

FINANCE, AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE – 4 AUGUST 2014



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

A Borough to be proud of

FINANCE, AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE UPDATE – PLANNING SERVICE
REPORT OF DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (CORPORATE DIRECTION)

WARDS AFFECTED: ALL WARDS

1. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide the committee with an update on the financial, performance and risk position of the planning service as at 30 June 2014.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That members note the contents of this report

3. **BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT**

Financial Performance

- 3.1 The financial performance for the planning service from 1st April 2014 – 30 June 2014 has been detailed in Appendix 1. As at 30th June 2014, the planning service is under spent against profiled budget (taking into account timing differences) by £107,726. Of this amount £110,000 has been forecast to year end.
- 3.2 Details of variances over £25,000 have been provided in Appendix 1. Planning income for the first quarter of 2014/15 has been higher than expected due to the increase in major planning applications. It is likely that additional speculative major schemes, that were not previously envisaged, will be submitted later in the financial year given the lack of a 5-year housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in national planning policy. Members should note that this forecast variance is in addition to the £100,000 additional income budget approved by Council in May 2014.

Performance

- 3.3 Performance against performance indicators for the planning service from 1st April 2014 – 30th June 2014 has been detailed in Appendix 2, along with explanation where indicators have not been met. In total 90% (9 out of 10) of indicators are currently meeting target.

Risk Management

- 3.4 The risk register for the planning service contains 13 risks for 2014/2015. There are two red (high) risks as at 30th June 2014 and these are detailed below, along with actions that are currently being taken to mitigate these:

Risk	Risk failure leads to:	Net Risk Level	Review commentary	Risk Owner
DLS42 – Meet the Needs of Gypsy and	Illegal incursions.	8	Additional sites are being explored as a number of existing sites which were identified as having potential	Sally Smith / Nic Thomas

Travelers in the Borough			for intensification or extension are unlikely to be deliverable, however work is still on-going on these sites.	
DLS44 – Five year housing land supply	Speculative unplanned housing developments plus additional costs incurred due to planning appeal process.	9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adoption of the site Allocations & DM policies DPD and the Barwell & Earl Shilton APP being prioritised. 2. Sites within the Site Allocations document are being promoted for early delivery. 3. Member engagement / training in relation to housing developments. 4. Prioritising completion of Barwell SUE S106 negotiations. 	Sally Smith / Nic Thomas

3.5 In addition, the following red corporate risks are deemed to impact the planning service. An update on these risks and corresponding actions are provided below.

Risk	Risk failure leads to:	Net Risk Level	Review commentary	Risk Owner
S14 - Dealing with numerous Public Enquiries	Increased costs, Impact on staff resource and performance, Questions over credibility of Masterplan, Payment of costs awarded by inspector	5	<p>There have been over 30 Appeals in 2013/14 and appeal costs have been lost. A review and forecast of potential cost implications arising from programmed appeals has been prepared and circulated to COB and SLB identifying worse case scenario of cost. Action is required to minimise these implications. Many arising from Member overturns at Committee. Discussions are in hand with Senior Members to seek to address this matter.</p> <p>A report was presented to July Scrutiny Commission setting out the position on appeals with learning points for the Authority and Members.</p>	Bill Cullen
S15 - Failure to successfully adopt and deliver the LDF	Penalties from government, uncontrollable development pressure, unsustainable development, no	8	<p>Further consultation to be carried out autumn 2014. Document to be submitted for examination late 2014.</p> <p>Examination into the Barwell and Earl Shilton AAP carried</p>	Sally Smith

	clear spatial strategy, loss of employment/housing opportunities, impact on environment		out March / April 2014. Main modifications consultation carried out, at the request of the Planning Inspector June / July 2014. Expect report for fact checking August 2014. On target for adoption Autumn 2014.	
S.33 - MIRA RGF Fund	Impact on development of MIRA on the A5	9	<p>The RGF programme remains on target although there have been some delays in progressing A5 infrastructure works due to site due to technical issues. Good progress is being made with cabling works to power station. Procurement of the 'Mira' sustainable buses is underway.</p> <p>Good progress is being made on preparation of business case for major upgrade to A5 which is on program to be submitted to Government in September.</p>	Bill Cullen

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [KP]

4.1 Contained within the *Financial Performance* section of the report

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS [initials of person writing the implications]

5.1 [Legal to insert – reports must be submitted to Legal by the deadline stated on the list of deadlines which can be found on the intranet. If there are no implications, it is for the relevant Solicitor to state 'none']

6. CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS

6.1 All budgets, performance indicators and risks are mapped against the appropriate corporate plan implication.

7. CONSULTATION

7.1 No direct consultation

8. RISK IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Covered within the *Risk Management* section of the report

9. KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY – EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Covered as appropriate in the body of the report

10. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

10.1 By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

- Community Safety implications
- Environmental implications
- ICT implications
- Asset Management implications
- Human Resources implications
- Planning Implications
- Voluntary Sector

Background papers: None.

Contact Officer: Nic Thomas, ext. 5692

Executive Member: Councillor Bray

Appendix 1 – Financial Performance as at 30th June 2014

	Estimate to Date	Actual to Date	Timing Diff	Variance exc Timing	Explanations >£25k	Forecast variance	Explanations >£25k
	£	£	£	£		£	
Local Land Charges	1,133	698	0	435	-	0	-
Building Inspection	6,548	85	6,380	83	-	0	-
Development Control	43,674	-78,485	25,070	97,089	£25k salary savings due to temporary vacancies. £74k planning fees income received ahead of expectation. (£2k) minor supplies & services overspends.	110,000	Forecast additional fees for speculative planning applications - higher than anticipated.
Economic Development	20,426	12,340	10,490	-2,404	-	0	-
Environmental Initiatives	1,080	527	0	553	-	0	-
Highways	11,623	14,479	0	-2,856	-	0	-
Miscellaneous							
Planning Policy	169,378	90,270	63,220	15,888	-	0	-
Public Transport	6,371	7,067	0	-696	-	0	-
Sustainable Development	9,641	10,007	0	-366	-	0	-
Total	269,874	56,988	105,160	107,726		110,000	

Appendix 2 – Performance Indicators as at 30th June 2014

Reference		Target	Current Performance	Comments where indicators are not being met
LIB070bi	Enforcement complaints acknowledged within 3 days	95%	100%	-
LIB070bii	Enforcement complaints responded to within 15 days	95%	100%	-
LCD60	B.C. Completion Certificates sent within 7 days	95%	100%	-
LCD61	B.C.Full Plans determined & returned within 5 weeks or 2 months	95%	100%	-
LCD62	B.C. Receipts sent within 4 working days from deposit	95%	98.4%	-
NI157a	Processing of planning apps - major	60%	91.7%	-
NI157b	Processing of planning apps - minor	80%	90.1%	-
NI157c	Processing of planning apps - other	85%	92.4%	-
LI157d	No of planning performance agreements made	90%	100%	-
LI204	Planning Appeals dismissed	60%	50%	2 out of 4 appeals dismissed (50%) during 1 st quarter