

Development Control Performance

RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 To note the report and resolve a course of action.
- 1.2 To agree to the proposed change, as outlined at 2.3, to the scheme of Delegation.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members may recall a previous report on this subject that was withdrawn from the agenda. Following subsequent discussions with the Chair and Vice Chair this report is written to identify a way forward to help us hit or exceed the **90%** target expected by the Government of decisions made under delegated powers and to ease the burden on Planning Control Committee members. As members will be aware we are monitored quarterly on our performance and achieving the defined Government targets. We have to comply with these requirements or suffer the potential penalties that could follow. Accordingly I have provided this report to identify an area for improvement where officers and members have had some concerns.
- 2.2 I previously reported that in the quarter January – March we achieved **89%**. In the following quarter we achieved **88%**. In the quarter July – September the number of delegated decisions had risen to **93%** with **92%** being achieved in the last quarter. We are just about achieving the Governments aim of speeding up the planning process through increased delegation. As this is a fluctuating figure I propose that we revisit the delegation arrangements as 2.3 below to give more comfort in seeking to achieve the Government's target.
- 2.3 The scheme of Delegations advises along with other criteria that the Planning Control Committee determines individual applications for planning permission and advertisement control where the application requires approval to the principal terms of planning and highways agreements. (Section 106 Agreements). It is proposed that I should be given delegated authority to determine such applications, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair. This would apply to a small proportion of applications: for example, since February 2006 PCC determined 12 Section 106 Agreements that would have been delegated decisions under the new proposed scheme.

- 2.4 The result of adopting this suggestion would result in an improvement in our delegation percentage figure. It would enable the Chair and Vice Chair to take a more active role in the decision making process, leaving the Committee meetings themselves to focus upon the more contentious and major projects of substance. It would also reduce the administrative burden allowing us to make quicker decisions thus improving our service to the customer.
- 2.5 The other suggested options raised in my previous report should be reserved for future consideration should circumstances deem it necessary.

For more information contact:	Nigel Scollin Tel. 01332 255948 e-mail nigel.scollin@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	None.
List of appendices:	Appendix 1 – Implications

IMPLICATIONS

Financial

1. None.

Legal

2. None.

Personnel

3. None.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

4. None.