

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING: THURSDAY AUGUST 13<sup>th</sup> 2009**

### **PLANNING PERFORMANCE MONITORING**

#### **REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING**

##### **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1. This is the first quarterly report of 2009-2010 to advise Members of the performance of the Corporation's development control function.
- 1.2. The value of performance monitoring is the ability to identify strengths and weaknesses and thus evaluate the reasons for performance changes, as well as to identify possible anticipatory action.

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

**It is RECOMMENDED that the contents of this report are noted.**

##### **2. DATA**

- 2.1. The data is obtained from the Corporation's electronic records of planning cases which have been registered since the granting of planning powers in October 2005.
- 2.2. The data highlights performance through each complete year of the Corporation's function.
- 2.3. The information presented is based on the performance of the Corporation in handling all formal planning decisions for which it is the decision making authority. Additional information is presented in relation to planning appeals in which the Corporation is involved.

##### **3. REPORT STRUCTURE**

- 3.1. This report comprises the following sections :
  - ◆ Development Control Performance- tables shown include the number of applications, the speed of decision-making, a breakdown of decisions made and a breakdown of applications under consideration.
  - ◆ Housing & Employment Data- tables provided are based upon data contained within formal planning applications. Please note that where data has not been provided then an estimate based on the size and density of the application has been included.
  - ◆ Appeals- a table is provided of planning appeal cases in which the Corporation is actively involved.

#### 4. KEY FINDINGS

- 4.1 A total of 9524 dwellings have been approved by LTGDC to date (of which 2366 are pending completion of S106 agreements). Development yielding an estimated 9742 jobs has also been approved (2283 subject to completing S106 agreements).
- 4.2 In the past four quarters (July 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 to June 30<sup>th</sup> 2009) the handling of those applications eligible for inclusion on the PS1/2 “major applications” return is: 41% being determined within the 13 week target period or 44% including applications determined according to the “agreed timescales” contained in a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA).
- 4.3 The return to DCLG excludes PPA applications whose targets are met from the figures and therefore the Corporation will return the 41% figure and this is compared against a national target set by DCLG of 60%. Consequently, this figure represents a 2% decrease in overall performance when compared with the last quarterly performance report in which the Corporation returned an annualised rolling average of 43% (April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008- March 31<sup>st</sup> 2009).

#### 5. CORPORATION PERFORMANCE DATA

##### Development Control Performance

**Table 1: Showing The Total Number Of Planning Applications Handled**

2005-2009		On Hand At Start	Received	Withdrawn	Decided	On Hand At End
①	Year 1 2005-2006	0	48	0	9	39
②	Year 2 2006-2007	39	184	13	92	118
③	Year 3 2007-2008	118	295	33	206	174
④	Year 4 2008-2009	174	144	17	177	124
2009-1010 Breakdown		On Hand At Start	Received	Withdrawn	Decided	On Hand At End
⑤	Q1Y5 Apr 1 - June 30 09	124	23	2	23	122
⑤	Of Which Are PPA's	12	2	1	2	11

- 5.1. 507 planning decisions have been issued by the Corporation to date. 23 decisions have made in the last quarter and 5 of these decisions relate to the PS1/2 Planning Performance statistics for processing MAJOR applications. The speed with which the UDC has determined these is shown in Table 3 further below.
- 5.2. This table now records figures for the proportion of Corporation applications which contain a PPA (Planning Performance Agreement). PPA's were introduced by DCLG as a means of improving the delivery of large scale applications. This was after a successful pilot project which showed that PPAs added value to the planning system by improving the planning process through better project management. The evidence showed that they give greater certainty on timescales, costs and requirements for all parties involved in the process.
- 5.3. In the last quarter the Corporation determined two MAJOR planning applications which were subject to a PPA. In both cases the terms and timescales of the PPA were successfully met.
- 5.4. A further 18 planning cases have been resolved by the Corporation planning committee but remain on hand pending the finalisation of S106 agreements.

**Table 2: Showing The Basic Breakdown Of Decisions Issued by the Corporation**


2005-2009		Decided	Granted	Refused	Delegated
①	Year 1 2005-2006	9	9	0	9
②	Year 2006-2007	92	90	2	79
③	Year 3 2007-2008	206	200	6	180
④	Year 4 2008-2009	177	174	3	157
2009-2010 Breakdown		Decided	Granted	Refused	Delegated
⑤	Q1Y5 Apr 1 - June 30 09	23	19	4	15

- 5.5. Table 2 shows, during the operating period of the LTGDC, that out of the 507 decisions made 492 applications were granted and fifteen (3%) were refused permission. This demonstrates the positive role of the Corporation in successfully negotiating schemes with agents and developers.

- 5.6. 440 applications were decided by the Director of Planning under delegated powers, with the remaining 67 (13%) being determined by the Corporation's Planning Committee.
- 5.7. The Corporation is asked to submit its performance statistics for publication by DCLG. The following table 3 and graph (further below) show these formal figures and highlight performance on determining major applications.
- 5.8. Table 3 demonstrates that when considering PS1/2 data for LTGDC in determining MAJOR applications then the total for the current quarter 1 of the new statistical year (2009-2010) is 3 out of 3 such cases have been decided within the 13 week target period. Two cases further cases were decided over 13 weeks but were both subject to a PPA agreement and both met their agreed timescales. These are therefore now excluded entirely from the DCLG return. This therefore gives a performance figure of 100% for the quarter and when included in the rolling annual average for the period ended June 30 2009 then the performance figure for the year is 41% compared against a national target set by DCLG of 60%.
- 5.9. This is also shown visually in the graph following Table 3 which displays the annualised rolling performance across each last four complete quarters (July 2008- June 2009).

**Table 3: Showing The Speed Of Decision-Making**

2005-2009		All ≤13 W	All >13W	Statutory MAJORS ≤13W	Statutory MAJORS >13 W
①	Year 1 2005-2006	1 (11%)	8	0 (0%)	0
②	Year 2006-2007	45 (49%)	47	4 (20%)	16
③	Year 3 2007-2008	102 (49.5%)	104	6 (24%)	19
④	Year 4 2008-2009	64 (36%)	113	13 (43%)	17
2009-2010 Breakdown		All ≤13 W & within "agreed timescales"	All >13W or outside "agreed timescales"	Statutory MAJORS ≤13W & within "agreed timescales"	Statutory MAJORS >13 W or outside "agreed timescales"
⑤	Q1Y5 Apr 1 - June 30 09	12 (52%)	11	3 (100%) & 2 met PPA's Total = 100%	0



### Housing & Employment Data

**Table 4a: Showing Housing Data To Date (October 31<sup>st</sup> 2005 – June 30<sup>th</sup> 2009)**

Housing		London Riverside	Lower Lea Valley	Total Predicted Dwellings
★	TOTAL GRANTED	<u>898(251)</u>	<u>6260 (1218)</u>	<u>7158 (1469)</u>
★	TOTAL PENDING S106	<u>320 (164)</u>	<u>2046 (642)</u>	<u>2366 (806)</u>
★	GRAND TOTAL	<u>1218 (415)</u>	<u>8306 (1860)</u>	<u>9524 (2275)</u>

**Table 4b: Showing Employment Data To Date (October 31<sup>st</sup> 2005 – June 30<sup>th</sup> 2009)**

Employment		London Riverside	Lower Lea Valley	Total Net Jobs
★	TOTAL GRANTED	<u>2691</u>	<u>4768</u>	<u>7459</u>
★	TOTAL PENDING S106	<u>1385</u>	<u>898</u>	<u>2283</u>
★	GRAND TOTAL	<u>4076</u>	<u>5666</u>	<u>9742</u>

Meeting: 13 August 2009  
 Agenda Item: 6  
 Report No: LTGDC/09/PC37

5.10. Table 4 shows housing & employment data gathered from information supplied by the applicant within their formal planning applications. Please note that where data has not been provided then an estimate based on the size and density of the application has been included based on research conducted by ARUPS for English Partnerships.

5.11. This table separates housing and employment figures contained in approved schemes (where permission has been formally granted) from those schemes that are pending the finalisation of their S106 agreements.

5.12. The figures currently show an overall total of 7158 predicted dwellings from LTGDC applications of which 1469 (or 21%) are affordable units. A further 2366 units are contained in schemes which are pending the S106's of which 806 (or 34%) are affordable dwellings. This brings the total housing pipeline to 9524 residential dwellings of which 2275 (or 24%) will be affordable.

5.13. Schemes considered by the Corporation also show a predicted net employment gain of 9742 jobs to date distributed across the Lower Lea Valley and London Riverside.

## 6. Appeals 2008/2009

6.1. Please see Table 5 for a complete list of appeals handled by the Corporation during the last year.

**Table 5: Showing Appeals Handled By The Corporation Between 1<sup>st</sup> July 2008 and 30<sup>th</sup> June 2009**

APPEAL REF	CASE	SITE	DATE LODGED	APPEAL TYPE	APPELLANT	REASON	DEC'N
APP/A9580/A/08/2069481	LTGDC-06-064-PP	Former Railway Land North Of Container Depot Box Lane Barking	11/09/2008	Public Inquiry	R F V Developments	Non-determination	Appeal Pending
APP/A9580/A/08/2082331	LTGDC-07-149-FUL	Plots 10-12 Off Consul Avenue And Manor Way, Beam Reach 5, Rainham.	18/08/2008	Public Inquiry	Kingsway International Christian Centre & London Development Agency	Refusal	Appeal Pending
APP/A9580/A/08/2075279	LTGDC-07-169-FUL	75 - 77 Chequers Lane Dagenham Essex RM9 6QT	06/06/2008	Public Inquiry	Hunts Heat & Power Ltd	Non-determination	Appeal Withdrawn
APP/A9580/A/08/2086759	LTGDC-08-010-FUL	Devon Wharf, Leven Road, Tower Hamlets, London, E14 0LL	13/10/2008	Written Representations	Chilton Transport (Bow) Ltd	Non-determination	Appeal dismissed

Meeting: 13 August 2009  
Agenda Item: 6  
Report No: LTGDC/09/PC37

APP/B548 0/A/09/210 5477	LTGDC-09- 002-FUL	`Panels Plus`, Manor Way, New Road, Rainham, Essex RM13 8RH	10/06/2009	Written Representa tions	F J Church & Sons Ltd	Against Condition	Appeal Pending
--------------------------------	----------------------	--	------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

- 6.2. Since the last quarterly report, one new appeal case has been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate against the LTGDC. This is at the `Panels Plus` site on Manor Way, New Road, Rainham.
- 6.3. The appeal follows the Corporations decision on the 21<sup>st</sup> of April 2009 to grant the application for a change of use to the site to permit the recycling of lead-acid cased batteries and spent catalysts.
- 6.4. The appeal was lodged with the Planning Inspectorate on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June 2009 and will be handled by the written representations procedure. The reason for the appeal is against 4 of the conditions attached to the permission which limit the life of the permission to five years as well as details of site contamination and the drainage and noise insulation systems required.