

# REPORT FOR DECISION

**MEETING:** PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** 20 OCTOBER 2009  
**SUBJECT:** PLANNING APPLICATIONS PERFORMANCE  
**REPORT FROM:** TOM MITCHELL, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER  
**CONTACT OFFICER:** TOM MITCHELL, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

---

**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 2008/9 (April to September).

**OPTIONS & 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?** N/A

---

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

**Wards Affected:** ALL WARDS

**Scrutiny Interest:** N/A

**TRACKING/PROCESS**

**EXECUTIVE 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 which measures the speed of decision making for 3 categories of application – Major, Minor and Other (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 **1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 until the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009 (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**

	<b>Target</b>	<b>No. of decisions</b>	<b>No. decided within target</b>	<b>% within target</b>
<b>Majors</b>	60% within 13 weeks	15 (27)	12 (24)	80% (88%)
<b>Minors</b>	65% within 8 weeks	135 (140)	125 (125)	93% (89%)
<b>Others</b>	80% within 8 weeks	399 (577)	389 (558)	97% (96%)

*(figures in brackets are for same period in 2007/8)*

Consistent with the national picture there has been a reduction overall in the number of applications processed – around 25% less than the same period in 2007/8.

## 2.2 Committee/Delegation performance

	<b>Number</b>	<b>% under 8 weeks</b>
<b>Committee</b>	<b>54</b> (52)	<b>57%</b> (40%)
<b>Delegated</b>	<b>498</b> (692)	<b>98%</b> (96%)

The percentage of delegated decisions during the period was 89.9% which is a slight reduction on the figure for the previous year (92.9%).

## 2.3 Allowed/Refused

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

	<b>Permission Granted</b>
<b>Committee</b>	<b>93%</b> ( <b>81%</b> )
<b>Delegated</b>	<b>77%</b> ( <b>81%</b> )
<b>Total</b>	<b>78%</b> ( <b>81%</b> )

## 3.0 APPEAL DECISIONS

### 3.1 Planning Applications

	<b>No W/drawn</b>	<b>No. of appeals decided</b>	<b>No. of appeals allowed</b>	<b>% allowed</b>
<b>Committee decision</b>	1	3 (0)	2 (0)	<b>66%</b> ( <b>0%</b> )
<b>Delegated decision</b>	0	13 (13)	2 (2)	<b>15%</b> ( <b>15%</b> )
<b>All decisions</b>	1	16 (13)	4 (2)	<b>25%</b> ( <b>15%</b> )

*(figures in brackets are for same period in 2007/8)*

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 around 35%.

The number of appeals has increased slightly above last year's figure. The current percentage of appeals allowed is well within the targets and is considered to be a good performance. The 4 appeals allowed were:-

49646 Mountheath Industrial Estate, Prestwich. Although allowed the inspector failed to add conditions and the Council has had the decision quashed at

Judicial Review with cost awarded against the Planning Inspectorate. The appeal will now be reheard.

50366 Former Brandlesholme PH – 50 bed residential Nursing Home. This application was refused contrary to officer recommendation by the Committee and the Inspector concluded that it would not adversely affect neighbouring residents.

50619 6 Bank Street, Wallshaw. This change of use to a hot food use was approved on appeal despite local opposition.

50786 1 Holcombe Brook Precinct – This change of use to a hot food use was approved on appeal despite local opposition.

During the period 6 new appeals were lodged compared to 24 in 2008

### 3.2 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).

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

The cases were:-

- Conservatory at 30 Woodhill Road, Bury - appeal allowed.
- Decking at 30 Kings Road, Sedgely, Prestwich – appeal allowed
- Gazebo at Bolholt Hotel - appeal dismissed.

**3.3** There has been no award of cost for or against the Council on any of the appeal decisions

---

### List of Background Papers:-

None

### Contact Details:-

Tom Mitchell, Chief Planning Officer, 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)**