

FINANCE, AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE – 10 AUGUST 2015



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

A Borough to be proud of

FINANCE, AUDIT AND PERFORMANCE UPDATE – PLANNING SERVICE AREA **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 2015.

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 Planning from 1st April 2015 – 30 June 2015 has been detailed in Appendix 1. As at 30 June 2015, Planning has under spent against the profiled budget (taking into account timing differences) by £573,322. In addition there is a £200,000 of forecast variance meaning a forecast outturn under-spend of £200,000.
- 3.2 Details of variances over £25,000 have been provided in Appendix 1.

Planning income for the first quarter of 2015/16 has been higher than expected due to the increase in speculative applications for solar farms as well as some detailed applications for major housing development. It is likely that some additional speculative major planning applications will be submitted over the coming months given the relatively strong economic conditions, but this is expected to be fewer than for 2014/15 given that the council now has a 5-year housing land supply.

- 3.3 The £573,322 underspend includes the Regional Growth Fund MIRA project contribution of £477,000 which has been received in advance but it is anticipated to be fully spent for 2015/16.

Performance

- 3.4 Performance against performance indicators for the Planning service from 1 April 2015 – 30 June 2015 has been detailed in Appendix 2, along with explanation where indicators have not been met. All indicators are currently meeting target or are within 5% of target.

Risk Management

- 3.5 The risk register for the Planning service contains 14 risks for 2015/2016. All red (high) risks as at 30 June 2015 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 Travellers in the Borough	Illegal incursions.	8	<p>The council has a positive record of granting permission for pitches in the most suitable locations.</p> <p>A gypsy and traveller needs assessment is being carried out to identify future pitch requirements for the borough.</p> <p>Clear and effective systems in place to apply the most suitable powers to deal with unlawful incursions.</p>	Nic Thomas
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 late 2015. 2. Sites within the Site Allocations document being promoted for early delivery (e.g. Hinckley West). 3. Member engagement / training in relation to housing developments. 4. Completion of Barwell SUE S106 negotiations August 2015. 5. Pro-active approach to bring forward Earl Shilton SUE. 	Nic Thomas

3.6 In addition, the following corporate risks are deemed to impact upon 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 Inquiries	Increased costs, impact on staff resource and performance, questions over credibility of Masterplan, payment of costs awarded by Inspector.	5	<p>The Council now has a five year housing land supply. This puts the Council in a strong position to resist speculative development in unsustainable locations. It also helps to resist planning appeals that are in process.</p> <p>The approach to reducing the number of public inquiries is based on delivering housing growth in a planned way as set out in</p>	Bill Cullen

			the adopted Core Strategy. The adoption of the final local plan document (Site Allocations and DM Policies DPD) later in 2015, alongside the adoption other key strategic planning documents, demonstrates that an effective plan is in place delivering housing growth. This, alongside the delivery of the key strategic housing sites, will discourage speculative planning applications and reduce the number of planning appeals.	
S15 – Failure to successfully adopt and deliver the LDF	Penalties from government, uncontrollable development pressure, unsustainable development, no clear spatial strategy, loss of employment / housing opportunities, impact on environment	8	<p>The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD is due to be considered at examination in September / October 2015. This is the final document to be adopted to complete the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has a good understanding of the issues and matters that will be raised at the examination and is in a strong position to present a robust response to the Planning Inspector.</p>	Bill Cullen

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [KP]

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

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS [MM]

5.1 There are no legal implications arising directly from this report. Legal implications will be fully considered in relation to further reports where decisions are proposed in light of this information.

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. 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
- Procurement implications
- Human Resources implications
- Planning implications
- Data Protection implications
- Voluntary Sector

Background papers: None.

Contact Officer: Nic Thomas, ext. 5692

Executive Member: Councillor Mike Hall

	Estimate to Date	Actual to Date	Timing Diff	Variance exc Timing	Explanations >£25k	Forecast variance	Explanations >£25k
	£	£	£	£		£	
Building Inspection	965	4947.9	0	-3,983		0	
					£25k savings on salaries due to vacancies, £61k increase in		Fees for speculative

Appendix 1 – Financial Performance

					level of planning fees received to date, £6k consultancy fees not spent to date		
Economic Development	37,970	-449,178	0	487,148	£477k RGF project contribution received in advance. Money to be spent in the year	0	
Environmental Initiatives	9,268	490.6	9000	-223		0	
Highways Miscellaneous	20,296	18,191	0	2,105		0	
Planning Policy	90,956	-1,035,492	1,129,000	-2,552		0	
Public Transport	0	-23	0	23		0	
Sustainable Development	9,527	10,765	0	-1,238		0	
Total	178,032	-1,533,290	1,138,000	573,322		200,000	