



Office of the
Deputy Prime Minister

Creating sustainable communities

Cllr R Spencer
The Leader
Gedling Borough Council
Civic Centre
Arnot Hill Park
Arnold
Nottingham
NG5 6LU

Baroness Andrews OBE
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
26 Whitehall
London SW1A 2WH

Tel: 020 7944 3083
Fax: 020 7944 4538
E-Mail: baroness.andrews@odpm.gsi.gov.uk

www.odpm.gov.uk
32/1/18

24 MARCH 2006

RECEIVED
27 MAR 2006

Dear Councillor Spencer

I am writing to send you a copy of the report of your authority's planning service that ODPM commissioned from consultants, and to let you know how we propose to proceed in light of its findings. We are most grateful for the help and co-operation that your officers have given the consultants in their work.

As you will be aware, officers from your authority have recently been involved in discussions with a consortium of consultants, headed by Addison & Associates, contracted by ODPM to assess your authority's planning performance. These investigations were instigated after your authority was designated as a Planning Standards Authority for 2005/06 for not meeting interim performance thresholds for processing minor planning applications. The consultants' initial assessment was done primarily as a desktop study. The second stage has involved the opportunity for your officers to comment on the accuracy and recommendations of the consultant's report. Any comments, observations, recent performance data were then used to inform the final assessment of your planning service's ability to meet national targets.

In considering these reports, regard has been given to your authority's progress towards the specific performance standards that were set for 2005/06, the steps taken to facilitate further performance improvements, and, in the longer term, your authority's ability to reach the national targets set out in the Office's public service agreement 6 (PSA6). As you will know, these targets require all local planning authorities to process at least 60% of major applications in 13 weeks, 65% of minor applications in 8 weeks and 80% of other applications in 8 weeks by March 2007, and maintain these levels of performance for the duration of the current spending review period which is up to March 2008.

After careful consideration of this report, I believe your authority is making excellent progress. Please accept my congratulations on your success to date. I would encourage you to consider taking steps to sustain your good levels of performance as suggested in the attached report.

Whilst we will continue to monitor your progress along with that of all other authorities from the quarterly returns made to ODPM, I see no reason to continue to scrutinise closely the activities of your authority.

If your officers have any detailed questions to raise on this letter or the report they should contact Julian Wheeler in ODPM on 020 7944 5790 in the first instance.

A copy of this letter goes to Peter Murdock your Chief Executive and Michael Stevenson your Head of Planning & Environment.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Baroness Andrews". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

BARONESS ANDREWS

Gedling Borough Council

Executive summary

Gedling Borough Council is a standards authority for 2005/06 because of its performance on minor applications from July 2003 to June 2004. The authority is not proposed as a standards authority for 2006/07 but was previously a standards authority in 2003/04 but not in 2002/03 or 2004/05. Since April 2004 there have been clear signs of improvement in respect of all categories of application, and performance for the annualised period up to the end of Q3 of 2005/06 on minor applications had reached the 2005/06 standard of 63%. Major and other applications are now being processed well above the national targets.

Officer caseloads are static. There is no backlog and although the number of applications on hand at the end of each quarter has fluctuated, actual numbers are low. The improvement plan fully addresses meeting the BVPI 109 targets. The sustainability of performance is not a concern.

The authority has responded well to issues raised by previous assessments and has improved its performance and quality of service considerably. The main area of concern is the small size of the department which makes it vulnerable to staff changes and to any increase in application numbers.

RECOMMENDATION

GREEN

The local planning authority is congratulated on meeting the best value development control performance standards for 2005/06 for the period up to the end of December 2005. It is encouraged to sustain progress to achieve best value and meet the national targets of 60% in 13 weeks for major applications, 65% in 8 weeks for minor applications and 80% in 8 weeks for other applications to March 2007 and beyond.

Current level of performance

Profile of applications received

- The Council received 1187 applications in 2004/05, a 7% decrease from those received in 2003/04. Of those determined during 2004/05 about 2% were major applications, about 21% were minor and the remainder, some 77%, were other applications. Compared to the national average profile of 3% of major applications, 25% of minor applications and 72% of other applications these figures are low for major and minor applications and high for other applications.
- Of those major applications determined in 2004/05 none required a Transport Impact Assessment and none an Environmental Impact Assessment with 4 (14% of the total) being subject to a section 106 agreement and none to a unilateral undertaking. With regard to minor applications 1 had a section 106 agreement.
- In addition and not included in the PS1 return to ODPM the Council received no resubmitted applications, 38 tree applications, no approval of conditions, 7 prior approval applications, and 1 other applications excluded from the PS1 return in 2004/05. No applications were "finally disposed of" (under part 25 of the GDPO 1995).

Throughput of applications

- Performance on major applications has improved substantially from 58% in 2003/04 to 90% for the annualised period up to the end of Q3 of 2005/06 which is above the standard set for standards authorities of 57% and above the national target of 60%. Performance for 2004/05 was 89% and performance in the first 3 quarters of 2005/06 has fluctuated but overall has maintained a high figure (Q1 of 2005/06 achieved 88%, Q2 achieved 100% and Q3 77% of applications determined within 13 weeks). The annual figure up to the end of Q3 of 2005/06 is 33 percentage points above the standard and 30 percentage points above the national target.
- Performance on minor applications has improved substantially from 42% in 2003/04 to 88% for the annualised period up to the end of Q3 2005/06 which is above the standard set for standards authorities of 63% and above the national target of 65%. Performance for 2004/05 was 72% and performance in the first 3 quarters of 2005/06 has improved. (Q1 of 2005/06 achieved 86%, Q2 achieved 86% and Q3 96% of applications determined within 8 weeks). The annual figure up to the end of Q3 of 2005/06 is 25 percentage points above the standard and 23 percentage points above the national target.
- Performance on other applications has improved substantially from 66% in 2003/04 to 94% for the annualised period up to the end of Q3 of 2005/06 which is above the standard set for standards authorities of 75% and above the national target of 80%. Performance for 2004/05 was 87% and performance in the first 3 quarters of 2005/06 has improved. (Q1 of 2005/06 achieved 94%, Q2 achieved 92% and Q3 95% of applications determined within 8 weeks). The annual figure up to the end of Q3 of 2005/06 is 19 percentage points above the standard and 14 percentage points above the national target. Of the other applications determined in 2004/05 less than 2% were Listed Building Consents and only 0.2% were Conservation Area Consents which together represent a small proportion of workload.
- The current caseloads per officer are expected to fall very slightly from 156 in 2004/05 to a projected 154 for 2005/06. This caseload is sustainable by comparison with the guideline figure of 150 cases per officer per annum. There is a FTE of 7.6 case officer posts and none of these posts was vacant at 30 September 2005.
- The refusal rate has risen slightly since 2003/04 from 9% but at 11% for 2004/05 is below the national weighted average of 17%. The percentage of applications withdrawn is low but has increased from 3% in 2003/04 to 4% in 2004/05.
- There is no current backlog of applications and the number on hand at the end of Q2 of 2005/06 is 60% of those that were received

Appeals and enforcement workload

- The appeal workload on hand at the end of Q2 of 2005/06 is 10 cases. This workload has increased since 2004/05. The percentage of appeals dismissed at 78% was above the national average of 66% for 2004/05, and has been above the national average of 67% for the first 6 months of 2005/06 at 77%. Performance against BVPI 204 was 16% in 2004/05 which is considerably below the national average of 33%.
- There is no dedicated appeals resource and all appeals work is carried out by the case officers.
- The number of enforcement complaints is declining; there is no dedicated resource for enforcement but the caseload is low enough for this not to be an issue.

Systems and procedures

- Administrative support for development control is provided by 2.5 FTE posts. The Council has an internal validation checklist for applications and the target period for validation of applications is 3 days from receipt of applications. During 2004/05, 99% of applications were validated within this target period. The authority requires applications to be submitted with the following information in order for the application to be validated: a 'red line' plan and cheque, plus detailed plans and elevations, plus supporting statements and/or supplementary information including an Environmental Statement. No applications received were considered invalid in 2004/05.
- The authority's validation criteria have changed in the light of the best practice guidance on the validation of applications published by ODPM in March 2005
- Current consultation arrangements provide for a target of 7 days from registration to send out neighbour notifications, 7 days to send out consultations to statutory consultees and allow 21 days for comments on planning applications. The Council does delay decisions beyond the expiry of the consultation period to wait for responses from statutory consultees in exceptional cases, but not for neighbour comments.
- An up to date procedures manual is in place.
- Performance management systems are in place to monitor performance on a monthly basis. The management system tracks: BVPI 109 performance, officer caseload, case numbers, backlog and cases past BVPI 109 deadlines.
- The performance is reported to management and officers monthly and quarterly to members
- No specific information was received about action taken in the event of slippage being identified but reference is made in the improvement plan to the frequent monitoring of caseload progress.
- The Council does not have a development control agents' forum.

Decision making

- During 2004/05 the planning applications committee met on a 3 weekly cycle and dealt on average with 4.2 applications per meeting. There were, on average, 0.1 deferrals, 0.1 member site visits and 0.2 overturns of officer recommendation per meeting. There is no provision to refer an application up to a parent committee.
- In 2004/05 the delegation rate was 95%. This compares well with the guideline benchmark of 90%. There has been a slight decrease in delegation from 98% of decisions delegated in 2003/04. The delegation rate at Q3 of 2005/06 was 93%.
- There are no standard written procedures for handling section 106 agreements or unilateral undertakings and there is no set of model clauses available for section 106 agreements or unilateral undertakings. Draft heads of terms are not requested with applications but a formula based payment system is in place for section 106 agreements but not for unilateral undertakings. The Council has an SPG or SPD that provides guidance on section 106 agreements but not on unilateral undertakings. Grampian conditions are used to expedite a decision. During 2004/05, of the 28 major applications determined 4 (14%) included a section 106 agreements and 1 minor applications determined (less than 1%) included section 106 agreements. All were determined in target. In the same period no major applications determined and no minor applications determined included unilateral undertakings.

ICT and customer service

ICT is used for some stages of the development control process and currently meets the following PARSOL service delivery standards:

- Online pre-application and general planning advice
- Submission of applications on line
- Electronic notifications of new planning applications or significant amendments
- Viewing planning applications on line
- Submission of comments on current planning applications accepted on line
- Planning Committee agenda and associated decisions available on line

ICT is not used for:

- Viewing planning related enforcement complaints and notices
- Submission of enforcement complaints on line

Work is not required to upgrade the existing system to meet BVPI 157. The Council does expect to meet BVPI 157 by the end of December 2005. The Pendleton score was 5 at May 2005.

In terms of customer service:

- The Council has a published and adopted development control customer charter.
- Pre-application advice is provided for all categories of application. Advice on all is provided by the case officer. The usual waiting time for advice from a case officer is up to a week for minor and other applications, but up to 3 weeks for major applications. There is no charge for this advice.
- Retrievable records are kept in a hard copy form for all categories of application.
- Customer satisfaction levels measured in terms of BVPI 111 stood at 81% in 2003/04 compared to the national figure of 75% for district councils.
- Performance against BVPI 205 suggests the Council is performing well in this regard.

Policy framework

The Gedling Local Plan was adopted in November 1990. The authority has reviewed this plan and the Gedling Replacement Local Plan was adopted in July 2005. It has been saved under the provisions of the pre September 2004 system. The current timetable for the Local Development Framework aims for a core strategy to be in place by November 2007 and first Local Development Document by August 2008.

Planning Delivery Grant

The Council was awarded £75,000 Planning Delivery Grant for 2003/04. The authority was allocated sums for improvement in performance.

The Council was awarded £122,000 Planning Delivery Grant for 2004/05. It was used in the planning service for staffing and consultancy. The authority was allocated sums for making timely progress towards adopting a development plan, and for each enterprise area within its boundaries. In addition it received a sum for improvement in development control performance on major applications in the period October 2002 to September 2003.

A sum of £259,000 was awarded for 2005/06. It is to be used in the planning service and for staffing, training, ICT and consultancy. The authority was allocated sums for making timely progress in plan making, for each enterprise area within its boundaries, for meeting

the BVPI 109 targets and for performance improvement in development control in the period October 2003 to September 2004 compared to the previous year. The service has no need to carry over any of the grant into 2006/07.

ODPM has proposed in its consultation paper that the authority be provisionally allocated £342,334 Planning Delivery Grant for 2006/07 of which £336,964 is for development control performance but excluding any amount for plan-making, housing and e-planning.

The scale of improvement since April 2004

The key areas of improvement since April 2004 have been:

- One additional case officer
- Greater staff stability compared to previous years
- Improved administrative processes
- Increasing the frequency of delegation
- Improved ICT systems
- Improved performance management systems

Between 2004/05 and the end of Q3 2005/06 major applications performance has risen by 1%, minor applications performance by 16 percentage points and other applications by 7 percentage points.

The authority does not believe that the quality of applications, decision making, the service or development outcomes have been compromised during the 18 months up to September 2005.

Reassessment of previous evaluations

This authority was a standards authority for 2003/04. The assessment made in 2003/04 was that the authority had suffered from staff shortages, the lack of a service head and there was no comprehensive improvement strategy. Performance management was felt to need improvement, blockages in processing needed identifying and the role of the delegation panel needed consideration.

An external review of the service was commissioned, identifying key obstacles and areas for improvement. A service improvement plan was produced, containing proposals for additional staff, improving administrative efficiency, ICT enhancement, better performance management and improving the frequency of the decision making process.

Other inspections

The Best Value inspection by the Audit Commission of Planning Services reported in March 2005. The service was assessed as a fair service with uncertain prospects for improvement. The report noted that the service was good at issues around sustainability and the historic environment, and that performance in relation to processing planning applications had recently improved. However, there was limited guidance available, no up to date local plan and a limited service for customers.

The CPA report was published in November 2003 and found the Council to be a good authority. It was felt to be good at delivering basic services, performance management and

customer satisfaction, but weaker on prioritisation and a range of corporate issues. Good performance in relation to planning indicators was noted.

Proposals for future improvement

Following the Audit Commission's report in March 2005, a draft Action Plan was produced. This was submitted to the Community and Quality of life Scrutiny Committee on 9th August 2005. It states that all of the recommendations arising out of the Audit Commission report of March 2005 have been taken into account. The key proposals for 2005/06 include:

- Website development and ICT improvements
- Production of SPDs for major development sites and conservation area enhancements
- Greater use of targets and action plans with regular monitoring of LDF priorities and section 106 agreements
- Greater community involvement
- A more proactive approach to guidance
- Additional training for members and staff
- Review of capacity and caseloads
- Improving presentations at committee and improving the transparency of the delegation system

The Council feels that past delays in speed of processing have been caused by staffing issues and some inefficient processes. The department is small which left it vulnerable to staff absences. The staffing complement has been increased since April 2004. The changes made since April 2004 have contributed to much improved performance which has been consistently maintained.

Improvements to the website have improved public accessibility to planning services and other ICT developments have enabled better monitoring and management of caseloads. The overall strategy in both the service improvement plan and the draft action plan has been to address directly the issues raised by external assessments and prepare coherent plans to deal with them. The recent performance has dealt effectively with the issue of BVPI 109 and other improvements are now planned to deal with a range of customer care, service quality and training issues.

The main risk, of problems which might arise out of staff absences, has been identified and dealt with by giving the head of service delegated powers to deal with short term problems by the use of external consultants.

Sustainability of improvement

The proposals in the draft action plan appear realistic. The plan does not attempt to be over optimistic and has confined itself to actions which will assist directly in maintaining performance and improve the quality of service. The service, because of its small size, will always be vulnerable to staff absences or turnover, but it has assessed this risk and taken action to minimise any adverse impact.

The caseload appears manageable and there is no backlog, with the numbers of applications on hand at the end of each quarter fluctuating but kept to an acceptable level.

The authority has responded well to previous external assessments and has delivered coherent improvement plans which have achieved their aim of improving and maintaining performance improvements

Although the authority had an out of date local plan for some time, this does not appear to have an adverse impact on its appeal performance. The replacement local plan was adopted in July 2005.

Accessibility for applicants appears limited, with no duty planer system and applicants having to wait up to a week to see a case officer. This is unlikely to encourage pre-application discussions and efforts to improve the quality of submitted applications.

Delivery capability

The authority was criticised by the Audit Commission in 2003 for being unclear on priorities and for a weak scrutiny function. From the documentation supplied it appears that these issues have been addressed, and there has been good member support in drawing up the service improvement plan and the more recent action plan. Additional resources have been agreed and there has been a considerable improvement in the e-planning capabilities. Internal processes and procedures appear efficient.

Concerns were expressed by the Audit Commission about some customer care aspects of the service, and although many of these are addressed in the action plan, the limited resources may mean the service will have to prioritise its activities.

The planning service establishment at 30 September 2005 was 25.3 FTE staff with 12 in the development control service. At that date the development control service was delivered by the FTE of 7.5 professional staff, 1 technical and 2.5 administrative with 1 manager, no agency staff, and no enforcement officers. There were no vacancies. Skills in urban design and historic buildings are provided by external consultants with advice on transport and highways, ecological and arboricultural issues provided from the county. The experience profile of development control staff is weighted toward those who are qualified with more than 5 years experience. The Council has a training and development strategy providing on average 3 days training per FTE post in 2004/05.

No staff left during 2004/05. Within the development control service since April 2004 an additional case officer post (0.6 FTE) has been created. Since April 2004 only 1 post has been advertised and there was no problem in filling it. There are 2 senior managers due to leave before the end of 2005 and this is likely to impact on the service. The Council does not have a recruitment and retention strategy.

The volume of major applications is small. There does not appear to be an issue or any problems in dealing with applications involving Environmental Impact Assessments, Transport Impact Assessments or section 106 agreements.

Conclusion

In the 12 months to the end of December 2005 the Council met the 2005/06 standard of 63% for minor applications and met the national BVPI 109 target levels of 60%, 65% and 80% for major, minor and other applications.

On current performance the standard set for 2005/06 is likely to be achieved and sustained for minor applications by the end of 2005/06 and the national targets for all categories are likely to be met at March 2007.

The challenges for the authority in sustaining the targets may be:

- Maintaining staff numbers
- Ensuring the action plan is implemented according to programme and monitored
- Ensuring continuity with changes at senior management level

From the information available improvement is needed in respect of the following:

- Development of a staff recruitment strategy
- Development of guidance on section 106 requirements
- Improving information available to the public and applicants
- Consideration of the benefits of a duty planner system and a developers forum

These matters need to be addressed in the near future if the Council is to sustain performance to March 2007 and beyond.

Documents used in the preparation of this report

1. Performance Indicators Case Datasheet 2005/06
2. Evaluation of PDG Questionnaire 2005/06
3. Evaluation of Chief Executive's PDG Questionnaire 2005/06
4. BVPI Questionnaire 2005/06
5. PS1 and PS2 returns for July to September 2005
6. FEE1 and FEE2 returns for July-September 2005
7. CPA report November 2003, Audit Commission
8. Planning Service Improvement Plan (undated)
9. Planning Services Inspection report, March 2005, Audit Commission
10. Planning Services Draft Action Plan, report to Community and Quality of Life Scrutiny Committee, 9th August 2005.
11. Staff structure charts
12. A range of performance monitoring reports
13. Customer Service Contract
14. Emails from the authority dated 24th January and 1st February.

Notes:

Backlog – An authority is considered to have a backlog of applications, in a quarter, where it did not determine at least as many applications as it received and the number on hand at the end of the 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 four quarters.

Caseloads – This has been calculated using the number of applications received in a year (only those included in the PS1/2 return) and divided by the number of **established** FTE posts for that year, ignoring current vacancies or any short term support. A sustainable caseload has been taken to be around 150 applications per case officer. A sustainable enforcement caseload has been taken to be around 150 complaints per case officer per annum.

Grampian Conditions - This expression derives from the decision in *Grampian Regional Council v City of Aberdeen* (1984) and in essence it provides that a condition precluding the implementation of development

permitted by a planning permission until some step has been taken is valid. There have been a number of subsequent High Court decisions on this point, in particular *British Railways Board v SSE* in 1994. As a result of these it is lawful for a local planning authority to grant planning permission, even in respect of land not within the planning applicant's ownership, subject to a negative condition restricting its implementation, in whole or in part, until some event has occurred.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS CASE DATA SHEET

Local Authority:		Gedling Borough Council																	
Performance (%)	2002/2003	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006	2003/4				2004/5				2005/6				2006/7 BVP Target		
					Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4			
Major decisions	25	26	28			9	6	5	6			7	8	7	6			28	30
% in 13 weeks	28%	58%	89%			33%	67%	60%	83%			100%	88%	71%	100%			89%	90%
Minor decisions	217	221	258			49	61	59	52			84	54	67	53			275	261
% in 8 weeks	60%	42%	72%			55%	46%	32%	35%			61%	65%	79%	87%			84%	88%
Other decisions	926	969	926			238	242	272	217			262	277	196	182			833	810
% in 8 weeks	78%	66%	87%			82%	60%	58%	70%			82%	84%	93%	97%			94%	94%

* Calculated by multiplying the performance figure by the number of decisions over the time period, and so contains an element of rounding.

Application nos.	2002/2003		2003/2004		2004/2005		2005/2006		2003/4				2004/5				2005/6			
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2004	2005	2005	2006	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
On hand at start	233	255	255	277	277	216			255	294	308	245	277	258	166	150	216	196	164	
Received	1221	1273	1273	1187	1187			343	328	280	322	342	314	270	261	314	317	272	228	
Determined	1168	1216	1216	1205	1205			296	309	336	275	353	270	339	270	243	332	293	246	
On hand at end	255	277	277	216	216			294	308	245	277	258	166	150	216	196	165	138		
Withdrawn	31	35	35	43	43			8	5	7	15	8	23	7	5	5	10			
% Withdrawn	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%			2%	2%	2%	5%	2%	9%	3%	2%	2%	4%			
Delegated	1116	1189	1189	1164	1164			290	300	330	269	345	327	258	234	314	277	230		
% Delegated	96%	98%	98%	97%	97%			98%	97%	98%	98%	98%	96%	96%	96%	96%	95%	93%		
Refused	74	105	105	128	128			31	25	22	27	32	38	34	24	45	34	32		
% Refused	6%	9%	9%	11%	11%			11%	8%	7%	10%	9%	12%	13%	10%	14%	12%	13%		
Backlog - del/rec	R > D	R > D	R > D	D > R	D > R			R > D	R > D	D > R	R > D	D > R	D > R	D > R	D > R	R > D	D > R	D > R		
Backlog - c/fwd								NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	

Annual statistics	2002/3		2003/4		2004/5		2005/6		% change 2002/3 to 2003/4		% change 2003/4 to 2004/5		% change 2004/5 to 2005/6	
	2002	2003	2003	2004	2004	2005	2005	2006	2002/3	2003/4	2003/4	2004/5	2004/5	2005/6
On hand at start	233	255	255	277	277	216			9%	9%	277	216	-22%	
Received	1221	1273	1273	1187	1187			4%	4%	1187				
Determined	1168	1216	1216	1205	1205			4%	4%	1205				
On hand at end	255	277	277	216	216			9%	9%	216				

Planning expenditure	Gross planning expenditure	Fee Income	PDG Income	Other Income	Net planning expenditure
2002/3	£877,000	£324,000	£0	£42,000	£511,000
2003/4	£1,004,000	£304,000	£75,000	£47,000	£578,000
2004/5	£954,000	£353,000	£122,000	£48,000	£431,000
2005/6*	£1,062,000	£327,000	£320,000	£43,000	£372,000

* Complete financial year estimate

Planning Staff	Total FTE est. posts at 31.03.04	Total FTE est. posts at 31.03.05	Total FTE in post at 31.03.05	No. of FTE vacancies at 31.03.05	Total FTE est. posts at 30.09.05	Total FTE staff in post at 30.09.05	No. of vacancies at 30.09.05	Total app's received*			App's per case officer posts ¹			
								2003/4	2004/5	2005/6	2003/4	2004/5	2005/6	
Management	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00							
Case officers - professional	7.80	7.60	7.60	0.00	7.60	7.60	0.00							
Case officers - technical/other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00							
Technical	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00							
Admin support	2.50	2.50	2.50	0.00	2.50	2.50	0.00							
Agency/consultancy - professional	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00								
Agency/consultancy - tech/admin	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00								
Appeals staff	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00								
Enforcement staff	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00								
Policy staff	4.40	4.40	4.40	0.00	4.40	4.40	0.00							
Management - all other	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00							
Agency/consultancy staff - all other	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00								
All other staff	7.80	7.80	7.80	0.00	7.80	7.80	0.00							
Total Planning Service	24.70	25.30	25.30	0.00	25.30	25.30	0.00							

* 2005/6 application numbers estimated on the basis of two quarters where Q3 is not available, otherwise based on three quarters.

Development Plan	Plan title	Date plan adopted	Review date	Review type	Review stage	Saved existing system?
	Gedling Local Plan	Nov-90	Aug-03	Review	Inquiry	Saved existing system
Local Development Framework	Annual Monitoring Report?					
	Work completed?	Date submitted to Govt. Office	Core Strategy			
	NO		Nov-07		SCI	1 st DPD
					Sep-06	Aug-08

BV Inspection (by Audit Commission)		
Date inspected	Date published	Score
Feb-05	Mar-05	Fair
		Uncertain

CPA Data		
Date published	Overall LPA Score	Direction of Travel
Nov-03	Good	

ICT Assessment		
Accepting online applications*	Pendleton score	Pendleton date
YES	5	May-05

*as at 28.10.05

Heritage/Conservation ¹¹	2002/ 2003		2003/ 2004		2004/ 2005		2005/ 2006		2003/4				2004/5				2005/6															
	Total Nos	%	Total Nos	%	Total Nos	%	Total Nos	%	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4												
LBC decisions	12	58%	14	14%	15	33%			1	6	1	6	3	6	4	2	5	10	3													
% in 8 weeks	2	50%	2	50%	2	50%			0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	0													
									0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	67%	0%													
Other data	EIA																				TIA				S106				Unilateral undertaking			
	Total Nos		Nos in target ¹²		Total Nos		Nos in target ¹²		Total Nos		Nos in target ¹²		Total Nos		Nos in target ¹²		Total Nos		Nos in target ¹²		Total Nos		Nos in target ¹²									
2002/3	0		0		0		0		6		1		0		0		0		0		0		0									
2003/4	0		0		0		0		5		2		0		0		0		0		0		0									
2004/5	0		0		0		0		1		1		0		0		0		0		0		0									
2005/6	0		0		0		0		1		1		0		0		0		0		0		0									
2005/6 based on 2 quarters	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0									

Sources:

- The statistics on planning applications are provided by ODPM, updated for the most recent quarter by the local authority.
- The BVPI targets for 2003/4 are from Annex C, for 2004/5 are from Annex B and for 2005/6 are from pages 272-274 of the ODPM published Best Value Performance Indicators documents.
- DC staff numbers and the information on the Development Plan, Enforcement and Complaints, BVPIs and Committee Cycles are mostly from the Local Authority.
- Appeals data was supplied by PINS.
- Other data was from ODPM and the Audit Commission.

Guidance:

- ¹ For 2005/6 the annual figure has been estimated on the basis of information grossed up from two quarters.
- ² For the purposes of this question 'major applications' is defined as all applications for more than 50 houses or 10,000 square metres of industrial, commercial or retail floorspace and smaller major applications in which more than one council department has an interest.
- ³ This should include all reported complaints about alleged breaches of planning control. Where more than one complaint is made about the same breach these should be included within the total.
- ⁴ Includes planning contravention, breach of condition, enforcement and stop notices.
- ⁵ Includes all S78 appeals
- ⁶ Applications to carry out works to trees/fell under TPOs and applications to carry out works/to fell trees in conservation areas.
- ⁷ Applications for consent, agreement or approval required by a condition or limitation attached to a grant of planning permission.
- ⁸ Applications under Part 24 of the GPDO 1995 – prior approval by telecommunications code system operators.
- ⁹ Applications under Part 25 of the GPDO 1995 – finally disposed of powers.
- ¹⁰ This could include minor amendments to existing or approved schemes where a new application is not required, applications under Part 31 of the GPDO 1995 (demolition of buildings), hedgerow removal notices and consultations on applications by a neighbouring authority.
- ¹¹ These are also included within the definition of 'other applications' within the ODPM PS2 return.
- ¹² The number of applications determined within the BV109 target timescale (i.e. 13 weeks for Major applications and 8 weeks for Minor applications).

Backlog:

Backlog (del/rec) is applications determined divided by applications received - measuring the relationship (level) of applications determined as compared to applications received. The result is given as either 'D>R' (Determined more than received) or 'R>D' (Received more than determined).

Backlog (c/fwd) is a measure of carry over (applications on hand at end of quarter) compared to either applications received or applications determined, whichever is greater. A 'Yes' is returned if the number carried forward exceeded the number received or determined by more than 10%.