

---

**MEETING:** PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

**DATE:** 23 OCTOBER 2007

**SUBJECT:** PLANNING PERFORMANCE

**REPORT FROM:** ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (PLANNING, ENGINEERING  
AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES)

**CONTACT OFFICER:** TOM MITCHELL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

---

**TYPE OF DECISION:** COUNCIL

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION/  
STATUS:** This paper is within the public domain

---

**SUMMARY:**

The report provides a brief analysis of performance within Development Control for Planning Applications and Appeals for the first half of the year 2007/8.

**OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDED OPTION:**

The Committee is recommended to note the report.

---

**IMPLICATIONS -**

**Corporate Aims/Policy  
Framework:** N/A

**Financial Implications and  
Risk Considerations** N/A

**Statement by Director of Finance  
and E-Government:** N/A

**Equality/Diversity implications** N/A

---

**Considered by Monitoring Officer:** N/A

Are there any legal implications? Yes  No

**Staffing/ICT/Property:** N/A

**Wards Affected:** All

**Scrutiny Interest:** N/A

---

---

---

---

**TRACKING/PROCESS**

**DIRECTOR:**

Chief Executive/ Management Board	Executive Member/ Chair	Ward Members	Partners
Scrutiny Commission	Executive	Committee	Council

---

---

**1.0 BACKGROUND**

1.1 The performance of the Council in terms of the Development Control function is subject to considerable scrutiny through the Best Value Performance Indicators.

BVPI 109 which measures the speed of decision making for 3 categories of application – Major (109a), Minor (109b) and Other (109c) (which includes house extensions).

BVPI 204 measures the percentage of appeals allowed.

1.2 Included within this report is a table of current statistics for the period from **1<sup>st</sup> April 2007 until the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2007 (half year)**.

1.3 The statistics of development control are submitted to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on a quarterly basis and are published regularly.

1.4 This item is for information only.

## 2.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### BVPI109 statistics for decisions on planning applications

	Target	No. of decisions	No. decided within target	% within target
<b>Majors</b>	60% within 13 weeks	21	14	67%
<b>Minors</b>	65% within 8 weeks	168	147	87%
<b>Others</b>	80% within 8 weeks	599	576	96%

### Committee/Delegation performance

	Major		Minor		Other		Total
	Number	% on target	Number	% on target	Number	% on target	
<b>Committee</b>	12	41%	48	64%	23	47%	<b>83 (10.5%)</b>
<b>Delegated</b>	9	100%	120	97%	575	98%	<b>704 (89.5%)</b>

These figures show a slight reduction in the percentage of delegated decisions which was 91.2% in 2006/07.

### Allowed/Refused

	Permission Granted	Refused
<b>Committee</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Delegated</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>14.5%</b>

## 3.0 APPEAL DECISIONS (BVPI204)

	No W/drawn	No. of appeals decided	No. of appeals allowed	% allowed
<b>Committee decision</b>	0	3 (11)	2 (3)	<b>66% (27)</b>
<b>Delegated decision</b>	1	6 (25)	4 (6)	<b>66% (24)</b>
<b>All decisions</b>	0	9 (36)	6 (9)	<b>66% (25)</b>

### Planning Applications

A previous Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) set a target of less than 40% of appeals to be allowed, i.e. the applicant was successful in appealing the Council's decision.

BVPI (204) in respect of the percentage of appeals allowed against the refusal of planning applications. A National target has not been set but a Local target of 35% has been included within the Council's Best Value Performance Plan.

The current National average of appeals allowed is 33% (and is consistently between 33% and 36%).

The number of appeals has fallen significantly compared to the same period last year (figures in brackets), although this was higher than normal. The current percentage of appeals allowed is higher than targets and could be considered to represent a poor performance however the small number of appeal decisions has resulted in statistically pronounced results.

It is therefore worth listing those appeals which were allowed:-

- 46544 Manchester Maccabi CSC – amendment to hours of operation condition.
- 46033 Eaves Cottage, Hawkshaw – retention of garage in the Green Belt.
- 47405 2 Parkhills Road – Change of use to café.
- 47071 Lower Grainings, Hawkshaw – conversion of stables to domestic garage.
- 46479 140 Butterstile Lane – ATM (refused on advice from Greater Manchester Police).

There was 1 appeal case involving a Committee refusal of permission against the officer recommendation, this was allowed (Telecoms mast on Bolton Road).

There was no award of cost for or against the Council.

During the period 11 new appeals were lodged.

**Enforcement Appeals** (these are not included in the BVPI 204 figures).

The increased number of Enforcement Notices has resulted in an increased number of Enforcement Appeals. Only 1 Enforcement Appeal in the year 2006/7 but we have had 3 decisions in the first 6 months of the year. The appeal that was allowed also involved an award of costs against the Council for pursuing the matter unreasonably.

	<b>No. W/drawn</b>	<b>No. of appeals decided</b>	<b>No. of appeals allowed</b>	<b>% allowed</b>
Enforcement Appeals	0	3	1	33%

---

**List of Background Papers:-**

None

**Contact Details:-**

Tom Mitchell, Development Manager, Environment and Development Services,  
Craig House, 5 Bank Street, Bury BL9 0DN

**Tel: 0161 253 5321**

**Email: [t.mitchell@bury.gov.uk](mailto:t.mitchell@bury.gov.uk)**