



Strategic Planning & Environment

Overview & Scrutiny

Agenda

TUESDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 7.30 PM

Conference Room 2 - The Forum

The Councillors listed below are requested to attend the above meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Membership

Councillor G Adshead
Councillor Anderson (Chairman)
Councillor Barrett
Councillor Birnie
Councillor Fisher
Councillor S Hearn
Councillor Hicks

Councillor Howard (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Matthews
Councillor Ransley
Councillor Riddick
Councillor Timmis
Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe

Substitute Members:

Councillors Bateman, England, Link, McLean, Ritchie, R Sutton and Tindall

For further information, please contact Katie Mogan or Member Support

AGENDA

9. PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION Q2 PERFORMANCE REPORT (Pages 2 - 15)

Report to follow

Agenda Item 9



| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Report for: | Strategic Planning and Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee |
| Date of meeting: | 21 November 2017 |
| PART: | 1 |
| If Part II, reason: | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Title of report: | Quarter 2 2017/18 Performance Report – Planning, Development and Regeneration |
| Contact: | Cllr Graham Sutton, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration James Doe, Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regeneration |
| Purpose of report: | To report on service performance for the second quarter of 2017/18, and to provide an update on the Operational Risk Register. |
| Recommendations | That the report be noted. |
| Corporate objectives: | The report focuses on the service plan for the area and key performance indicators. All corporate objectives are therefore relevant. |
| Implications: | <u>Financial</u> None arising directly from this report. |
| 'Value For Money Implications' | <u>Value for Money</u> None arising directly from this report. |
| Risk Implications | Risk Assessment completed as part of the service plan. |
| Equalities Implications | None arising from this report. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Health And Safety Implications | None arising from this report. |
| Consultees: | Cllr Graham Sutton, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration. Mark Gaynor, Corporate Director for Housing and Regeneration Andrew Horner, Group Manager for Development Management and Planning Chris Taylor, Group Manager for Strategic Planning and Regeneration |
| Background papers: | Planning and Regeneration Service Plan 2016-17 Performance information held on the CorVu system. |

Introduction

1. The report provides information on performance of the Planning, Development and Regeneration service for the second quarter of the business year 2017/18, from the start of July to the end of September.
2. In summary, performance remains generally strong, with the main exceptions to this being in the validation process for planning applications and income levels in Building Control and Local Land Charges.

Performance Indicators

3. Building Control. The service continues to perform strongly. The key indicator results were on target at 100% of applications determined within two months of receipt (BC01).
4. Income from the Building Control service is currently running below target by around £53,000, though it was on target at the end of the last financial year. (FIN15). Generally, the number of applications submitted to the service is holding up, but there has been a slight fall-off so far in the receipt of larger, higher value work.
5. Development Management. Workload (DMP02) continues to remain high with 474 applications received during the quarter, though down from the 614 applications received in quarter 1.
6. Planning fee income (FIN16) remains very strong with just over £452,000 collected this quarter, over £71,000 ahead of target. This continues to be due to the receipt of major planning applications which attract large fees.
7. Processing times for planning applications (DMP04, 05 and 06) continues to remain strong.
8. For major planning applications, all nine applications determined were processed within the statutory timescale or with agreed extensions of time,

considerably above the target of 60%, reflecting well on the need to process the larger developments efficiently.

9. Just over 72% of Minor applications were approved on time – ahead of the 65% target.
10. The 'other' category of applications – the bulk of the service's workload – ended the quarter at 84.3%, again with the 80% target met.
11. The refusal rate for planning applications continues to remain low, with only 4.9% of applications refused, well ahead of the 10% target (DMP07).
12. Quarter two was good for planning appeals, with the success rate at 100% of cases dismissed (DMP30), and well over the 70% target. There were 13 cases determined in comparison with ten in quarter 1.
13. The time taken to validate planning applications (DMP08) remains a problem, though performance is beginning to improve. For the quarter, against a target of validating 70% of applications within 3 days, only 34% was achieved. The complexity of some major cases has slowed validation, even with a degree of overtime working. Problems with the upgrades to the online planning system have not helped.
14. The service's management has brought in assistance from the Improvement team to review processes with the aim of validating applications more efficiently, and currently the turnaround time is now down to 7 days, though further improvements are needed to return to target performance.
15. As reported previously, Members will note however that slow validation in recent months has not impacted adversely on the service's ability to achieve and exceed application processing targets.
16. Planning Enforcement. An update will be provided at the meeting.
17. Land Charges. Performance remains good at an average processing time of 6.87 days (an improvement from the 7.25 days last quarter) to process property searches against the target of ten days. Income is however just over £6000 below target at £139,000 received in search fees (FIN15).
18. Strategic Planning and Regeneration. 111 new homes were completed in quarter 1 (SPR05), up from 88 homes last quarter. Delivery rates will vary from quarter to quarter depending on market conditions and the supply of sites.

Operational Risk Register

19. The risk register is at appendix 2, and this remains unchanged. Questions on the register are invited at the meeting.

SPE OSC QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT

Planning, Development and Regeneration

September 2017



| Measure | Owner & Updater | Sep 2017 Result | Jun 2017 Result | Sep 2016 Result | Sign Off | Comments |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|
| BC01 - Percentage of Building Control Applications determined within 2 months | Andrew Horner Andrew Howard | 100% (140/140) Target: 100 | 98.91% (182/184) Target: 100 | 100% (178/178) Target: 100 | ✓ Updater | 100% Target Met. |
| DMP02 - Number of planning applications received | Andrew Horner Fiona Bogle | 474 Applications Info Only | 614 Applications Info Only | 606 Applications Info Only | ✓ Updater | |
| DMP04 - Percentage of major applications determined within 13 weeks (YTD) | Andrew Horner Fiona Bogle | No Data Target: 60 | 77.78% (7/9) Target: 60 | 57.14% (4/7) Target: 60 | ✓ Updater | |
| DMP05 - Percentage of minor applications determined within 8 weeks | Andrew Horner Fiona Bogle | 72.29% (60/83) Target: 65 | 92.54% (62/67) Target: 65 | 83.33% (65/78) Target: 65 | ✓ Updater | |
| DMP06 - Percentage of other applications determined within 8 weeks | Andrew Horner Fiona Bogle | 84.37% (286/339) Target: 80 | 83.9% (245/292) Target: 80 | 93.54% (275/294) Target: 80 | ✓ Updater | |
| DMP07 - Percentage of planning applications refused | Andrew Horner Fiona Bogle | 4.9% (28/572) Target: 10 | 4.96% (27/544) Target: 10 | 4.56% (23/504) Target: 10 | ✓ Updater | |
| DMP08 - Percentage of planning applications validated within 3 working days | Andrew Horner Joan Reid | 34% (190/553) Target: 70 | 38% (234/621) Target: 70 | 49% (292/593) Target: 70 | ✓ Owner | Performance consistent across the quarter but backlog remains. Systems thinking review with support from Improvement Team to begin late October to identify opportunities to deliver more efficient service and cut out waste and unnecessary actions. |

Monitoring Information

| Measure | Owner & Updater | Sep 2017 Result | Jun 2017 Result | Sep 2016 Result | Sign Off | Comments |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| DMP30 - Appeals dismissed | Andrew Horner Fiona Bogle | 100% (13/13) Target: 70 | 65% (6/10) Target: 0.7 | 61.54% (8/13) Target: 0.7 | ✓ Updater | |
| FIN15 - Building Control Income ytd actual against profiled budget | James Doe Caroline Souto | £276191 Target: 328920 | £138061 Target: 171650 | £295703 Target: 287297 | ✗ | |
| FIN16 - Planning Fees ytd actual against profiled budget | James Doe Caroline Souto | £452359 Target: 381360 | £251166 Target: 190680 | £276008 Target: 406355 | ✗ | |
| FIN17 - Search Fees ytd actual against profiled budget | James Doe Caroline Souto | £139127 Target: 145500 | £68672 Target: 72750 | £124125 Target: 140000 | ✗ | |
| LC04 - Average time taken to process an official Local Land Charges search | Andrew Horner Ann Stowe | 6.87 Days Target: 10 | 7.25 Days Target: 10 | 5.18 Days Target: 10 | ✓ Updater | The turnaround time has decreased during this quarter. |
| PE01 - Percentage of priority 1 enforcement cases visited within 1 working day | Andrew Horner Philip Stanley | No Data Target: 100 | 100% (2/2) Target: 100 | 75% (3/4) Target: 0 | ✓ Updater | |
| PE02 - Percentage of priority 2 enforcement cases visited within 10 working days | Andrew Horner Philip Stanley | No Data No Target | 89.5% (68/76) Target: 0 | 96.9% (62/64) Target: 0 | ✓ Updater | |
| PE03 - Percentage of priority 3 enforcement cases visited within 15 working days | Andrew Horner Philip Stanley | No Data No Target | 93.2% (55/59) Target: 0 | 100% (64/64) Target: 0 | ✓ Updater | |
| SPR05 - Number of new homes completed | Chris Taylor Francis Whittaker | 111 Homes Info Only | 88 Homes Info Only | 111 Homes Info Only | ✓ Updater Owner | |
| SPR20 - Level of CIL receipts | Chris Taylor Robert Freeman | No Data Info Only | No Data Info Only | No Data Info Only | ✗ Updater Owner | |

Proposed

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



Planning Development & Regeneration - James Doe

PDR_F01 Market fails to bring forward because of continuing economic uncertainty

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| Category: Financial | Corporate Priority: Regeneration | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 3 Likely | 2 Medium | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Needs of the community in terms of housing, jobs and local services will not be met. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Enterprise Zone for Maylands secured, due to be operational by April 2017 - Developments coming forward at the Maylands Aviva site (out of town retail) and Prologis/Aviva (new commercial floorspace) - Economic Development Strategy in place with review process planned in - Dacorum Development Programme in place with dedicated team and budget - Participation in county-wide initiatives and Partnership - Corporate actions; developments monitored and managed through Corporate Regeneration Group; - Role of CRG updated into a new Growth and Infrastructure Board - Submission made to the LEP's bid for Growth Deal 3 fund for a range of projects to boost the economy; - Town Centre Strategy now approved; | | <p>Economic Development Strategy published at http://www.dacorumlooknofurther.co.uk/docs/default-document-library/ed-strategy-brochure-web-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>Dacorum Development Programme at http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/ddpjanuary2013.pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>Regeneration proposals generally at http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/regeneration</p> <p>See promotional information at www.dacorumlooknofurther.co.uk</p> <p>Town Centre Strategy at</p> | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/council-democracy/meetings-minutes-and-agendas/events/2014/10/21/cabinet/cabinet |
| Sign Off and Comments | |
| Sign Off Complete | |

PDR_F02 External funding sources are reduced or disappear

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| Category: Financial | Corporate Priority: Regeneration | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 2 Unlikely | 4 Severe | 8 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Key projects fail to come forward. | | Robust project management procedures in place to minimise risk to the Council in seeking new funds and to ensure timely spend to avoid clawback of grant funding. Ongoing liaison with Herts LEP on external funding proposals, with submission made to the Growth Deal 3 programme in 2016 Participation in the Herts Enviro-Tech Enterprise Zone at Maylands / East Hemel to secure funding for major infrastructure improvements Corporate Project Management systems | | Corvu project updates Cabinet reports on Water Gardens project Cabinet reports on Maylands Urban Realm Project Bid submission to Herts LEP | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



| | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| | Management of cases through Dacorum Regeneration Programme Board. | |
| Sign Off and Comments | | |
| Sign Off Complete | | |

PDR_F03 Key income streams do not meet planning fees, building regulations and local land charges income budgets

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| PDR_F03 | Category: Financial | Corporate Priority: Regeneration | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
| | Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| | 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 3 Likely | 3 High | 9 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | | |
| Unable to meet government and local targets. - Bad press - Shortfall on budget and potential staff cuts/service reduction - possibility of Govt intervention in the planning service if performance declines as a result | | Monthly monitoring of development levels and income with Accountancy at GM and AD level Review of major developments monthly to help track income trajectory Building Control fees are to be increased from 1 April 2017 | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Sign Off and Comments | | | | | |
| Sign Off Complete | | | | | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



Income from Planning fees now unlikely to meet the increased income target set in the 16/17 budget. impact has been mitigated by the later than expected arrival of major planning applications

PDR_I01 Failure to deliver on the Regeneration and Sustainability Agenda by Insufficient Capac

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| Category: Infrastructure | Corporate Priority: Regeneration | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 2 Unlikely | 3 High | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Regeneration projects fail, are delayed or go over budget. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPAR team fully in place - Formation of corporate regeneration group has brought in further support and capacity - Projects monitored through Dacorum Regeneration Programme Board and Steering Group | | <p>Project PIDs and governance in place, particularly Corporate Regeneration Group and Dacorum Regeneration Programme Board.</p> <p>See Cabinet report Dec 2013 regarding Hemel Evolution project management arrangements http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/cabinet---13-12-17---hemel-evolution-report---final-report-jd-comments.pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>Work now progressing on site for the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements and on schedule.</p> | |
| Sign Off and Comments | | | | | |
| Sign Off Complete | | | | | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



PDR_I02 Failure to deliver on the Regeneration and Sustainability Agenda by lack of internal expertise

| Category: Infrastructure | Corporate Priority: Regeneration | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---------------------|
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 2 Unlikely | 3 High | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Regeneration projects fail, are delayed or go over budget. | | Qualified staf appointed. Specialist expertise has been brought in using project finance on cost management, Design monitoring and Health and Safety. | | See Dec 2013 Cabinet report for Hemel Evolution project management arrangements http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/cabinet---13-12-17---hemel-evolution-report---final-report-jd-comments.pdf?sfvrsn=0 | |
| Sign Off and Comments | | | | | |
| Sign Off Complete | | | | | |

PDR_I03 Failure to deliver on the Regeneration and Sustainability Agenda by Failure of partners to engage

| Category: Infrastructure | Corporate Priority: Regeneration | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 3 Likely | 3 High | 9 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| | | | | | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Regeneration projects fail, are delayed or go over budget. | Regular engagement with key partners and stakeholders through direct project management and through Dacorum Regeneration Programme Board. Infrastructure delivery plan in place and plans to engage key providers to address needs of development growth within Dacorum new Two Waters masterplan in draft and engaging key partners | HH Town Centre Masterplan at http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/regeneration/hemel-evolution/hemel-hempstead-masterplan Water Gardens funding report to Cabinet at http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/council-democracy/meetings-minutes-and-agendas/events/2014/07/22/cabinet/cabinet |
|--|--|--|

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Residual risk rating raised to reflect increased delivery of regeneration and development in the Borough by the private sector and therefore with less direct control. Challenge to match the needs generated by new developments with necessary infrastructure improvements.

PDR_I04 Failure of Business Continuity Plan to keep critical and key services running

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Category: Infrastructure | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Tolerating |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 2 Unlikely | 3 High | 6 Amber | 1 Very Unlikely | 3 High | 3 Green |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| - loss of service to the public - harm to Council's reputation - duty to meet legal requirements is impaired - potential loss of income and business | | Actions in Corporate Business Continuity Plan Prioritisation of key service in the event of disaster or other failure. | | Corporate Business Continuity Plan | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

PDR_I05 Workforce Planning fails to prevent service failure

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Category: Infrastructure | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Treating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 2 Unlikely | 4 Severe | 8 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| Service cannot be delivered effectively if staffing levels are reduced | | Workforce development plan as drafted Timely filling of posts and rearrangement of responsibilities where appropriate when staff leave Review of need for trainees to be developed in house to deal with recruitment and retention issues caused by a strong professional jobs market in 2015. | | Workforce Development Plan | |

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete
 Growing difficulty in retaining and recruiting Building Control staff, yet recent recruitment in early 2017 has secured 3 trainee appointments.

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



PDR_R01 Local Development Framework (LDF) fails to meet milestones in Local Development Scheme

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| Category: Reputational | Corporate Priority: Dacorum Delivers | Risk Owner: James Doe | Portfolio Holder: Graham Sutton | Tolerance: Tolerating | |
| Inherent Probability | Inherent Impact | Inherent Risk Score | Residual Probability | Residual Impact | Residual Risk Score |
| 3 Likely | 4 Severe | 12 Red | 2 Unlikely | 3 High | 6 Amber |
| Consequences | | Current Controls | | Assurance | |
| The Council is left without and up to date development plan and unable to resist inappropriate new developments (eg in the Green belt) and unable to plan effectively for future growth and development | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Core Strategy adopted September 2013 - a major task and milestone achieved, to make the rest of the process achievable - Project management and monitoring of progress against the Local Development Scheme - Site Allocations DPD nearing adoption (summer 2017) - New Local Development Scheme approved by DBC in December 2016 to cover production of the new Dacorum Local Plan by 2019 | | <p>Core Strategy published on line at http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/planning-development/planning-strategic-planning/local-planning-framework/core-strategy</p> <p>Report to Cabinet http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/core-strategy-adoption---report-(373-kb).pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>supplementary report to Cabinet on 17 Sep at http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/core-strategy-adoption---report-supplement---core-strategy-legal-challenge-(572-kb).pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>Further report to Cabinet on next steps with Local Planning Framework Dec 2013 http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-</p> | |

OPERATIONAL RISK REGISTER

December 2016



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>source/council-democracy/annual-monitoring-report-and-lpf---report-(187-kb).pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>Local Development Scheme at http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/lfs-2014-final-version.pdf?sfvrsn=0</p> <p>Other cabinet reports on Local Planning Framework progress</p> |
|--|--|--|

Sign Off and Comments

Sign Off Complete

Residual risk rating raised as the new Local Plan gets underway. Potential for delays are quite high with introduction of new evidence throughout the process (eg new housing data) and reliance on the Planning Inspectorate to set up Examinations to align to the timescale.