

REPORT FOR DECISION

Agenda Item	
----------------	--

MEETING: PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

DATE: 25 NOVEMBER 2008

SUBJECT: PLANNING APPLICATIONS 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 National Indicator 157 (formerly BVPI109) which measures the speed of decision making for 3 categories of application – Major (109a), Minor (109b) and Other (109c) (which includes house extensions).
- 1.2 The former BVPI's also had an indicator (BVPI204) for the performance on appeal decisions and this was in respect of the percentage of appeals allowed. This is no longer a National Indicator but is nonetheless a useful indicator of the Council's performance.
- 1.3 Included within this report are tables of current statistics for the period from **1st April 2008 until the 30th September 2008 (half year)**.
- 1.4 The statistics of development control are submitted to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on a quarterly basis and are published regularly.
- 1.5 This item is for information only.

2.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

2.1 NI157 statistics for decisions on planning applications

	Target	No. of decisions	No. decided within target	% within target
Majors	60% within 13 weeks	27 (21)	24 (14)	88% (67%)
Minors	65% within 8 weeks	140 (168)	125 (147)	89% (87%)
Others	80% within 8 weeks	577 (599)	558 (576)	96% (96%)

(figures in brackets are for same period in 2006/7)

2.2 Committee/Delegation performance

	Number	% under 8 weeks
Committee	52 (83)	40% (41%)
Delegated	692 (7049)	96% (89%)

The percentage of delegated decisions during the period was 92.9% which is a slight increase on the figure for the previous year (91.2%).

2.3 Allowed/Refused

The table below describes the percentage of applications decided which are approved.

	Permission Granted
Committee	81% (87%)
Delegated	81% (85%)
Total	81% (85%)

2.0 APPEAL DECISIONS

2.1 Planning Applications

	No W/drawn	No. of appeals decided	No. of appeals allowed	% allowed
Committee decision	1	0 (3)	0 (2)	0 % (66%)
Delegated decision	3	13 (6)	2 (14)	15% (24%)
All decisions	4	13 (9)	2 (6)	15% (25%)

(Figures in brackets are 2007 figures)

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. 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 increased above last years low figures but is still less than in previous years. The current percentage of appeals allowed is well within the targets and is considered to be a good performance. The 2 appeals allowed were:-

48511 Smoking shelters to the front to the front of the White Horse PH in Prestwich Village. Although allowed I still have concerns about the design and appearance of this prominently located structure.

48951 16 Venwood Road, Prestwich. This appeal was allowed despite the lack of car parking that would remain following the extension.

During the period 24 new appeals were lodged compared to 11 in 2007

2.2 Enforcement Appeals

The sustained activity on the service of Enforcement Notices has resulted in 3 appeal decisions (no new appeals have been lodged in the period).

	No. W/drawn	No. of appeals decided	No. of appeals allowed	% allowed
Enforcement Appeals	0	3	2 (1)	66% (33%)

The cases were:-

- Premises at First Choice, Cook Street – appeal allowed.
- Manor Park, Scholes Lane, Prestwich (erection of gates) – appeal allowed
- 76-80 Water Street, Radcliffe (Massage Parlour) - appeal dismissed.

2.3 There was no award of cost for or against the Council on any of the appeal decisions

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