultation dates are recorded and responses received are scanned into the electronic file. Those files inspected did not contain any details of negotiations or request for amendments, there was no evidence of any site visits (no photographs or notes on file or date of visit), telephone conversations or discussions with applicants or consultees. The audit trail for decision making and quality control checks by senior officers were not apparent on the system, nor the sign off process for delegated/committee reports and decision notice. All the supporting evidence for a decision is contained in the officer report – these were very variable in quality and some very poor. Notes on enforcement cases were better although again the audit trail for decision making on cases was not always apparent on the system – enforcement page has initial site visit, decision date and sign off date on first page. Closure notes are signed and scanned.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Validation procedure updated in Q4 2012-13. Major Application PM system in place Q3 2012-13. Report writing and case assessment training Q4 2012-13. Case File Audit and Instruction Q1 2013-14.</i></p>		
<p>5. REGISTRATION & VALIDATION</p> <p>Are efficient registration and validation procedures in place?</p>	<p>5.1 Information requirements set out and up to date ?</p> <p>5.2 Procedures clear and supported by internal guidance notes for staff and published advice for applicants?</p> <p>5.3 Are the procedures in line with the CLG guidance note on information requirements and validation published in March 2010?</p>	<p>5.1 Validation Updated Dec 2012. Professional staff supervision put in place. Need second Update for July 2013</p> <p>5.2 Not sufficient. July 2013</p> <p>5.3 No. Updated Nov 2012</p>	<p>5.1 <u>Validation Update I + Triage - Professional Validation Check- Dec 2012/13</u></p> <p>5.2 <u>Validation Update II. To include Sustainable Design & Construction Checklist and Review of</u></p>

**Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey**

	<p>5.4 Are the procedures appropriate to the type of application? E.g. is there professional input on complex /major applications to ensure early identification of missing information?</p> <p>5.5 Do ICT systems support registration and validation e.g. with good GIS, specialist data and site constraints plotted?</p> <p>5.6 Has the authority had, or does it currently have a backlog of cases awaiting validation?</p>	<p>5.4 Updated Nov 2012 and again July 2013</p> <p>5.5 Yes.</p> <p>5.6 No backlog</p>	<p>Professional Validation Check and Public Consultation – Q2 2013/14</p>
<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Validation guidance on the website is out of date. Registration and validation currently dealt with as two separate processes. A review is required to ensure information requirements are in line with policy e.g basement impact assessments. Those using the formal pre-application advice service are advised in general terms of the information required when submitting an application but not clear how this is used by staff when an application is subsequently submitted. Although there is quite a high rate of initial rejection of applications this is generally because of absence of information/drawings/fee rather than any assessment of the quality of information provided. Professional staff needed.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Validation updated in Q4 2012-13, including professional checks at early stage. Further update and review in Q2 with final system in place July 2013, then bi annual review.</i></p>		
<p>6. S106 & COMMUNITY LEVY</p> <p>Is the authority clear about its section 106/CiL requirements? Are there effective arrangements for securing &</p>	<p>6.1 Does the authority have published guidance on section 106 agreements? What progress has been made in terms of CiL?</p> <p>6.2 Are a range of contributions covered by S106</p> <p>6.3 Are there standard written procedures for</p>	<p>6.1 Yes. Mayor CiL in place. Local CiL Charging Schedule April 2013,</p> <p>6.2 Yes.</p> <p>6.3 Yes. But needs updating – DM Manual</p>	<p>6.1 <u>Mayor CiL Procedure Note and System Review</u>. Check on 106/CiL calculation checking by officers – Q4 2012/13 + Q1/2 2013/14 (BAU)</p> <p>6.2 <u>106/CiL – AMR</u></p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p>monitoring section 106 agreements? Are appropriate systems in place for collecting the Mayoral CiL</p>	<p>handling section 106 agreements and unilateral undertakings?</p> <p>6.4 Are model agreements or standard clauses used where appropriate?</p> <p>6.5 Are there clear liaison arrangements with a legal service for the provision of timely advice</p> <p>6.6 Are there regular interdepartmental discussions on requirements for major development at pre application and post submission stage?</p> <p>6.7 How is the progress of each S106 agreement tracked and monitored to ensure action at the time and in the form required?</p> <p>6.8 Does the authority have in place (from April 2012) appropriate systems for collecting CiL</p>	<p>June 2013</p> <p>6.4 Yes.</p> <p>6.5 Yes.</p> <p>6.6 Yes</p> <p>6.7 Monitoring officer and annual report</p> <p>6.8 Yes. CiL checking and management review in 2013/14</p>	<p>– <u>Regulatory Cttee</u> – Q1 2013/14 (BAU)</p> <p>6.3 <u>Local CiL Procedure Note</u> – Q3 2013/14 (BAU)</p>
<p><i>Review comment</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Arrangements have been put in place to collect Mayoral CiL but no agreed procedure note is in place. Major sites meetings have recently been re-established and will provide a mechanism to determine S106 requirements and a corporate view of priorities. This will need active management. Files reviewed do not record the basis of negotiations/discussions although it is understood that Section 106 agreements are negotiated on the basis of key areas e.g. housing, education, local employment.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Procedure Manual Update June/Q2 2013-14. Monthly staff Updates in the Interim, including CiL calculation and management. New ownership by DM Management via DM Review Action Plan</i></p>		
<p>7. BUSINESS AS USUAL &</p>	<p>7.1 Are systems in place to ensure that standard and specialist skills/advice is</p>	<p>7.1 Yes. But lack of “deep skill” in Core Service (i.e. major schemes; design;</p>	<p>7.1 <u>Structure and Skills Audit Review</u> + <u>Training Plan.</u></p>

<p>SPECIALIST SKILLS & TRAINING</p> <p>Is the right range of 'consultancy' services provided internally and externally by other parts of the Council and its partners to ensure good development delivered?</p>	<p>achieved at the right time to influence development outcome? E.g. viability conservation, design, sustainability, transport, legal?</p> <p>7.2 Can staff identify where they have added value on specific schemes and localities?</p>	<p>viability; sustainability; commissioning).</p> <p>7.2 Statutory requirement is in place.</p>	<p>Introduce Assessment of Professional Competence, once new National Competency Framework launched Sept 2013. Set out Service and individual Training Plans (focus: customer care/getting it right first time; DM procedures; DM regulation updates; design; viability; sustainability; new LP policy; corporate priorities; CiL; performance targets and management) – Q2/3 2013/14</p> <p>(see also 23.2 <u>DM Resource Improvement Plan Part 2 (part of Skills/Structure Review)-</u> Skill Gaps/Staff balance between functions: Majors; Viability Assessment; Service Commissioning; Process streamlining/ICT development and Staff Development programmes –</p>
--	--	---	--

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

			Q2/3 2013/14
<i>Review comment Sept 2012</i>	<p><i>DM officers rely on specialist advice on conservation, design, viability etc as part of the consultation process on proposals. Even where there has been training e.g AH viability, this is not something that DM officers take on themselves. There is currently no mechanism for recording where there has been added value to the development approved as this is not recorded on IPlan.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: basic “added value” recording system in place. This will be reviewed in Q1 2013-14. Service training on design and viability continues on a regular basis, (eg Univ West Course 3-5-13). New staff appointments will add stability and more experience to service.</i></p>		

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>8. APPLICATION CONSULTATION</p> <p>Are there good consultation arrangements in place?</p>	<p>8.1 Does the Council have in place timely arrangements for consultation with regular statutory consultees e.g. highways, environmental health?</p> <p>8.2 Do case officers actively ensure/chase responses are received?</p> <p>8.3 Are neighbours given timely clear information about proposals e.g. does neighbour notification/site visits/press adverts take place at an early stage and is information provided about how neighbours can make representations?</p> <p>8.4 ICT support the consultation arrangements e.g. use of GIS to identify neighbours, generation of consultation</p>	<p>8.1 Yes</p> <p>8.2 Not sufficiently. Review and instruct. Part of DM Manual Update.</p> <p>8.3 Yes - letters, site notices, press adverts and on the website. However, not always checked on site</p> <p>8.4 ICT system not sufficiently used. Development Plan needed</p>	<p>8.1 SCI Check - Project and Performance Management – Q3/4 2013/14</p> <p>(ICT Development Plan – see Nos 2.1 above)</p>

**Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey**

	<p>letters etc., automated consultation, e-forms for submission of representations/responses?</p> <p>8.5 Design Panel and Development Management Forum?</p>	<p>8.5 yes</p>	
<p><i>Review comment</i></p>	<p><i>Consultees are identified at the registration stage but not clear that SCI always followed – need quality checks. Case officer does not always check the consultees. Design Panel input is valued but case officers do not routinely go to panel meetings to hear the discussion and it is not clear how amendments/negotiations are handled following the advice. The Development Management Forum appears to be working well and is seen as an important part of the process on major/controversial applications. Notes from the design panel/forum etc are appended to the officer report.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Monthly DM Staff briefings and reminders. DM Manual Update Q2 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>9. DECISION MAKING</p> <p>Are there efficient decision making processes leading to expeditious decision making?</p>	<p>9.1 Are standard report formats used for delegated and committee items?</p> <p>9.2 What use is made of standard conditions, reasons for refusal and reasons for approval? What use is made of pre-commencement conditions? Are they used appropriately or indiscriminately?</p> <p>9.3 Does the timing of any Planning Committee member site visits facilitate efficient decision making?</p> <p>9.4 Do the reports identify the relevant policies and include an assessment of the proposal, consultee comments and other material planning considerations? Are the reports sufficient for use if taken to appeal?</p>	<p>9.1 Yes. Reports shortened/focused Jan 2013. (Report Writing and Standards Guide and Training at 4.1 and new PM at 3.1 above)</p> <p>9.2 Conditions and reasons reviewed and pre commencement put in place Jan 2013</p> <p>9.3 Yes</p> <p>9.4 Yes</p>	<p>9.1 Conditions and <u>Reasons</u> Updated Q4 2012/13</p> <p>9.2 <u>Pre Commencement</u> in place Q4 2012/13 (BAU)</p> <p>9.3 <u>“Spot check” compliance system</u> (eg check every 20th application) Q2 2013/14</p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	<p>9.5 Is the percentage of applications that go to appeal as a result of non determination low?</p> <p>9.6 Do decision notices set out clearly the reasons for approval/refusal and identify where further submissions are required e.g approval of details or amendments made to make a scheme acceptable?</p> <p>9.7 Are approval of conditions submissions monitored and decisions taken efficiently?</p>	<p>9.5 Yes.</p> <p>9.6 Yes</p> <p>9.7 Not sufficiently. Need spot check system</p>	
<p><i>Review comment</i></p>	<p><i>Standard conditions and reasons for refusal need to be updated. Report writing is variable but often very weak. Reports are too long, do not summarise and tease out clearly the main issues. Need for a simpler template for straightforward applications. Original reports are generally used for appeals. Decision notices do not separate out pre-commencement conditions and ongoing conditions. No proactive monitoring of compliance with pre commencement conditions. Report writing would benefit from being undertaken at an earlier stage in the process.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Monthly DM Staff briefings and reminders. DM Manual Update Q2 2013-14. Report writing and case assessment training delivered in 2012/13 – reports now shorter and more focused. Pre commencement conditions now separated. “Spot checks” system to be put in place in 2013/14. Performance management system in 2013/14 Q1/2 will require reports to be produced at 6 weeks.</i></p>		
<p>10. DELEGATION</p> <p>Do delegation arrangements ensure that the committee(s) only deals with complex and /or</p>	<p>10.1 Do the delegation arrangements enable decisions to be taken regularly and ensure that targets are met?</p> <p>10.2 Is there a member call in procedure and how does it operate?</p>	<p>10.1 Yes, 97/98% of all decisions taken are delegated.</p> <p>10.2 No. Members bring applications to the attention of the Heads of Service or DM/Chair before a decision is taken to call in an application.</p>	<p>10.1 <u>Review Delegated Information and Call in List Procedure</u> – Part of DM manual see 1.1 above - Q1 2013/14 (BAU)</p>

**Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey**

<p>controversial applications?</p>	<p>10.3 Does it allow for only proposals that are normally delegated to be called in to committee if they are controversial?</p> <p>10.4 Are the mechanisms for referring applications to committee clear and trigger referral both early in the process and for appropriate reasons (i.e. for planning reasons)?</p> <p>10.5 Is the delegation agreement overridden? I.e. are high numbers of simple applications being called in to committee for decision?</p> <p>10.6 Are the reasons and numbers of deferrals and call-ins monitored?</p>	<p>10.3 No.</p> <p>10.4 Yes. Numbers are small and not always for planning reasons.</p> <p>10.5 No.</p> <p>10.6 No. Numbers are small.</p>	
<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>A weekly list of applications due for determination under delegated powers is circulated to members together with the draft report each Friday. These are then determined the following week. Need to check call in procedure and that such a procedure can operate within 8/13 time targets. Need to check issue of applications being added late to delegated list.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Delegated List and Call in procedure review Q1 2013-14. Monthly DM Staff briefings and reminders. DM Manual Update Q2 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>11. STATUTORY TARGETS and COMMITTEE DECISIONS</p>	<p>11.1 What is the cycle of committee(s) and does it ensure that decision making targets can be met? Is it frequent enough for complex minor and major decisions to be made within the local targets set?</p> <p>11.2 What are the reasons for decisions missing the targets?</p>	<p>11.1 Major Application Performance Management in place since Nov/Dec 2012. 13/16 week met and or/PPAs in place. Special/extra Cttees can be created. See 3 above</p> <p>11.2 Lack of Major Application Performance Management – now in place since Q4 2012/13</p>	

**Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey**

	<p>11.3 Are both the presentation and agenda requirements, including timing of preparation of reports, conducive to both speedy decision making and members having the information to make the decision?</p> <p>11.4 Is there appropriate liaison and briefing with members prior to committee?</p> <p>11.5 What is the deferral rate? (If this is more than 10% then it is high).</p>	<p>11.3 Yes</p> <p>11.4 – Yes. Head of DM is available for briefing members as required.</p> <p>11.5 - 5%</p>	
<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Planning Sub Committee meets monthly and additional meetings can be arranged where necessary. Those applications considered by Committee are generally not within target times</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Majors now on target and extra Cttees arranged as required. Q1 2013-14 performance management for “others/minors” will put in place similar system.</i></p>		

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>12. ENFORCEMENT</p> <p>Are there effective enforcement processes in place?</p>	<p>12.1 Is there a priority system for dealing with complaints, and clarity about which conditions and plans will be proactively monitored for compliance? Does this accord with the Councils policy? Are there local performance indicators</p> <p>12.2 Has the Council signed up to the Enforcement Concordat and if so do procedures comply?</p> <p>12.3 What is the percentage of enforcement appeals upheld?</p> <p>12.4 What is the proportion of prosecutions taken that are successful?</p> <p>12.5 Is the interaction with other relevant services e.g. noise monitoring, environmental health and building control effective in terms of integrated action?</p> <p>12.6 Are the roles of respective services clear e.g. legal service?</p>	<p>12.1 Yes. (Enforcement Case tracking – ICT Improvement Plan – see Nos 2 above)</p> <p>12.2 Yes. To be reviewed Dec2013</p> <p>12.3 5-10% - low, which good.</p> <p>12.4 93%</p> <p>12.5 Yes</p> <p>12.6 Yes</p>	<p>12.1 <u>Enforcement Concordat and Charter Review</u> – Q2/3 2013/14 See also ICT Development Plan above 2.1 (BAU)</p>
<p><i>Review comment</i></p> <p><i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Enforcement charter and guide to planning enforcement in place (2009) but due for an update. Some thought has been given to need for additional local advice given the introduction of the NPPF and loss of PPG18 and a draft note circulated for comment in April 2012. There are priorities but generally a reactive rather than proactive service (little direct action). Some exceptions to this e.g Myddleton Road and Tower Gardens – Noel Park a priority for 2012/13. However scope for more proactive work to monitor applications invited, direct action, monitor conditions and dissemination. Since May 2011 have been back within the planning service. Procedures need to be revisited and information improved on IPlan to track cases and provide an audit trail of decision making</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM Manual Update Q2 2013-14. ICT Development Plan in 2013/14 and review of PE resources including part supported from POCA; planning applications fees from enforcement work and costs awards when appeals against enforcement lost.</i></p>		

<p>13. APPEALS</p> <p>Is the administration of appeals handled efficiently?</p>	<p>13.1 Does the Council meet all the targets set by PINS e.g. consultations despatched, questionnaire returned and statement within time limits?</p> <p>13.2 Are the procedures clear including the relationship with and role of the legal service?</p> <p>13.3 Are appeals statements (where necessary) produced that are of a high quality, arguing the case and providing evidence? How is this quality monitored? What is the success level?</p>	<p>13.1 In majority of cases</p> <p>13.2 Yes</p> <p>13.3 Performance is measured by Appeal results; timeliness of document submission and new Learning Review</p>	<p>13.1 <u>Monthly Learning and Promotion of Good Performance Review and Meeting – Appeals</u>; Cttee; Ombudsman; complaints; MEs; FOIs; Pre Apps and Schemes/Cases.</p> <p>13.2 <u>Mini Action Plan for “Appeals Quality” in place</u> by end of Q1 2013-14</p>
<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Revised draft procedure note prepared and issued to staff on 13 December 2011 but not yet incorporated in manual. Legal generally involved on inquiries. Level of success on appeals is above the national average.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Haringey Appeal performance declined in Feb/April 2013 – concerns about PINS interpretation of parking/extension and design policies. Mini Action Plan to be created in May 2013.</i></p>		

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<i>Theme 1B</i>	<i>Effective Partnership Working</i>		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>14. LOCAL and LONDON PARTNERSHIPS</p> <p>Are day to day linkages in place with local and regional bodies responsible for development outcomes?</p>	<p>14.1 Are mechanisms in place such as joint working groups, partnership agreements and protocols?</p> <p>14.2 Is the development team approach fully operational including where necessary external partners? – and for major schemes</p> <p>14.3 Are integrated services delivered to ensure high quality in e.g. street scene and the public realm, sustainable transport, sustainable construction?</p>	<p>14.1 Yes – GLA; adjoining Boroughs (NLSA), Statutory consultees eg English Heritage, NLWA, Environment Agency.</p> <p>14.2 Yes. More liaison work needed on Majors from other Boroughs.</p> <p>14.3 On major public realm projects (eg Wood Green/Green Lanes and Tottenham High Rd a bespoke project management system is set up. When public realm s106 is ready to be spent a similar PM system is put in place. Haringey has a “street scene guide” that is agreed with Frontline Services.</p>	<p>14.1 <u>Review Neighbouring Borough Major Application Information</u> – Q2 2013/14 (BAU)</p> <p>14.2 <u>Set up talks and visits from key local/statutory agencies and ensure /check contact/database details</u> – this in place but adhoc – set up programme for the year in Q2 2013/14 (BAU)</p>
<i>Review comment</i>	<p><i>Seems patchy with the major sites meeting only recently re-established and not clear how this links to asset management and other corporate groups. Not clear that all relevant bodies/relevant services within Council are involved at pre-application stage or during the application process</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Majors PM system in place Q3 2012/13. “others/minors” PM system Q1 2013/14</i></p>		
<p>15. RESOLVING SITE/POLICY CONFLICTS</p>	<p>15.1 Conflict/partnership agreement protocols? E.g. pre-application discussions/development team approach with regeneration and conservation agencies, flood risk assessment with environment agency and infrastructure</p>	<p>15.1 Yes.</p>	<p>CiL/CiP Working Party to be established in 2013/14. (BAU)</p>

	provision with the highways agency.		
	15.2 Is there a mechanism in place for prioritising section 106 requirements on a scheme, both corporately and externally, with key stakeholders e.g. highways, education contributions?	15.2 Yes. Supplementary Planning Guidance and Major Application Project Management. CiL Working Party in place. CiL/CiP Working Party to be established in 2013/14	

DRAFT

<p><i>Review comment</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Mechanism not yet embedded as development team approach only recently reintroduced – not clear what agreements, protocols and terms of reference are in place. Seems a bit hit and miss as to who is involved and planning is not always involved in early corporate discussions. Mechanism will be needed if local CIL introduced to determine priority projects</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: CiL/CiP Working Party to be set up - Q2 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>16. CUSTOMER FEEDBACK</p> <p>(USE COMPLAINTS; APPEALS; OMBUDSMAN; CUSTOMER FEEDBACK to IMPROVE SERVICE)</p> <p>Does the service have a culture of facilitating solutions rather than confrontation?</p>	<p>16.1 How does the service deal with conflicts of interest?</p> <p>16.2 Does the service seek local settlement of complaints rather than ombudsman referral? What mediation arrangements are in place in relation to internal, external consultees, members, the community and applicants? How does the service deal with freedom of information requests?</p>	<p>16.1/2 Targets for Member Enquiries; Ombudsman; Complaints; Appeals; FOIs are set. PRE has improved its performance on replying in 12/13. But PRE still has high levels of Ombudsman Complaints/Complaints per member of staff. Whilst this level of “complaint” is not high against national average levels – it indicated the need to address conflict in a more thorough way. In some cases, where appropriate and feasible – mediation explored and used.</p>	<p>16.1 <u>Local Cllr Proposal – “How Planning Works” - Community Information presentations</u>, and workshops on planning policy, applications and enforcement Q4 2012/13 and repeat monthly/quarterly</p> <p>16.2 <u>New Service Leaflets and Charter – Q2/3 2013/14</u></p> <p>16.3 <u>Maintenance of Regulatory Cttee scrutiny role and Agents Forum</u> and Application Feedback – Regular reports (BAU)</p> <p>16.4 <u>Review “complaints/ME/Ombudsman/Appeals” to seek 2013/14</u></p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

		<p><u>Business Plan</u> Improvements – Q1 2013/14 (BAU)</p> <p>(See also Monthly Appeals and Complaints Learning – 13.1 above)</p>
<p>Review comment Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>There was little evidence from those complaints reviewed that complaints are used to drive change to working methods/arrangements.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: 2012/13 PRE improved performance in terms of response to complaints. 2013-14: check SCI performance; build complaints analysis into business plan; phone audit; customer charter and more community information.</i></p>	

DRAFT

Theme 1C	Delivering Sustainable Outcomes/Stewardship		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>17. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT /REGENERATION GUIDANCE and AIMS</p> <p>Is the authority clear about its pursuit of sustainable development in its requirements for developments?</p>	<p>17.1 Does the range of SPD available cover the pertinent local development issues and sustainability criteria? i.e. Does the authority set explicit local success criteria for development that seek sustainable development and express them to developers in their pre-application guidance e.g. for regeneration projects/sites, design quality, treatment of listed buildings, sustainable transport, public spaces, community benefit, eco-building standards, protection of habitats; on site renewables?</p> <p>17.2 Is the authority explicit with regard to what it considers to be the critical local environmental, economic and social assets that significantly contribute to local distinctiveness, (e.g. area regeneration projects; nature conservation and built conservation, and fostering recreational and cultural facilities?); seek to negotiate and evaluate annually delivery – AMR ?</p>	<p>17.1/2 Yes – Annual Monitoring Reports, Regulatory Cttee, Scrutiny Cttees. (Sustainable Design and Construction SPD Checklist in place July 2013 and new Validation List to be in place by July 2013. Muswell Hill Low Carbon Zone used as exemplar. See Nos 4 and 5 above)</p>	

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<i>Review comment Sept 2012</i>	<p><i>Draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD sets standards beyond building regulations (as does London Plan) e.g Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes but this and other elements in the SPD do not seem to be consistently applied and negotiated. Departmental group charged with looking at implementation and to develop a checklist. Greening your home guide although a few years old could be used more effectively for householder proposals</i></p> <p><i>Could link in better with work done by Environment Resources team and initiatives e.g Green Deal and Muswell Hill Low carbon Zone</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: New Validation/Sustainable checklist in place July 2013. See Nos 5 above</i></p>		
<p>18. SUSTAINABILITY</p> <p>Does decision-making protect and enhance the area's assets and promote sustainability?</p>	<p>18.1 Do decisions take account of the range of national guidance and technical studies e.g. design and access statements, conservation area appraisals, nature conservation appraisals? Checklists used ?</p> <p>18.2 Does the Council require a high standard e.g. Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes?</p>	<p>18.1/2 Yes. See Nos 17 above.</p> <p>18.2 No. Need for development opportunity across the Borough and new homes, so remain at statutory minimum level. But if chance to negotiate higher this is encouraged. Developers also concerned about new costs (CIL). LBH negotiates Code for Sustainable Homes govt guideline.</p>	
<i>Review comment Sept 2012</i>	<p><i>Not pursued systematically – sustainability checklist not yet in use. Code 4 required but not always negotiated/achieved.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: New Validation/Sustainable checklist in place July 2013. See Nos 5 above</i></p>		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals

			2013/14
<p>19. LIVEABILITY/SENSE OF PLACE</p> <p>Does decision-making meet the aspirations of the community in terms of providing facilities, sense of place and liveability?</p>	<p>19.1 Is the area inclusive, meeting the needs of the widest range of its community? Does the local area provide an appropriate level and range of community facilities in relation to its need and size, with facilities that meet the needs of the range of local residents in age, ethnicity, social structure, life stage and income? Where there is shortfall in provision is the deficiency being addressed?</p> <p>19.2 Does the area have vibrant local centres and high streets providing the appropriate range of retail and leisure facilities for the size of the settlement and creating liveable streets?</p> <p>19.3 Is the locality well connected and integrated? Can everyone access the full range of facilities because places are well connected by public and private transport & design meets the accessibility needs of all?</p> <p>19.4 Is satisfaction with the local area high?</p>	<p>19.1 LDF Development Plan Documents carried out to Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) standards. Community Infrastructure Plan published as part of LDF and Levy should be in place by April 2014. These also partly with Council Corporate Plan and to Area Forum Service Plans (clusters of wards). Monitoring reports on LDF planning objectives and a separate report on S106 work are prepared and presented to Cabinet and Regulatory Cttee respectively.</p> <p>19.2 Town Centre and Retail studies being carried out in 2013. These will inform both DM DPD; planning and corporate project work. In 2012/13 the Council supported all the Haringey TC Business Partnerships and or Areas to improve footfall and vitality. Commitment to 2013/14 (March 2014) to improvement plans for TCs.</p> <p>19.3 Haringey has an annual LiP and Transport Strategy which along with its LDF supports “access for all and PT” as main aims. This is addressed by Policy, Projects and DM negotiation.</p> <p>19.4 Haringey subscribes to resident/customer feedback and this is reviewed when the Borough considers business plans and service priorities.</p>	

<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>No evidence in files reviewed of links to the community infrastructure plan and looking to meet identified deficits. Service still sees itself as largely regulatory rather than about implementing the plan, and managing development and achieving corporate objectives.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Link between DM and LDF delivery dealt with through officer liaison and AMR at the end of each year, so - DM Review comment relevant. 2013/14, therefore see Nos 4.2 above.</i></p>		
<p>20. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE & AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <p>Does the authority add value to development proposals through success in negotiating appropriate contributions from developers to meet community needs?</p>	<p>20.1 What contribution to the range of community facilities available is delivered through section 106 agreements and unilateral undertakings such as leisure facilities, management of open space, improved transport etc and are the negative impacts of development mitigated by these benefits? How will this be transferred to CIL?</p> <p>20.2 Do affordable housing levels meet local need and is the community well served with core facilities such as children's play, sustainable transport?</p>	<p>20.1/2 LDF Development Plan Documents carried out to Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) standards. Community Infrastructure Plan published as part of LDF and Levy should be in place by April 2014. These also with Council Corporate Plan and to Area Forum Service Plans (clusters of wards). Monitoring reports on LDF planning objectives (including affordable housing and community infrastructure) and a separate report on S106 work are prepared and presented to Cabinet and Regulatory Cttee respectively. AMR is produced. See Nos 15 above</p>	
<p><i>Review comment</i></p>	<p>Between 2005-11 approximately £13m was received through S106. Council employs 2 officers for</p>		

<p><i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p>monitoring, negotiating and managing S106. Council due to consult shortly on draft charging schedule for CIL.</p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: CiL/CiP Working Party to be set up - Q2 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>21. RESPONDING TO COMMUNITY COMMENTS & ASPIRATIONS</p> <p>Does the authority add value to proposals through success in negotiating amendments to schemes to reflect community need and concerns?</p>	<p>21.1 Do clear examples exist of proposals which have been improved for the benefit of the community?</p> <p>21.2 Where ethnic communities have specific spatial needs (e.g. relating to extended families) have these been addressed in planning new developments?</p> <p>21.3 Have issues about congestion, transport and parking been effectively addressed?</p>	<p>21.1/3 Annual Monitoring Reports, Scrutiny, Regulatory and Planning Cttee.</p> <p>21.2 South Tottenham Design Guide (SPD) is good example of specific spatial needs (very large family size), being accommodated by planning policy. Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and the Plan for Tottenham are other good examples of local planning through local consultation.</p> <p>21.3 Annual Monitoring Report and Transport Strategy/Projects illustrate action and funding focus on “place making”, access for all; town centres, public transport and support the “transport hierarchy”.</p>	
<p><i>Review comment</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>This information is not readily available as it is not currently recorded on IPlan so it is not clear where DM officers add value to proposals</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Link between DM and LDF delivery dealt with through officer liaison and AMR at the end of each year. Nos 4.2 above will seek to improve assessment and explanation of this link and exemplify in officer reports. .CiL/CiP Working Party to be set up - Q2 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>Key issues to explore</p>	<p>Diagnostic Questions</p>	<p>Service Response/Progress</p>	<p>Actions</p>

			2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>22. BUILDING & URBAN DESIGN</p> <p>Does the service achieve a high quality of design in individual buildings streets and places in terms of both urban form and sustainability criteria?</p>	<p>22.1 Does the area and its constituent parts have a strong sense of place?</p> <p>22.2 Does new development create or reinforce local distinctiveness and inclusivity adding to the quality and character of the area?</p> <p>22.3 Is satisfaction with the appearance and usability of new development high?</p> <p>22.4 Is the ecological footprint of new development low in that it respects environmental limits, reflects high standards of energy efficiency, has low water and minerals usage, uses sustainable materials, promotes renewable energy, minimises the need to travel and takes climate change impacts into account?</p> <p>22.5 How does the Council use the design panel to assist with assessment of major proposals?</p> <p>22.6 Is the enforcement service pro-active, monitoring conditions and ensuring compliance?</p>	<p>22.1 LDF Local Plan adopted March 2013 has a “local place” section which sets out distinctiveness. These mirror Area Forums and Service Improvement projects.</p> <p>22.2 Local consultation; neighbourhood character; conservation area and advisory groups - and Design Panel used to support assessments of planning applications to promote distinctiveness. Streetscape Design Manual in place to support s106/transport/highway capital spend.</p> <p>22.3 Design Panel and Design Awards support quality design. 2013 will see a “characterisation study” and further development of “Design Improvement ” programme.</p> <p>22.4 2013 will see establishment of Sustainable Design checklist</p> <p>22.5 See above at 22.2/3</p> <p>22.6 Planning Enforcement focuses on community/resident demand. Trial “spot checking” of conditions, will begin in 2013, to do some compliance work. See Nos 9 above</p>	<p>22.1 <u>Design Panel Assessment</u> Q1 2013 Planning Policy. See also proposal for “compliance spot checks” at 9.3 above (BAU)</p>
<i>Review comment</i>	<i>Reliance by DM officers on advice from specialists but not possible to assess impact of advice as it is</i>		

<p>Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>not possible from the records available to identify where this has led to changes to proposals. Enforcement service largely reactive with little compliance monitoring.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Enforcement/Compliance spot checking to be introduced in 2013/14. Improvement in case file notes/audit and added value also to be introduced. See Nos 3,4,9 and 12 above.</i></p>
------------------	--

DRAFT

THEME 2: PERFORMANCE: People, performance and resource management

- Capacity and the use of resources
- Performance management
- Learning and supportive culture

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
Theme 2A	Capacity and Use of Resources		
<p>23. STAFFING</p> <p>Are staffing levels/resources appropriate?</p>	<p>21.1 What is the average FTE case officer (include planners and technicians carrying caseload) caseload per annum. How does it relate to the 150 benchmark? If above 150 are caseload levels sustainable in relation to the profile of cases and committee structures (i.e. proportion of major/minor/other applications received by the authority compared to the national average profile of 3% major, 27% minor and 70% other applications and the decision making processes in operation) and look to see whether it is static, increasing or decreasing over a period of the last 2 years and that projected for forthcoming year.</p> <p>23.2 How has the Council used the PAS benchmarking exercise to assess how its service compares in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and use of resources for different parts of the service when</p>	<p><u>Applications</u></p> <p>23.1 In 2012/13 – 2298 applications received, plus 1000 backlog applications of which 300 needed to be processed. DM staff = head of service and 7.5 staff allocated to DM + 4 extra agency staff for part of the year to deal with backlog and improve performance on 2011/12. Equal to = 192 applications per staff member. Application profile = 1% major; 16% minor and 82% other.</p> <p>The % of agency staff high; team leaders carried case loads; no area teams; no majors team and no sharing between planning and enforcement officers, significant backlog of cases to manage and sickness level affected productive capacity.</p> <p><u>Part 1 DM Resource Improvement Plan Q4 2012/13: focus on backlog and Majors performance; recruitment</u></p>	<p>23.1 <u>DM Resource Improvement Plan Part 1. New Interim Head of DM and extra Agency staff to deal with Backlog –Q4 2012/13 (BAU)</u></p> <p>23.2 <u>DM Resource Improvement Plan Part 2. Skill Gaps/Staff balance between functions: Majors; Viability Assessment; Service Commissioning; Process streamlining/ICT development and Staff Development programmes – Q2/3 2013-14</u></p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	<p>compared to other similar authorities? What changes have been made as a result?</p> <p>23.3 Is time for pre-application discussions provided for in the staff resources? Is the service self financing?</p> <p>23.4 Is there a backlog of applications (see <i>backlog definition footnote 2</i>) and is it static, growing or declining? What measures are in place to clear it?</p> <p>23.5 Is the proportion of administrative support staff appropriate to the number of case officers and the scale of the work?</p> <p>23.6 What is the caseload of enforcement staff? How does it relate to the 150 complaints per officer guideline? Is the caseload achieving the enforcement objectives of the service? Is there a backlog of complaints?</p> <p>23.7 Are enforcement cases followed through i.e. is the service of a notice then followed up with action if not acted upon by the recipient?</p> <p>23.8 How is appeals and enforcement work</p>	<p>to reduce agency staff and new Head of DM Service; majors team in place and two temporary area teams – subject to review in 2013/14; more officer guidance and sickness/performance management; share workload between applications and enforcement staff to get to more balanced workload position by April 2013. Cases “live” at April 2013 is 275 compared to 1000 in Jan 2012. Major applications on target.</p> <p><u>Part 2 DM Resource Improvement Plan Proposal - June 2013.</u> DM professional establishment is 1 manager, 1 team leader and 8 officer posts and around 2000 applications. It is likely that this will need to increase by 1/2 officers in 2013/14 in order to maintain performance and improve service quality – particularly need Majors skill level. This will be achieved through temporary maintenance of some agency staff and a DM Review/Part 2 Improvement Plan to look at options for service delivery, including DM Technical Staff and Enforcement Staff. Part 2 Plan will also need to take into account the possibility of “1 year Special Measures” Designation. To be considered as part of Place Restructure and increase in demand for Planning Enforcement.</p>	<p>23.3 <u>Enforcement Staff</u> – look to increase via POCA and possible joint working across Enforcement services – Q2/3 2013-14</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>staffed in terms of administrative support? How is appeals work staffed in terms of case officers bearing in mind the 150 guide for case officers excludes appeals case work?</p>	<p>23.2 PAS Benchmarking March 2012 undertaken but not reviewed. Second Benchmark undertaken in Dec/Jan. Results awaited April 2013.</p> <p>23.3 Pre Application self financing under review – see 23.2</p> <p>23.4 Backlog substantially cleared @ April 2013, (see 23.1). However 23 applications still over 26 weeks. This to be addressed in Q1 2013/14.</p> <p>23.5 Administrative Support- under Review see 23.1</p> <p><u>Enforcement</u></p> <p>23.6 Enforcement Caseload per officer @ 180 is high. 750/850 enquiries pa, 80-100 notices and 10-20 prosecutions pa with 4 staff and team leader. The service is improving year on year - but there is high demand and high service pressure. See 23.1</p> <p>23.7 Enforcement Notices are followed up, but quickly enough – this will need to review in 2014</p> <p><u>Appeals</u></p> <p>23.8 Appeals: Approximately 100 pa. Service timeliness needs to be improved and Jan/Feb saw increase in appeal loss rate for first time in 2 years – this needs to be reviewed,</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>through staff guidance; performance management and Monthly Learning sessions. See Nos 13 above</p>	
<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Given the profile of applications compared with the national average and the support from outside the service for major applications the current DM resources for applications should be sufficient to cope with the caseload of around 160 applications per year. Yet case officers are carrying very high caseloads 80+ applications and there is a backlog of applications. Additional resources have recently been recruited to clear the backlog but no clear plan and there is an air of firefighting with performance and morale dropping. The PAS/MEPs benchmarking report received in March 2012 has not been evaluated and considered by SMT and has not yet been used to inform the action plan for the service. Although the pre-application service is self financing the service is provided by senior DM officers in addition to their caseload and is not always given the priority it needs to meet the time targets. The operation of the team on a borough wide basis and allocation of work on a taxi rank principle leads to inefficiencies with case officers needing to attend site visits throughout the Borough. Pressure on officers means that sites are not always visited.</i></p> <p><i>There is a good level of technical support (one of whom also has a small caseload of applications) and act as a first point of contact for the PAPA service. Enforcement caseloads are higher than the 150 benchmark (about 190 at start of 2012/13 including the team leader, without team leader this would equate to about 210). Referral of Tottenham cases is likely to increase the workload and means it is necessarily a reactive service at present. Although appeals are dealt with by case officers in addition to their caseloads the new householder appeals service means that the number requiring additional statements/proofs of evidence should be relatively low.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM Improvement Plan will review resource allocation in 2013/14, including productivity improvements; costs of ICT improvements; improved skills and processes and balance of staff resources between customer/professional/technical. This work will build on new PAS benchmark work to be verified in May/June.</i></p>		

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>24. DM SKILLS ASSESSMENT</p> <p>Has the development management service achieved the range and mix of skills needed to deliver its aims and objectives? Are there any gaps in skills/ experience?</p>	<p>24.1 What is the experience profile of staff (whether employed direct or agent/consultants) in relation to caseload profile e.g. if there are large numbers of complex major applications are there adequate numbers of senior, experienced staff? If there are a large number of listed buildings, is there adequate expertise?</p> <p>24.2 Are there adequate management, technical, administrative, enquiry, reception and project management skills as well as planning skills?</p> <p>24.3 Have there been any changes to the FTE posts in development management in the last year? Are any changes planned?</p> <p>24.4 Does a competency framework exist for the service and is a competency based approach to selection taken?</p> <p>24.5 Do members have the appropriate range and level of skills and competencies for their role? (Is the PAS elected member's planning skills framework used?)</p>	<p>24.1 Skills Audit – see Nos 7 above Despite low % of Majors (1% = 20 pa), service still lacks strong/high skill levels in this area. Appoint staff member and develop existing members. See Nos 23</p> <p>24.2 PRE will need service delivery/commissioning skills; viability assessment; service process streamlining/ICT improvement. Use PAS support. See Nos 23</p> <p>24.3 Recruitment now ongoing</p> <p>24.4 Competency Framework at national level to be launched Sept 2013. Review in 2014. See Nos 7</p> <p>24.5 Member training undertaken every May with external trainers</p>	
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Not aware of any skills audit of either officers or members in DM. DM service is however over dependent on temporary (but long term) agency staff. DM officers tend to rely on specialist input for</i></p>		

	<p><i>design, viability, transport even on the simple applications. Current one team structure does not work effectively with not enough supervision of staff – since the loss of a team leader/Head of DM there is insufficient management capacity in the current arrangement so that there are not always regular 1:1s or team meetings. Enforcement has undertaken training audit.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Skills/Training Audit in 2013/14 – see Nos 7. PM and Appraisal targets; case conferences; regular management arrangements all now in place. Increased delegation has provided DM management with more time/resource.</i></p>		
<p>25. DM SPECIALIST SKILLS</p> <p>Is access to external services appropriate?</p>	<p>25.1 Is specialist advice permanently available for design, highways, conservation, arboricultural, and ecological advice either in-house, from another authority or group of authorities, from a public body, or from the private sector?</p> <p>25.2 Are staff deployed flexibly to tackle peaks in workload?</p>	<p>25.1 London Councils will pilot “skill share project for town planning” in Oct-Dec 2013. LBH continues to use pre app/performance agreement funding to buy specialist services when needed. Design and Conservation Officer was replaced in Planning Policy.</p> <p>25.2 Draft JDs for restructure have created a “generic JD”</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>There is specialist advice available in house. But with resources limited, more flexibility and sharing of skills needed</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM Improvement Plan will review resource allocation in 2013/14, including productivity improvements; costs of ICT improvements; improved skills and processes and balance of staff resources between customer/professional/technical. This work will build on new PAS benchmark work to be verified in May/June.</i></p>		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>26. DM RECRUITMENT & RETENTION</p>	<p>26.1 Have there been changes to the establishment over the past 18 months and are any further</p>	<p>26.1 DM professional/technical service has reduced 25% over 3 years. DM and BC Technical teams</p>	

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p>Does a recruitment and retention strategy exist which manages the vacancy and turnover rates experienced by the service?</p>	<p>changes/restructuring proposed?</p> <p>26.2 Is the service over reliant on temporary staff i.e. are key positions or a high proportion of positions held by temporary staff or as temporary posts? Why?</p> <p>26.3 Does the authority consider there have been any recruitment and retention problems in the last 18 months?</p>	<p>have been integrated. Emphasis is now on skill and process upgrading.</p> <p>26.2 Yes. Lack of skills and development of permanent staff, despite training and development. But this is now being rectified.</p> <p>26.3 Yes. Senior staff.</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Current restructuring proposals have dominated this issue and further savings need to be identified for the current year.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Skills/Training Audit in 2013/14 – see Nos 7. LBH to introduce professional Assessment of Professional Competence (RTPI system), once national competency for TP launched Sept 2013.</i></p>		
<p>27. DM TRAINING</p> <p>Does a training and development strategy exist that meets the needs of the service?</p>	<p>27.1 Is member training compulsory for those on committee or holding a portfolio, is it provided for all members, held frequently and comprehensive in its coverage?</p> <p>27.2 Are staff sponsored on planning courses to develop their skills/provide CPD?</p> <p>27.3 Is there an active developmental approach to all staff e.g. linked to staff appraisals?</p>	<p>27.1 Planning Committee members required to attend planning and probity training.</p> <p>27.2 PRE has no apprenticeships and does not sponsor qualification of junior staff. Training budget limited. Funds need to be developed from restructure/re provision of service.</p> <p>27.3 Appraisal of DM professional staff has been poor. Poor attitude to regular and searching learning and testing. Need to require Assessment of Professional Competency. Nos 7</p>	

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p><i>Review comment</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Member training programme is organised and 7 member training sessions were held in 2011/12 covering policy updates, conservation, house extensions, building control, use classes order but enforcement not yet covered. Have set up a series of lunchtime seminars for officers.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Skills/Training Audit in 2013/14 – see Nos 7.</i></p>		
<p>Key issues to explore</p>	<p>Diagnostic Questions</p>	<p>Service Response/Progress</p>	<p>Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14</p>
<p>28. DM PROFESSIONAL, ADMIN & CUSTOMER STAFF BALANCE</p> <p>Are tasks allocated at suitable levels so that case officers are able to concentrate on assessing applications and technical and administrative work supports the handling of applications?</p>	<p>28.1 How is each stage of the application process divided up between administrative, technical, specialist and case officers? Are case officers carrying out unnecessary administrative duties?</p> <p>28.2 Are there customer care officers or the equivalent that handle the majority of initial contacts? Do they have professional backup? Have they received training?</p>	<p>28.1 Division of duties clear/fair. But better ICT use would improve service consistency and productivity. See Nos 2 and 23</p> <p>28.2 Combination of DM Technical Team on the phone and professional officers offering “face to face” duty officer service.</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Seems to be an appropriate split of tasks between technical/administrative and professional staff. Case officers do minimal amount of administration, nevertheless record keeping is weak. The technical support teams for development management and building control have recently been merged. Initial discussions have taken place with a view to a shared service with Waltham Forest – however progress stalled.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: 2013/14 – ICT Development and Improvement Plan and DM resource review.</i></p>		
<p>Theme 2B</p>	<p>Performance management</p>		
<p>29. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</p>	<p>29.1 Does the service have a clear performance management framework that integrates finance, people, performance and ICT?</p>	<p>29.1 No. This is proposed by using resource from vacant post in Business Management and support from PAS. Integrate:</p>	<p>29.1 <u>Ensure integration of DM Improvement Plan elements:</u></p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p>Is the performance of the service being actively managed?</p>	<p>29.2 Does the service know whether or not it is improving, where and why? Is action taken when problems are identified?</p> <p>29.3 Does the head of service, and members drive performance towards local targets?</p> <p>29.4 Do managers and key members (e.g. portfolio holder and chair of planning committee) meet regularly to discuss performance and potential barriers to improvement?</p> <p>29.5 What regular performance reporting to SMT, Cabinet and Planning Committee is undertaken? Which local PI's are included?</p> <p>29.6 Is up to date performance against local PI's readily available?</p> <p>29.7 Do back office ICT systems provide the capability to monitor performance and outcomes at all key levels and across development management e.g. in enforcement, appeals, applications, customer service?</p>	<p>- ICT Development Plan - Sept (Nos 2 above)</p> <p>- Application/Appeals Project Management - May (Nos 3 above)</p> <p>- Staff Skills Plan - Sept (Nos 7 above)</p> <p>- Staff Resource Plan - June (Nos 23 above)</p> <p>29.2 Yes. Regular service and key indicator reporting to Regulatory Cttee. Scrutiny Cttee Reports. AMR Reports. DM Review Report.</p> <p>29.3 Not in the recent past. This is now being more closely examined</p> <p>29.4 Yes Regulatory Committee, but not until prospect of "special measures".</p> <p>29.5 AMR; Application speeds; Appeal success and enforcement enquiries/resolutions</p> <p>29.6/7. Yes</p>	<p>Finance/Staff (Nos 23); Skills (Nos 7); Project and Performance Management (Nos 3) and ICT (nos 2) – Q2/3 2013/14</p> <p>(See also Nos 32 Improvement Plan and Commissioning Review and Nos 36 Leadership)</p>
<p>Review comments Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>There is regular monitoring and reporting of corporate performance indicators at service level including to the Regulatory Committee but no regular performance monitoring of individual staff or setting of local performance indicators. A performance culture does not appear to be embedded but left to individuals to identify their own priorities and undertake their own performance monitoring. The benchmarking work undertaken has not been used to evaluate performance and to identify areas for improvement</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Q2 DM Review Action Plan – taking into account May 2013 PAS benchmarking work.</i></p>		

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>30. PERFORMANCE TARGETS & TRENDS</p> <p>Is the level of performance achieved satisfactory with regard to local targets and the customer charter standards?</p> <p>Has performance on time targets (e.g former NI157) been maintained without recourse to actions that potentially reduce the quality of service?</p>	<p>30.1 How does performance with regard to time targets (stand in relation to the former national targets set in NI157)?</p> <p>30.2 Has performance declined or improved over the last two quarters, and the last year?</p> <p>30.3 What is the proportion of conservation areas with an up to date character appraisal? What is the proportion of conservation areas with management proposals?</p> <p>30.4 What is the trend in refusal rates and how does it relate to the national average?</p> <p>30.5 What is the trend in withdrawal rates and is this in line with the national average?</p> <p>30.6 Is there a backlog of applications? How are applications that run over the target managed?</p> <p>30.7 What is the appeals record and is it in line with the national average of 67% appeals upheld?</p> <p>30.8 What are the reasons for a change of</p>	<p>30.1 <u>DM Performance: 2012/13</u>: 63% of Majors (above national target), but Minors (57%) and Others (68%) – not at the national target level. This is because of 2012/13 focused on Majors and Backlog reduction. Appeals at 39% lost – this fallen from 32/35% in previous years. Enforcement performance continues to be maintained.</p> <p>30.2 <u>DM Performance Trend</u>: performance reduced between 2011-13, but improved in the last 2 Quarters of 2012/13. See 30.1</p> <p>30.3 <u>Policy Indicator</u>: This performance indicator not used anymore at the national level. Not with standing this LBH is only slowly carrying out such appraisals because of resource management. Better indicators are the AMR and LDF progression.</p> <p>30.4 <u>DM Approval Rate</u>: LBH has a high approval rate</p> <p>30.5 <u>DM Withdrawal</u>: Low withdrawal rates</p> <p>30.6 <u>Backlog</u>: of 2012/13 has been cleared – 275 on hand at the start of</p>	<p>30.1 Backlog cleared in 2012/13. Majors on target. Address “26 week old applications” and Minors/Others in 2013/14. From Feb 2012 ensure same or more applications processed per Quarter than received</p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	<p>performance (if any) in the last 18 months?</p>	<p>2013/14. This should be 50-100 less. To be addressed in 13/14. Cases over target are reducing because of increase in 2 weekly monitoring.</p> <p>30.7 <u>Appeals</u>: performance declining (2012/13 – 61% won instead of 67%)</p> <p>30.8 <u>Performance Causes</u>: inadequate management processes and drive and project management. Little support from ICT. Lack of skills and management enthusiasm. Some lack of resources which led to service/staff pressure, which becomes a bulwark to change and improvement. Of concern also is 23 applications on hand over 26 weeks</p>	
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Performance has been falling – the last quarter of 2011/12 saw performance at 0% majors (8 determined); 51% minors (65 determined) and 65% of others (336 determined) and meant that the targets were not met for major or other applications for the 2011/12 period. There is a backlog of applications which has been static for a considerable period. The nature of the backlog is not known – e.g whether there are a lot of very old cases which are no longer ‘live’.</i></p> <p><i>The figures in the datasheet show that there is a backlog of about 500 cases (the number of cases on hand was over 1000 and the number determined has been consistently less than the number received for the last 5 quarters). The nature of the backlog is not known – there would be benefit in understanding this so that the appropriate action can be taken. Although additional resources have been brought in the backlog is spread around the team and is dragging down performance and the quality of service. Site visits are being undertaken late in the process so there is little opportunity for negotiating or seeking amendments if targets are to be met. Appeals performance is good. The refusal rate at 18% for 2011/12 was around the national average and considerably lower than in many London boroughs. Withdrawal rate of 11% is higher than the national average and rose to 29% in Q3 of 2011/12. It is not clear whether this was part of the attempt to clear the backlog.</i></p>		

	<i>Response @ April 2013: Backlog addressed in 2012/13 and “backlog performance target” set for 2013/14. Performance on Majors now above national Target. PM system for “others/majors” to be put in place Q2 2013/14 and also for “appeals”. Regular reporting to Regulatory Cttee. Stronger appraisal system being put in place for 2013/14 – “timeliness; customer focus and professional quality”</i>		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
31. TARGET MONITORING Is regular monitoring taking place of individuals, team and overall position with regard local quality standards and targets?	31.1 How is individual, team and service performance monitoring and management with regard local quality standards and targets achieved? It should be both monitored and followed up where performance is lagging at individual, team and service level. Is this included in team and individual appraisals?	31.1 There has been poor observance of proactive action as a result of individual and team performance monitoring. However DM Service statistics and performance as a whole have been reported regularly to Planning and Regulatory Cttees, to the Directorate, on covalent and on the web – so performance has not been hidden. Performance speed standards were given less priority in 10/11 and 11/12, when such statistics were given less priority by Central Govt. Since this has again become a priority by Central Govt – so it has become a priority for Local Government. Targets have been not been highlighted in appraisals in a rigorous way – this is now being done.	
<i>Review comments Sept 2012</i>	<i>There was little evidence of the monthly monitoring although it is included in appraisals</i> <i>Response @ April 2013: Backlog addressed in 2012/13 and “backlog performance target” set for 2013/14. Performance on Majors now above national Target. PM system for “others/majors” to be put in place Q2 2013/14 and also for “appeals”. Regular reporting to Regulatory Cttee. Stronger appraisal</i>		

	<i>system being put in place for 2013/14 – “timeliness; customer focus and professional quality”</i>		
<p>32. SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PROCESS & PLAN</p> <p>Is the service improvement plan and improvement process fit for purpose and effective?</p> <p>Do staff understand their role in meeting local targets, delivering service objectives, and how they are held to account for their performance?</p>	<p>32.1 Is there an up to date improvement strategy (e.g from benchmarking work) and is it regularly reviewed?</p> <p>32.2 Has the Council recently reviewed its processes for the handling of major, minor/other applications; enforcement; section 106 agreements; appeals, pre-application discussions and customer care? Examples ?</p> <p>32.3 Did the PAS benchmarking identify any areas of the process requiring improvement? e.g validation, registration etc</p> <p>32.4 What are the proposals for future improvement? What examples of action have been taken as a result of process review or issues arising from performance management? What areas of the service represent best practice?</p> <p>32.5 Are individuals’ responsibilities and accountability for performance clear and relevant to their level in the structure?</p>	<p>32.1 No. Improvement Plans to date have focused on “business as usual” not visionary/improvement plans</p> <p>32.2 DM Service has focused improvement on Enforcement and Appeals and Mayoral CIL</p> <p>32.3 March 2012 PAS benchmarking indicated Haringey cost of processing applications was low/average for London. DM Tech operated well, BUT application processing times were declining.</p> <p>32.4 Paperless DM process; Committee Report templates; DM Committee procedure and Cttee member training</p> <p>32.5 Not clear. This is in Review – June 2013</p>	<p>32.1 <u>DM Improvement Process/Plan 2 weekly meetings</u></p> <p>32.2 <u>Improvement Plan Draft Q1 2013 and Commissioning Review Draft Q3/4 2013. PAS Benchmarking and bid for support. Q2 2013-14</u></p> <p>(see also <u>Nos 29 Integrating key performance elements – ICT, performance and project management, skills, resources – and Nos 36 Leadership</u>)</p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p><i>Review comments</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>The draft development management improvement plan/work programme plan January 2012-January 2013 sets out the current work programme with some areas for improvement - it lacks detail and is not comprehensive in its approach. The PAS/CIPFA benchmarking work (2011/12) and performance monitoring has not been used to help identify areas requiring improvement. There are areas of good practice – eg. Development management forum, design review panel</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Q2 DM Review Action Plan – taking into account May 2013 PAS benchmarking work.</i></p>		
<p>Theme 2C</p>	<p>Learning and supportive culture</p>		
<p>Key issues to explore</p>	<p>Diagnostic Questions</p>	<p>Service Response/Progress</p>	<p>Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14</p>
<p>33. SERVICE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS & PERCEPTIONS</p> <p>Are positive working relationships between the staff and members within the Council and with its partners and users maintained?</p>	<p>33.1 Do staff work positively across service boundaries e.g. is the development team approach considered to be effective? How does the service relate to other corporate initiatives e.g asset management. Are there sound working links between the development management teams and the policy, conservation, urban designers and other development professionals including in other authorities if relevant?</p> <p>33.2 Are conflicts that arise in the course of working dealt with openly and positively?</p> <p>33.3 Is there mutual trust between members and officers?</p> <p>33.4 Does there appear to be a strong team spirit and mutually supportive culture among officers?</p>	<p>33.1/2 Improvement in place for Major Applications (see Nos 3). For other and minors – Q2 2013/14</p> <p>33.3 This needs improving through better performance and communication. Ensuring ME/customer complaints answered and reviewed. (See Nos 4, 13 and Nos 29)</p> <p>33.4 This needs support and improvement. (see Nos 3,4,13,29)</p> <p>33.5 Yes</p> <p>33.6 No – this needs improving through the DM Review Action Plan. Establish stronger working relationship between Regulatory Cttee and DM/Planning Staff/Service. Resource issue need to be</p>	

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	<p>33.5 Do staff display a positive attitude towards the stakeholders with whom they engage and the users of the service and consider them to have a legitimate voice?</p> <p>33.6 Is the service perceived as effective, supportive, innovative and co-operative by members and officers within the service, other services, chief officers, consultants and partners?</p>	<p>recognised, but this must be balanced by more effective customer service processes and community planning events (see Nos 16)</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Limited consideration – would need interviews with key officers from outside the service and members. Major sites meeting only recently re-established so too early to tell but have recently dealt with a number of major applications e.g Wards Corner, Heartlands, Aldi, 638 High Road. Need to set up an effective feedback system</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Q2 DM Review Action Plan – taking into account May 2013 PAS benchmarking work.</i></p>		
<p>34. LEARNING FROM GOOD PRACTICE</p> <p>Do staff share good practice and experience?</p>	<p>34.1 Are there mechanisms for learning from experience in dealing with applications, appeals, enforcement cases, customer service etc. that enable collective learning from individual experience to improve the way the service processes applications, appeals, enforcement cases etc. and provides a service?</p>	<p>34. Service Wide Training Plan : focus on s106/viability, Design, Legislation Updates. Annual Urban Design for London and Future of London. More joint case conference since November – but this should be pushed. See Skills/Training Plan Nos 7 and Monthly Nos 13 Monthly Learning and feedback and discussion and Nos 14 new Talk Series + Feedback Nos 16 + Nos 35</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>This appears quite limited – no real formal mechanism and rely on informal mechanisms</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Q2 DM Review Action Plan – taking into account May 2013 PAS benchmarking work. See also Monthly feedback/learning sessions – Nos 13.</i></p>		

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p>35. SERVICE LEARNING CULTURE</p> <p>Is there a learning culture that takes lessons from both success and failure and applies them to future work?</p>	<p>35.1 Is good performance celebrated and poor performance addressed?</p> <p>35.2 Is there regular review of the impact and effectiveness of pre-application and post application discussions?</p> <p>35.3 Is there regular review of overturned decisions and appeals upheld?</p> <p>35.4 Is there annual review of the quality of recently completed developments and their sustainability performance?</p> <p>35.5 Are revisions made to the service in response to detailed comments in customer survey?</p> <p>35.6 Does the service seek to learn how others achieve success?</p> <p>35.7 Is continuous improvement taken for granted?</p>	<p>35.1 PRE has published 8 newsletters which features good work of staff in all sections. We don't have an awards event – good idea. On performance management, this is now being better addressed with Leadership change.</p> <p>35.2/3 Yes See Nos 13 Monthly Feedback</p> <p>35.4 Annual Review of schemes good idea. Design Awards and Review will demonstrate this to some extent. Resource issue.</p> <p>35.5 Use Feedback from Agents Forum and Customer Feedback</p> <p>35.6 Yes on DM procedures and CIL</p> <p>35.7 No. DM first needs to stabilise procedures and resources</p>	<p>35.1 <u>Annual Review of "good, bad and the ugly"</u> – Q3/4 2013-14 (BAU)</p>
<p>Review comments Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Little evidence of this – morale appears low, officers stressed and little time given to evaluation. Run annual design awards and achievements for 2011/12 are set out in the Business Plan</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Q2 DM Review Action Plan – taking into account May 2013 PAS benchmarking work. See also Monthly feedback/learning sessions – Nos 13.</i></p>		

THEME 3: LEADERSHIP: Leadership and Corporate Engagement: Nos 36-45

- Vision and direction
- Integration of Policy and delivery
- Decision making and scrutiny

Theme 3A	Vision and direction		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>36. DM LEADERSHIP</p> <p>Does the development management service have effective champions at officer and member level?</p>	<p>36.1 Does the head of service clearly lead the service? Does the service have an officer champion above the head of service in the hierarchy in the corporate management team?</p> <p>37.2 Does the portfolio holder responsible for planning and chair of development control committee provide direction for the service? Does the lead member for planning sit on the cabinet?</p> <p>38.3 Is there regular liaison between the portfolio holder and chair of planning committee?</p> <p>37.4 Is there corporate management team and member support for plans to improve the service? (if the answer is 'no ' to any of the questions above then the service could be isolated)</p>	<p>36.1 Service has recruited new Head. Director Place sits on Directors Group. There is need to stabilise DM service through "performance management and ensuring basic processes/procedure and customer service is put in place. Then during 13/14 a commissioning review is to be undertaken on how best to provide/procure DM</p> <p>37.2 Focus is on design and regeneration. Yes cabinet members</p> <p>37.3 Regular Liaison</p> <p>37.4 Yes – Director of Place</p>	<p>36.1 <u>Recruit head of DM – Q1 2013-14</u></p> <p>36.2 <u>Improvement Plan Draft Q1 2013 and Commissioning Review Draft Q3/4 2013. PAS Benchmarking and bid for support. Q2 2013-14</u></p> <p>36.3 <u>Strategic Sites meeting established by Director. Monthly Meetings – in place Q4 2012/13</u></p> <p>36.4 <u>DM Team and Confidence Building Programme Q2-Q4 2013/14</u></p>
<p><i>Review comments</i></p>	<p><i>There seems to be a lack of clarity over the priorities for the DM service. Not clear how the service is</i></p>		

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p>Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>perceived by CMT. No formal feedback mechanism exists.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Priorities established for 2013-14: "PM; major sites; s106/CiL; enforcement; customer service/getting the basics right; value for money" Note – focus was on "major sites" in 2012/13 – in 2013/14 the focus must be on "minors/others" without losing PM of Majors</i></p>		
<p>Key issues to explore</p>	<p>Diagnostic Questions</p>	<p>Service Response/Progress</p>	<p>Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14</p>
<p>37. SERVICE VISION & PURPOSE</p> <p>Is there a clear and articulated vision of the role of development management within the Council and planning service?</p>	<p>37.1 Does the service plan and priorities explicitly demonstrate how the development management service contributes to corporate priorities and the objectives of the service reflect the Council's ambitions?</p> <p>37.2 Do the senior management and politicians of the Council understand the role of development management in delivering corporate objectives? Is it clear that the chief executive understands the role of development management in delivering the Council's wider objectives such as affordable housing and recreational facilities?</p> <p>37.3 Do the Council leader, members and chief executive take an interest in development management performance?</p> <p>37.4 Does the development management service effectively input to the policy formulation and delivery function?</p>	<p>37.1 Priorities are <u>Design, Enforcement, s106/community infrastructure, major sites</u>. Focus and resources have been put into these areas and recognised by Diagnostic Review. It is good that staff recognise these areas. Resource reduction puts a service into transition and does result in staff pressure. An area that must be developed is <u>better "value for money and customer service" and more "professionalism"</u>. Since special measures concerns "<u>timeliness and performance management</u>" are also now higher priorities</p> <p>37.2 Yes</p> <p>37.3 Yes</p> <p>37.4 Not recently – Nov/Dec 2012 – now in place</p>	<p>37.1 <u>DM Priorities</u> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "design, - major sites, - s106 community infrastructure, - enforcement <p>-better value for money and customer service,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more professionalism, - timeliness and performance management <p>- getting the basics right"</p>

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p><i>Review comments</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>The business plan needs to set out the vision and objectives related to the corporate priorities in order to drive the focus for the service, together with a detailed improvement plan setting out what it wants to achieve and how it will get there. Although priorities have been set e.g major sites, good design, infrastructure contributions and enforcement, officers in DM seem to have little understanding of where their focus should be and as a result 'firefight' providing a day to day response to the most pressing issue. There seems to be little input from development management into policy. Areas where there needs to be more engagement include the annual monitoring report, Sustainable construction DPD as well as the Development Management DPD.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Priorities established for 2013-14: "PM; major sites; s106/CiL; enforcement; customer service/getting the basics right; value for money"</i></p>
---	---

<p>38. DM BUDGET</p> <p>Does the budget process ensure that service priorities drive the resource allocation for the development management service?</p>	<p>38.1 Is the service adequately and cost effectively resourced? How does fee income relate to the costs of the service? New Homes Bonus?</p> <p>38.2 Is the service being subject to budget cuts?</p> <p>38.3 How is the service plan resourced?</p> <p>38.4 Is the budget managed in line with the needs and priorities of the service?</p>	<p>38.1 The DM service costs 1.4m and its fee income is now around 1m, including £200k pre app/performance fees. Net cost to council tax payer is £400k – a reduction of 60% since 2009/10</p> <p>38.2 Yes</p> <p>38.3 Should the Improvement Plan be agreed 1-3 extra staff will be delivered thru re orientation/ re balancing of existing resources and improved performance management</p> <p>38.4 in broad terms yes</p>	<p>38.1 <u>Budget for 13/14 fixed. Budget for 14/15 under review.</u> During 13/14 there may be re orientation/ re balancing of existing resources to support more DM planners and enforcement thru reviewing existing roles and POCA/cross enforcement service working</p>
---	--	---	---

<p><i>Review comments</i> Sept 2012</p>	<p><i>Limited information available. Fee income does not cover total cost of DM service. Fees are supplemented by PAPA charges and PPA income but still a shortfall. Budget is monitored by DM Management/Corporate Finance.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM Improvement Plan will review resource allocation in 2013/14, including productivity improvements; costs of ICT improvements; improved skills and processes and balance of staff</i></p>
---	--

	<i>resources between customer/professional/technical. This work will build on new PAS benchmark work to be verified in May/June.</i>		
<p>39. DM VALUE FOR MONEY</p> <p>Is the service providing value for money?</p>	<p>39.1 Is the service actively managing the relationship between service quality and cost to maximise service quality and limit overall cost?</p> <p>39.2 Do staff demonstrate high levels of productivity?</p>	<p>39.1 DM Service is “low cost and average/poor on quality”. DM Review and Action Plans are beginning to improve quality/performance. CIPFA/Benchmark show DM to be low cost.</p> <p>39.2 Staff work hard but have not been well managed or challenged to perform. Staff have not been sufficiently supported/focused. The DM Review and early action plans (Dec-March 2012) are beginning to improve productivity. Backlog of 12/13 cleared, more PM being put in place. PAS Benchmarking 12/13 results awaited – May 2013</p>	<p>39.1 <u>PAS Benchmarking and bid for support</u> to support DM Improvement Plan Q2 2013-14</p>
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Limited information available – the PAS benchmarking exercise showed that the Haringey service was low cost but did not look at the comparable level of service provided by others in the group so not possible to say how the service quality compared. From this review there is scope for further efficiencies which would allow improvements to the service quality. Not clear that staff demonstrate high levels of productivity – given backlog and high caseloads – would need further evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM Improvement Plan will review resource allocation in 2013/14, including productivity improvements; costs of ICT improvements; improved skills and processes and balance of staff resources between customer/professional/technical. This work will build on new PAS benchmark work to be verified in May/June.</i></p>		

Theme 3B	Integration of policy and delivery		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>40. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK</p> <p>Is there a clear and up to date policy framework for the development of the area rooted in a locally distinct vision within which development management decisions are made?</p>	<p>40.1 Is the overall vision for the area clearly stated in the LDF and community plan and widely understood?</p> <p>40.2 Does the LDF, community strategy and/or the corporate plan set out the approach taken for example to affordable housing, or regeneration and make it clear that development management is a primary delivery mechanism? Is the adopted Development Plan/LDF up to date?</p> <p>40.3 What SPD is available and is it up to date? Is SPD, policy and guidance easily accessible to applicants and other stakeholders including S106 guidance?</p> <p>40.4 Does this guidance reflect corporate ambitions and development issues for the local area?</p> <p>40.5 Does the planning committee have active input to policy development?</p>	<p>40.1 yes - in both 39 Saved UDP Policies in the Core Strategy – now the adopted Local Plan. The Diagnostic Reviewer however is right that in 2012 not enough “quotation of Core Strategy policy” – and this illustrates need for more work on linking policy and practise See Nos 4 and 13</p> <p>40.2 Yes Local Plan in place.</p> <p>40.3 Yes. Range of SPDs in place and new ones developed to meet new aspirations i.e. South Tottenham Design; Sustainable Design; Highgate Neighbourhood Plan; Article 4 Direction HMOs</p> <p>40.4 Yes</p> <p>40.5 Yes. Cross Party Working group, reports to Regulatory/Planning cttee.</p>	
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Despite the new national policy framework NPPF introduced in March 2012 and the weight that can now be attached to plans which are well advanced, little use would appear to be made of the core strategy policies in DM – still relying on the UDP and waiting for the DM DPD.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM Review rather unfair. Important to quote and use “relevant policies” and for</i></p>		

	<p><i>DM "saved 39 UDP Policies" most critical, (in addition to new strategic polices in Core Strategy/Local Plan only adopted in March 2013). These – the saved 39 UDP policies - continue until new DM policies in place (2014).</i></p>		
<p>41. DM & CORPORATE ENGAGEMENT</p> <p>Does the service take part in the development and review of corporate strategies and the means of their delivery?</p>	<p>41.1 Is there a clear understanding by development management staff of the significant geographic, demographic, environmental, economic and social context and spatial drivers of the area?</p> <p>41.2 Are the activities of development management linked to other services in the council?</p> <p>41.3 Is the use and impact of policies monitored to establish whether they are achieving what was intended including in relation to the community strategy?</p> <p>41.4 Does feedback between spatial policy development and development management occur to achieve change to policy where necessary?</p> <p>41.5 Does the service keep the rest of the council up to date on current issues for development management e.g. new development pressures or trends?</p>	<p>41.1 No. This is being improved. See Nos 2,3,4,13</p> <p>41.2 Yes. Corporate Property , Private Sector Housing, Regeneration links in place. These could always be improved</p> <p>41.3 yes – Annual Monitoring Report. But there needs to be improvement in DM data entry for monitoring purposes. See Nos 2</p> <p>41.4 Liaison between policy and DM was insufficient. More cross training and regular liaison now – including on AMR meetings</p> <p>41.5 Monthly legislation news letter. Bi monthly internal planning newsletter. The latter will now stop and be integrated into corporate 2 weekly newsletter. 2 weekly Cabinet member meetings.</p>	
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Not all information from planning decisions currently monitored and captured by AMR - intention is to make the AMR more of a corporate document – little input from DM who did not attend a recent seminar. Appears to be little feedback/interaction</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: new 2012/13 PRE Annual Report and AMR for 2012/13 will ensure DM contributions and PI are prominent. Also regular reporting to Regulatory Cttee on more comprehensive set of PIs.</i></p>		

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>42. DATA MANAGEMENT – DM & POLICY</p> <p>Does the service hold good quality information systems to aid decision making?</p>	<p>42.1 Are site based records and databases well maintained e.g.s106, EIA, TPO listed buildings, conservation areas, archaeology, contaminated land, nature conservation records?</p> <p>42.2 Is data collected by the development management function that directly informs LDF monitoring systems e.g. through applications and processing systems for proposals, appeals, enforcement etc?</p> <p>42.3 Is maximum use made of ICT and integrated back office systems to facilitate monitoring?</p>	<p>42.1 See Nos 2</p> <p>42.2 Partly. See Nos 2</p> <p>42.3 No. See Nos 2</p>	
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>See response to 2 above. Not all data being collected currently for the AMR. Need to check if site based records and databases are well maintained</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: DM ICT development and Improvement plan in Q2 2013-14</i></p>		
<p>Theme 3C</p>	<p>Decision making and scrutiny</p>		
<p>43. DELEGATION & SCRUTINY</p> <p>Are decision-making arrangements between the Executive and development control committee clear with</p>	<p>43.1 Is there an up to date delegation scheme which identifies those applications that can be determined by the appropriate officer under delegated powers or the development control committee?</p> <p>43.2 Have these arrangements been recently reviewed (last 18 months)?</p>	<p>43.1 Yes.</p> <p>43.2 Yes by Regulatory Cttee in 2012/13.</p>	

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

distinct responsibilities?	43.3 What is the delegation rate? 43.4 Are any changes proposed to the current scheme (in the next 6 months?) 43.5 Is guidance/training provided to members with respect to expediting clear decision making reflecting local circumstances?	43.3 97%-98% 43.4 No – see 43.2 43.5 yes (Annual)	
<i>Review comments Sept 2012</i>	<i>The sending of the weekly list with reports on a Friday is to allow a call in/query procedure – suggest that this is too late in the process – no clear written procedure/protocol for this. Delegation agreement suggests that decisions must be made in consultation with the Chair or Deputy and names specific posts – this does not include the Team Leader post although it is understood that such decisions are made in the Head of DM’s absence</i> <i>Response @ April 2013: BAU Review in 2013-14 Q2.</i>		
44. CONSISTENT DECISION MAKING Are systems in place to ensure consistency of decision making?	44.1 Are systems and procedures in place to ensure consistency of decision making at all levels including committee procedures and delegated decisions? 44.2 Is there consistency between decisions on major applications, the community strategy, the LDF and the decisions of the executive?	44.1/2 Yes. See Nos 1-3 and 36. Also AMR and Scrutiny and Regulatory Cttees.	
<i>Review comment Sept 2012</i>	<i>Consistency ensured by all decisions being funnelled through Head of DM. However lack of written procedures may mean there is inconsistency if others deal with applications. Not clear how major applications are considered corporately.</i> <i>Response @ April 2013: DM Manual update in Q2 2013-14. See Nos 3 above for Majors management and corporate engagement.</i>		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
45. MEMBER CODE OF	45.1 Does the member code of conduct meet the demands of probity and include a	45.1 Yes	

<p>CONDUCT & PLANNING CTTEE</p> <p>Is there an up to date member's code of conduct? Does the conduct of members and officers comply with the principles of probity: are decisions fair and transparent?</p>	<p>protocol for site visits, pre-applications discussions dealing with representations etc. in accordance with the Localism Act 2011</p> <p>45.2 Have members of the planning committee been given training on Planning, Probity and Localism Act?</p> <p>45.3 Are planning application reports of high quality, include details of representations and the factors evaluated in coming to the recommendation, as well as assumptions and evidence?</p> <p>45.4 Are minutes of meetings clear?</p> <p>45.5 Are planning committees effective, 'public friendly' and transparent in the way they operate?</p> <p>45.6 Are member site visits transparent and accessible?</p> <p>45.7 Is appeal performance around the national average for the type of authority?</p> <p>45.8 Is the award of costs against the authority on appeal decisions rare and justified when it happens?</p> <p>45.9 Is the enforcement policy and procedures transparent and published? Does it include priorities and service standards?</p>	<p>45.2 Yes Annual.</p> <p>45.3 Template introduced in 2012/13 and improved Dec 2012</p> <p>45.4/5/6/7/8/9 - Yes</p>	
<p><i>Review comment Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>New code of conduct for members incorporated in the constitution in July 2012 – planning protocol for site visits and planning applications committee members protocols was last updated in June 2005. Member training includes probity issues including predetermination/predisposition. Also need to consider members involvement at pre-application stage.</i></p> <p><i>Planning application reports are of variable quality – many are very long – not always up to date with legislation e.g April 2012 reports still referring to PPS's. Policy section just lists. Would benefit from</i></p>		

thinking through what is required as different formats currently used e.g should consultations/policy be in an appendix, use of summary section etc and a more straightforward format for delegated reports. Committee procedures could be improved – seem to move from asking questions to the vote. The purpose of viewing plans on the board is not clear when these are part of the presentation. Little debate.but significant dialogue allowed between speakers and committee members in the form of questions. Committee site visits have not been observed.

Response @ April 2013: Monthly DM Staff briefings and reminders. DM Manual Update Q2 2013-14. Report writing and case assessment training delivered in 2012/13 – reports now shorter and more focused. Pre commencement conditions now separated. “Spot checks” system to be put in place in 2013/14. Performance management system in 2013/14 Q1/2 will require reports to be produced at 6 weeks.

THEME 4: CUSTOMER SERVICE: Customer Focus and community engagement: Nos 46-53

- Transparency of process
- Accessibility
- Responsiveness to service users

Theme 4A	Transparency of process for users		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>46. SERVICE – CUSTOMER CHARTER</p> <p>Are service standards published, monitored and results made available regularly?</p>	<p>46.1 Are the service standards in the customer charter and statement of community involvement clear, are targets owned by staff, and the service standards and delivery arrangements expected by applicants, objectors and consultees included?</p> <p>46.2 Are these standards and targets monitored and the results made available publicly at regular intervals?</p> <p>46.3 What is performance on customer satisfaction?</p>	<p>46.1 Not clear/comprehensive enough. No reported on</p> <p>46.2 No</p> <p>46.3 Declining 2009 75% 2010 81% 2011 76% 2012 70%</p>	<p>46.1 <u>Customer Charter and Standards owned by Service/Staff and reported on.</u> To include: “Get the basics Right” programme; Reception offer/Customer Information reviewed – including on web. Need to check and include access and service demands by diverse/equality groups. Need to check written documents for “plain English” (Letters Panel in Q1 2013-14). Review 24 hrs services; large print/Braille; translation. Review how customers kept informed about progress of applications/appeals/enf case . Review effectiveness of Agents Forum and if PRE takes on feedback. Review/ensure DM feedback forms reflected in service change – Q1-3 2013-14</p> <p>46.2 Complaints</p>

**Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey**

			<p>management. Dedicate staff to dealing with Complaints and review causes – Q1/2 2013-14</p> <p>46.3 Ensure and Test Telephone Answering Q1 2013-14</p>
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Customer satisfaction survey for 201/12 showed that 76% of respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the level of service received. No customer charter available on the website – targets for processing applications set out but not clear that these are regularly monitored. Difficult to locate service standards and delivery arrangements expected by applicants, objectors and consultees.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Q1-3 2013-14 Customer Charter and Get the Basic Right Programme.</i></p> <p><u>Business Plans</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRE Business Plan 13/14 – draft V1 completed and sent to Directorate coordinator 2. PRE 12/13 Annual Report – draft V1 completed and sent to Directorate coordinator 3. Complaints reviewed and built into 2013-14 business plan 4. 1 to 1s – diarised for May 5. Team meetings – diarised for SMT, DM, Carbon, Econ. Service and BC organise once a month 6. Appraisals – diarised for SMT, Carbon, Econ. DM, Service and BC being organised for May <p><u>Customer Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Customer Charter and service standards review Q2 2013-14 2. Customer Feedback surveys DM and BC. These services regularly ask for feedback on applications and this is reported. Currently being fed back into the business plan for 13/14 3. Monthly feedback on appeals/complaints/ombudsman/ME (as well as legislation/policy/planning cttee) to DM staff 4. Econ Dev/Carbon propose feedback survey asking strategic partners how we perform – new survey for 2013/14 – Q3 <p><u>Customer Relations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Answering the phone – PRE Phone Audit underway (speed and politeness) – report in May – speed and politeness 2. New dedicated BC phone set up – considering this for DM and DM Enforcement, (negotiation with Call Centre) 3. New customer script in development for DM/BC – end May/early June 4. Answering MEs/FOIs/Complaints/Ombudsman – dedicated staff allocated to address 5. Face to Face – reviewing Duty Rota service for the customer – seek to extend in Q2 6. DM/BC Agents Forum – being organised for Q2. Workshop for agents who submit planning applications and building notices 7. Development Management Forums – community consultation meetings on large/major applications. Increasingly these applications also involve pre application consultation organised with guidance of local ward cllrs (eg Lawrence Rd and Hornsey Depot) 		

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	<p>8. Planning Workshops for Community Groups/Cllrs – one delivered and a tour of Area Cttees being organised to start in Q2.</p> <p>9. Review of DM Consultation process – Q4</p> <p>10. Letters Panel being put in place in May to look at 30 standard letters/forms – DM/BC</p> <p><u>Smart Working and Tidy Desks</u></p> <p>1. Clean and tidy desks and office area – “clean up” notices up; “clean up” officers (Service Wide and DM/BC) – in place. Daily asking staff to ensure clean desks at the end of every day. Aim to have office area improved by 9/5.</p>		
<p>47. CUSTOMER INFORMATION</p> <p>Are policy and practice in development management explicit to participants and the wider community?</p>	<p>47.1 Is a broad range of written guidance on development management processes available on and off line e.g. on how committees work, the way decisions are made, enforcement cases investigated etc?</p>	<p>47.1 yes</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i> <i>Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>Some guidance is available on line but not always easy to locate as it is not all in one place and it is not all up to date e.g could not find out easily about development management forum which was not included in the leaflet on consultation. Does not cover all parts of the process. Availability of all reports on the website is positive</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: see Nos 46</i></p>		

Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>48. STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT & ENGAGEMENT</p> <p>Are stakeholders clear</p>	<p>48.1 Is the statement of community involvement clear about the minimum legal requirements for publicity and consultation on planning applications?</p> <p>48.2 Is the statement of community involvement clear about the particular consultation arrangements on significant</p>	<p>48.1 Yes</p> <p>48.2 Yes</p> <p>48.3 yes</p> <p>48.4 – this could be improved.</p>	<p>48.1 SCI Review against Delivery – Q2/3 2013-14</p>

<p>about their role in the decision-making process and provided with the information to engage effectively?</p> <p>Does the service enable others to understand the implications of development proposals and the relationship between policies and what happens on the ground?</p>	<p>major or controversial applications in terms of the types of application, circumstances under which consultation will take place, how people will be informed and how comments should be made and the timetable for doing so?</p> <p>48.3 Do applicants and consultees understand what involvement they can expect and at what stage and does this vary with application types?</p> <p>48.4 Are neighbours and objectors given clear, timely information about proposals and amendments?</p> <p>48.5 Are requirements for section 106 agreements transparent?</p> <p>48.6 Is there a published complaints and compliments procedure?</p> <p>48.7 Is the basis of decision-making clear in committee and are delegated reports and correspondence, policies and procedures explicit such that the factors taken into account in decisions and the path of the decision-making process is clear?</p> <p>43.8 Are the public clear about what information is not publicly available and why?</p> <p>48.9 Are options and issues for development clearly presented in the DPDs including the public availability of the Sustainability Appraisals?</p> <p>48.10 Is a range of information about the relationship between policy and proposals made available?</p> <p>48.11 Do public meetings, events and</p>	<p>48.5 Yes (always goes to Cttee)</p> <p>48.6 Yes</p> <p>48.7. Yes</p> <p>48.8 yes</p> <p>48.9 yes</p> <p>48.10 yes</p> <p>48.11 yes</p>	
---	--	---	--

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	committees operate in a manner that is open and positive and involves entering a dialogue with non planners to ensure people understand planning processes and their implications?		
<i>Review comments Sept 2012</i>	<p><i>Statement of community involvement updated in February 2011 and available on the website sets out the publicity and consultation arrangements although this did not set out the development management forum arrangements. Letters set out clear information. Could not easily locate the complaints and compliments procedure on the website. All reports are available on the website. Policies are referenced but not always explained. Although not all information on the file is available publicly – most of it is there as there is very little recorded.</i></p> <p><i>Core Strategy well advanced but not yet in use by DM staff. Little engagement from DM on DM DPD and Site Allocations DPD. Information on website – not clear that evidence base being used in decision making. Development Management Forum provides opportunity to discuss specific planning proposals.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: review SCI in Q3/4 2013-14. Customer charter and standards review – see Nos 46.</i></p>		
Theme 4B	Accessibility		
Key issues to explore	Diagnostic Questions	Service Response/Progress	Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14
<p>49. ACCESS TO CUSTOMER INFORMATION</p> <p>What information and service is available online and offline?</p> <p>Is the service</p>	<p>49.1 Information available online?</p> <p>49.2 What is the availability of information and service at reception/one stop shop/duty planner? E.g. what are opening hours of reception and duty officer hours? Is the statutory register easy to access? Can applicants contact case officers direct? How quickly is advice available?</p>	<p>49.1 Yes</p> <p>49.2 Duty Planner System only 2 days per week. Little development of Reception because of plans to move. Reception service under review in Q1/2 2013-14 See Nos 46</p> <p>49.3 Pre application meetings booked by individual officers. No complaints for this issue. Review</p>	

<p>accessed by users in ways and at times and locations suited to their needs?</p>	<p>49.3 What is the usual waiting time for pre-application discussions/ meetings with case officers for major/ minor and other applications</p> <p>49.4 Does survey information exist on the characteristics of users, and does the consultation database for the service contain such details?</p> <p>49.5 Is the service clear about the needs of its diverse community and customers in terms of the service and the preferred method of access?</p> <p>49.6 Is the range of information, consultation & engagement tools used fit for purpose i.e. for the objective of the particular exercise & the target group? Does the service make available the relevant information for effective participation?</p> <p>49.7 Does the service take a proactive approach to engaging the community by identifying and overcoming barriers to effective communication with hard to reach groups?</p> <p>49.8 Is access to the service easy for people with disabilities, whatever the disability - for example for reception, meetings, documentation?</p>	<p>See Nos 46</p> <p>49.4 Survey Yes.</p> <p>49.5 No See Nos 46</p> <p>49.6 Yes</p> <p>49.7 Not always – for major policy issues/documents yes</p> <p>49.8 yes</p>	
<p><i>Review comments Sept 2012</i></p>	<p><i>More work still needed to make more information available on line and make the website easier to navigate/find relevant material. Since moving into River House, reception service is poor – very limited meeting space so that the staff area is often used and very limited information available. Duty planner service is very limited and getting through on the telephone via the call centre can often result in lengthy waits.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Customer Charter and Service Standards review – Nos 46</i></p>		

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

<p>50. EASY TO UNDERSTAND INFORMATION</p> <p>Does the service provide information that is easy to understand from the lay perspective?</p>	<p>50.1 Does written and verbal communication use plain language?</p> <p>50.2 Are all publications concise, clear and written in non technical language: are they readable and understandable to the public?</p> <p>50.3 Are all publications available at reasonable cost? Are they easy to obtain?</p>	<p>50.1/2/3 – yes in principle. Review see Nos 46</p>	
<p><i>Review comments</i></p>	<p><i>Those documents that are available are easy to read and clear and available on the website.</i></p> <p><i>Response @ April 2013: Customer Charter and Service Standards review – Nos 46</i></p>		
<p>Theme 4C</p>	<p>Responsiveness to users</p>		
<p>Key issues to explore</p>	<p>Diagnostic Questions</p>	<p>Service Response/Progress</p>	<p>Actions 2012/13 & Proposals 2013/14</p>
<p>51. RESPECT FOR DIVERSE COMMUNITY – SERVICE ACCESS</p> <p>Do the diverse range of stakeholders have easy access to a responsive service</p>	<p>51.1 Is there access to a responsive service e.g. availability of advice at reception, one stop, shop etc; information on the web including clear advice to applicants about the processing of applications and to consultees, feedback to consultees etc. Does this include 24 hours access for issues such as trees/ buildings at risk and enforcement complaints?</p> <p>51.2 Is there a range of pre-application advice provided to suit different users e.g. 1:1 meetings, duty officer and case officer, publications, web and email, written individual advice, development team?</p> <p>51.3 Is service information and key guidance material available in a variety of formats e.g. large print, braille and languages</p>	<p>51.1 Yes</p> <p>51.2 Yes</p> <p>51.3 No See Nos 46</p> <p>51.4 No See Nos 46</p>	

Strategic review of the development management function using diagnostic
Revised draft for Haringey

	relevant to the local population? 51.4 Are applicants and objectors kept informed of the progress of the relevant applications, or enforcement case etc?		
<i>Review comments Sept 2012</i>	<i>Advice at reception is very limited – ground floor reception service is poor. Need for a planning reception area is well understood but seems to be waiting the outcome of the smart working initiative and reorganisation. It is therefore difficult to get pre-application advice except through the paid PAPA service. The web could be used to provide additional advice/signposting. Often difficult to get through to the case officer. Reliance is placed on applicants and objectors tracking progress on the website.</i>		
	<i>Response @ April 2013: Customer Charter and Service Standards review – Nos 46</i>		
52. RESPECT FOR DIVERSE COMMUNITY – RESPOND TO SERVICE DEMANDS Does the service seek to resolve, though negotiation, objections or shortfalls in applications wherever possible?	52.1 Is there a clear approach to the types of application that will and will not be negotiated for improvement? 52.2 Does the Council accept amendments to an application once submitted? 52.3 Is there an effective procedure for a proactive approach to pre-application discussions providing the opportunity for timely input of concerns and issues with respect to proposals? 52.4 Is the development team approach used for engaging all relevant parties to resolve issues around applications both before as well as during the application process?	52.1 All 52.2 Yes 52.3 Increasingly pre app consultation on major schemes (Spurs; GLS; Clarendon; Coronation; Lawrence rd; St Ann's; St Lukes; Hornsey Deport) 52.4 Yes in principle	
<i>Review comments Sept 2012</i>	<i>No clear approach to the types of application that will and will not be negotiated for improvement – seems to be left to the individual officer to determine and often affected by the workload and point at which the officer goes out on site – often this is very close to the deadline date and leaves little scope for seeking changes. The development team through major sites meeting has only recently been re-established. Additional thought will need to be given to this given the recent Development Management Order requiring the decision notice to include a statement explaining how in dealing with the application the LPA has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with a planning application</i>		

	<i>Response @ April 2013: DM Review rather unfair. In principle all applications will be negotiated on. Tjis should be possible and still comply with 8-16 week targets – LBH PM system will aim to provide this service by end 2013/14. This will include pre app and performance agreement systems and agreeing formal “extensions of time” when necessary so performance remains high.</i>		
53. SERVICE DESIGN & QUALITY FEEDBACK Do stakeholders have opportunities to shape delivery of the service?	53.1 Is an agents or developers forum held to keep these groups informed of changes to the service and to receive feedback? 53.2 Does the service regularly canvass feedback? 53.3 Is there on-going monitoring of the effects that policies and procedures are having on different people and are the findings used to point the way for future actions?	53.1 Yes (2 a year). See Nos 46 53.2 Yes. Alot in 2012/13 about poor communication and lack of feedback. See Nos 13 and 46 53.3 Feedback into Business Plan See Nos 13 and 46	
<i>Review comments Sept 2012</i>	<i>Only one Forum held in 2011/12 in March 2012. Customer satisfaction survey information sought from all applicants when decision notice sent out. Not clear that there is ongoing monitoring,</i> <i>Response @ April 2013: Customer Charter and Service Standards review – Nos 46</i>		

Footnote 1: Definition of Caseload

This has been calculated using the number of applications received in a year (those included in the PSF return) and divided by the number of established FTE posts for that year. A sustainable caseload has been taken to be around 150 applications per case officer and takes into account input into other work e.g. pre-application meetings, appeals and applications not included in the PSF return. A sustainable enforcement caseload has been taken to be around 150 complaints per case officer per annum.

Footnote 2: Definition of Backlog

An authority is considered to have a backlog of applications where, in the last quarter, it did not determine at least as many applications as it received, and the number on hand at the end of that quarter exceeds the number received or the number determined (whichever is greater) by more than 10%. In order to determine whether there is a static backlog, declining backlog or growing backlog the trend is reviewed over the last two years taking account of the number of applications on hand at the end of a quarter/year and the relationship between the number of applications determined and received in a quarter. However, the last four quarters are considered to be the most important period for this purpose.

DRAFT