

## Development Control Performance Quarter APRIL - JUNE 2006

### RECOMMENDATION

1. To note the report

### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 2.1 This report is based on the contents of the Communities and Local Government's statistical report on planning applications and decisions relating to Derby for the period April to June 2006.
- 2.2 Our overall performance for that quarter was **78%** of applications dealt with in eight weeks. This was **1** percentage point higher than in the previous quarter.
- 2.3 The performance level for dealing with householder applications, at **85%** within eight weeks, matched the previous quarter.
- 2.4 We received **496** applications **23** fewer than in the previous quarter.
- 2.5 The number of decisions made was **448**, which was **37** more than during January to March 2006.
- 2.6 Of all the decisions made, **91%** were made under delegated powers; this is 2% age points higher than the previous quarter exceeding the **90%** target expected by the Government.
- 2.7 During April - June 2006 our performance levels in dealing with major, minor and other types of applications were as shown below:

| Type   | Government Target      | Local Target | Performance in Quarter (change from previous quarter) |
|--------|------------------------|--------------|---|
| Major  | <b>60%</b> in 13 weeks | <b>57%</b>   | <b>75%</b> (+11%)                                     |
| Minor  | <b>65%</b> in 8 weeks  | <b>69%</b>   | <b>66%</b> (-2%)                                      |
| Others | <b>80%</b> in 8 weeks  | <b>83%</b>   | <b>85%</b> (-)  |

- 2.8 Members will note that we continue to exceed the Government targets in all categories and were only **3** percentage points away from achieving all our own targets for each category of application. It was particularly satisfying to continue to exceed the target for major applications to such an extent as we have concentrated a great deal of extra effort into dealing with those applications. To put this excellent performance into context the following table shows how we compare with similar neighbouring authorities including the number of applications received which, in terms of performance, workload is a major factor in output. It is interesting to note that we continue to receive more applications each quarter than we determine, and this is despite the impressive performance figures.

|                    | <b>Applications received in Quarter</b> | <b>Total Decisions in Quarter</b> | <b>Decisions within 8 weeks Number percent</b> |    | <b>Major Decisions Total Number/ percent within 13 weeks</b> |    |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|----|--|----|
| Derby              | 496                                     | 448                               | 349  | 78 | 16   | 75 |
| City of Nottingham |   | 382                               | 332  | 87 | 12   | 75 |
| Leicester          |   | 464                               | 399  | 86 | 26   | 58 |
| Stoke on Trent     |   | 393                               | 346  | 88 | 19   | 79 |

- 2.9 The charts in Appendix 2 show the following:

Chart 1 – Overall performance since 1990

Chart 2 – Statistical distribution of national performance levels for the three categories of planning applications with this Authority's performances superimposed.

Chart 3 – Total number of applications received.

Chart 4 – Total number of decisions, split to show those that took less than and more than eight weeks.

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>For more information contact:</b> | Paul Clarke Tel 01332 255942 e-mail paul.clarke@derby.gov.uk                 |
| <b>Background papers:</b>            | Communities and Local Government Statistical Release – Planning Applications |
| <b>List of appendices:</b>           | Appendix 1 – Implications<br>Appendix 2 - Charts                             |

|                     |
|---------------------|
| <b>IMPLICATIONS</b> |
|---------------------|

**Financial**

1. None..

**Legal**

2. None.

**Personnel**

3. None.

**Corporate objectives and priorities for change**

4. Our performance levels in dealing with planning applications have implications for delivering excellent services, performance and value for money (priority).