Planning Performance Framework

The City of Edinburgh Council Planning & Transport, PLACE

2012 - 2016



PLANNING PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK - ANNUAL REPORT 2015-2016

Contents

| Introduction | |
|--|----|
| Planning Performance Framework 2014-15 | |
| Part 1 | |
| National Headline Indicators | 5 |
| Part 2 | |
| Defining and Measuring a High Quality Planning Service | 8 |
| Quality of Outcomes | 8 |
| Quality of service and engagement | |
| Open for business | |
| Certainty | |
| Communications, engagement and customer service | |
| Governance | |
| Culture of Continuous Improvement | |
| Part 3 | |
| Supporting Evidence | 28 |
| Part 4 | |
| Service Improvements 2016 - 17 | 29 |
| Delivery of our service improvements in 2015 - 16 | 30 |
| Part 5 | |
| Official Statistics | 31 |
| Part 6 | |
| Workforce and Financial Information | 33 |
| Appendix 1 | |
| Performance Markers Report 2014-15 | 34 |
| | |

Introduction

The City of Edinburgh Council is pleased to submit its fifth Planning Performance Framework (PPF) Report. The document highlights the work we have done from April 2015 to March 2016 to improve performance and deliver a high quality planning service.

The Planning service has continued to operate in the context of a Council under severe financial pressure and with ambitions to create a leaner, more agile council. The Council's Transformational Change programme commenced in earnest over the 2015-16 period and will continue into the coming year. The Transformational Change programme, whilst focussed on making savings across the Council, provides an opportunity to review how services are delivered.

The Council now has a Place directorate with Planning and Transport as one service. This will enable closer working and collaboration across these two areas with the directorate including housing, regulatory services and environment services.

The Council will move to a locality based model with all the Council services, including Planning, operating in the context of joined up services, serving local communities. The service will also retain a city-wide remit dealing with issues such as the local and strategic development plans, planning and transport policy, placemaking and appeals.

The Planning and Building Standards service has had a busy year with 4450 planning applications being submitted, a small increase on the year before, and a number of new projects and workstreams around areas such as placemaking and service improvements.

The ongoing challenge has been to finalise the proposed Local Development Plan and make significant improvements in performance. Whilst the proposed Plan was agreed by Planning Committee in May 2015 and submitted to Scottish Ministers in that month, the report of examination has yet to be issued.

With the announcement in March this year of a City Region Deal for Edinburgh and South East Scotland, Planning will play a key role in defining and coordinating infrastructure investment required to deliver the spatial and economic growth of the city and the wider region.

Planning Performance Framework 2014-15

The Council submitted its fourth Planning Performance Framework to the Scottish Government on 7 July 2015. This covered the period from April 2014 to March 2015.

Through the Heads of Planning Scotland, the PPFs were subject to peer review with authorities paired to provide feedback on respective PPFs. This also provided an opportunity to share practice amongst authorities.

Alex Neil, Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Communities and Pensioners' Rights provided feedback on 5 October 2015. This included some general feedback based on an improving Scotland-wide performance, the need to resolve legacy cases and the opportunity to comment on the review of the Scottish planning system.

The Cabinet Secretary's letter included feedback on Edinburgh's Performance Markers Report. This is set out in Appendix 1. The following strengths were highlighted in this feedback:

Major developments saw a slight improvement in decisios making timescales from 27.9 to 26.5 over the year which is still better than the national average of 46.4 weeks.

Processing agreements continue to be offered for all major applications with 20 out of 33 of these subject to an agreement. There is also good evidence that agreements are also being used for local developments.

Increasing the number of applications subject to pre-application advice from 23% to 36% suggests that we are collaborating early with applicants and consultees.

In respect of legal agreements, timescales are improving for major applications taking on average 29.8 weeks compared to 33.4 last year. This is quicker than the national average.

The Planning Enforcement Charter is up to date.

In terms of continuous improvement, we are re ducing the time taken to decide major applications with a good record of providing pre-application advice and processing agreements.

In terms of corporate working we have a range of protocols and are working in partnership with a range of service areas and partners.

We are sharing good practice with other authorities and engage in a number of groups, forums and benchmarking groups.

Our LDP action programme details infrastructure requirements for sites along with costings, responsibilities for delivery, funding options and contribution requirements.

The Performance Markers Report highlights areas for improvement, including:

Timescales for local (non-householder developments) applications have lengthened slightly from 10.7 to 11.6 weeks however this is quicker than the national average of 12.9 weeks.

Timescales for householder development applications have lengthened slightly from 7.5 to 7.7 weeks which is slightly longer than the national average of 7.5 weeks.

Both local plans are over 5 years old and although a good explanation was provided, little evidence was provided of our approach to project managing the LDP.

Of the stalled/legacy cases 66 were cleared in the past year, however a high number of 203 cases remain.

This feedback allows us to consider improvements for future years.

Part 1

National Headline Indicators

The Council is continuing to progress its first *Local Development Plan* (LDP). Following consultation in 2011/12, the Council published a Proposed Plan in 2013 which received representations from 2,300 individuals and organisations. The issues raised were considered by the Council when it prepared and approved a Second Proposed Plan on 19 June 2014. The reasons for a Second Proposed Plan were set out in last year's PPF with the proposed plan submitted to Scottish Ministers for examination in May 2015.

During 2015/16, the number of planning applications has remained steady and performance has generally been good when compared to national averages. Whilst major applications and householder applications are taking slightly longer to process than the previous year, this is within acceptable limits and reflects the work we have been doing over the year to remove legacy cases from the system. Notably non-householder performance has remained the same as last year despite a 2.7% increase in numbers.

During 2015/16, a system of embedding processing agreements into local developments, and other non-major development, was put into place by using an 'extension of time procedure'. The extended date is agreed with the applicant and recorded in back office systems for analysis. The number of processing agreements for local developments and other consents has increased by 165%. This has helped offset the skewing caused by the clearance of legacy applications.

The City of Edinburgh Council continues to take a positive attitude to development proposals with a 93.6% approval rate. In addition, the Local Review Body has overturned 52% of refusals, so approvals from this planning authority are actually higher.

Improving performance is a top priority and through lean reviews and other initiatives, our aim is to move from a relatively static position to an improving authority.

| Key outcomes | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|--|---|---|
| Development Planning: | | |
| age of local/strategic development plan(s) (years and months) at end of reporting period Requirement: less than 5 years | Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan – 9 years 9 months | Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan – 8 years 9 months |
| | Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan alteration – 6 years 3 months | Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan alteration – 5 years 3 months |
| • Will the local/strategic development plan(s) be replaced by their 5th anniversary according to the current development plan scheme? (Y/N) | No | No |
| • Has the expected date of submission of the plan to Scottish Ministers in the development plan scheme changed over the past year? (Y-earlier/Y-later/N) | No | No |
| • Were development plan scheme engagement/consultation commitments met during the year? (Y/N) | Yes | Yes |
| Effective Land Supply and Delivery of Outputs* | (*1) | |
| Established housing land supply | 33,020 | 30,090 |
| 5-year effective housing land supply | 25,748 (*2) | 21,183 (*2) |
| 5-year housing supply target | 13,619 | 14,476 |
| 5-year effective housing land supply (to one decimal place) | 9.5 | 7.3 |
| Housing approvals | 4811 | 4553 |
| Housing completions over the last 5 years | 8,716 | 7,458 |
| Marketable employment land supply | 317.7 (*3) | 183.7 |
| Employment land take-up during reporting year | 0 | 12.6 |

* the most up to date approved figures are to be supplied

(*1). Information is from the final 2016 housing land audit and delivery programme.

(*2) The effective land supply is defined as the total capacity of sites which are free of planning/development constraints. Previously, the effective land supply was given as the number of units programmed for completion over the next five years.

(*3) Employment land relates to position at September 2015.

| Development Management | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|---|---------------|-----------|
| Project Planning | | |
| Percentage of applications subject to pre-application advice | 30.9 % | 36.9% |
| Number of major applications subject to processing agreement | 18 | 20 |
| Number of applications subject to other project plan | 162 | N/A |
| Percentage planned timescales met | 76.7% | 80% |
| Decision-making | | |
| Application approval rate | 93.6 % | 92.6% |
| Delegation rate | 95.1% | 94% |
| Decision-making timescales | | |
| Average number of weeks to decision: | | |
| Major developments | 33.6 | 26.5 |
| Local developments (non-householder) | 11.6 | 11.6 |
| Householder developments | 8 | 7.7 |
| Legacy Cases | | |
| Number cleared during reporting period | 65 | 66 |
| Number remaining | 163 | 230 |
| Enforcement | | |
| • time since enforcement charter published / reviewed (months) <i>Requirement:</i> review every 2 years | 4 months | 19 months |
| number of breaches identified / resolved | 626 | 764 |

Part 2

Defining and Measuring a High Quality Planning Service

Quality of Outcomes

High quality development on the ground

The emerging Local Development Plan continues to set the context for the sustainable economic growth of the city. The Plan is currently progressing through the examination process with the report being drafted by the Scottish Government Reporter.

Notwithstanding delays to the development plan, greater certainty has been achieved through the Action Plan Programme. This process is covered as a case study in the Governance section. In May 2015, we published our 10th *Development Plan Scheme* as of May 2016. This set out the context to the change in timescales for the proposed LDP and the new timetable.

The second SESplan Main Issues Report was published on 21 July 2015 with 245 responses received from the 10 week consultation. The response was higher than previous consultations and is helping to shape the next stage in the plan preparation. The Proposed Plan Period for Representations will be in late summer 2016. This will be a six week period where all stakeholders can indicate support for the plan or what changes should be made.

This past year the Council has updated a number of its non-statutory planning guidance documents. The changes have allowed us the opportunity to make clear certain aspects of the guidance and provide a clear route for customers to get information online and make the necessary applications through ePlanning.

After extensive consultation, we have now introduced new non-statutory planning *guidance for Student Housing* in the city. This provides clarity on the location of student accommodation to ensure the character of each site is considered, whilst promoting or safeguarding mixed, sustainable communities.

The guidance also links the need for general and affordable housing.

The *annual review of the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel* acknowledges the good work being done by the Panel. Since its inception in 2009, it has carried out 129 reviews. A number of points were agreed such as it continuing to be chaired by a senior planning manager, with the membership of the panel remaining as it stands and an evidence base to be developed to track the value added to the quality of development from the Panel's work.



Case study 1 – Town Centre Supplementary Guidance

The Council has continued to develop its approach to placemaking for town centres. In the past year we prepared draft supplementary guidance for two more town centres: Leith and Bruntsfield/ Morningside. This work has placed particular emphasis on making use of street and neighbourhood level knowledge through the Council's neighbourhood teams. This approach reflects the wider shift to a locality and place-based model being progressed by Council's Transformational Change Programme.

A joined-up multidisciplinary approach is being taken. For example, the supplementary guidance preparation is informed by 'public life street assessments' of the town centres. This work has been funded by the 'Smarter Choices Smarter Places' using Scottish Government funding. By aligning a transport funding programme promoting active travel with preparation of statutory planning guidance, there is a better prospect of maintaining and improving the city's town centres as successful places. This



PUBLIC LIFE STREET ASSESSMENTS LETH WALK AND GREAT JUNCTION ST + BRUINTSFIELD AND MORNINGSIDE CLEME: CITY OF FDINBURGH COUNCIL | PRODUCED BY: HERE+NOW C.L.C. | DEC 2015

work is now proceeding to the other town centres.

Case study 2 – working together to deliver high quality development

The University of Edinburgh's Estate Strategy represents one of the largest annual investments in the City. As part of the lengthy development process, we established quarterly meetings with the University to identify projects and issues at an early stage.

We actively engaged with the University and its Masterplanner to develop a strategy for the regeneration of the Holyrood Road area to replace their aging facilities. After extensive discussions an approved masterplan was approved in 2011.

Work has continued to progress the masterplan with a planning permission in principle application granted for the land to north of Holyrood Road. This included demolishing existing buildings, redeveloping and refurbishing buildings to create a mixed use of education uses, retail, food and drink, offices and purpose built student accommodation.

We provided extensive pre-application advice for each tender bid through meetings between the University and bidders and compliance with the original masterplan and Local Development Plan. The final application was approved in December 2012 for a mixed use redevelopment including accommodation for 900 students. The application was processed within 3 months. The development has been recently completed and is testimony to the time and effort made through working in partnership over a number of years.









Case study 3 - Advocates Close Development

This scheme has *won numerous awards*_including a Scottish Award for Quality in Planning. This complex development posed a number of planning challenges not least in creating a development on a site that is embedded in the fine grain of closes on the flanks of the Old Town ridge. The reuse of buildings and the careful design of new buildings for commercial units, a restaurant, offices, a bar/ bistro and serviced apartments have brought new life to this part of the Old Town. AWARD City of Edinburgh Council – Mixed Use Development – Advocate's Close



s project involves the regeneration and re-use a complex series of buildings in Editburgh's toric full rown. The project has resulted in a ge mixed-use development including hotel, art-stay holiday accommodation, offices, restaur it residential.



Reason for an award the Judges fill think Advocate's Close wis an impressive example of planning and heritage delivering a contemporary design on the average both creative and pragmatic - all within a World heritage site in the sense both creative and pragmatic - all within a World heritage site inferent levels and access sizes. From the start, however, a brief imbraded that but, equally, had a strong desire as well as a steely imbraded that to copaily, had a strong desire as well as a steely esgeneration project which opens on new bathways of accessibility in the accession of the start of the

Who made it happen City of Edinburgh Council with Morgan Chris Stewart Group as key partners Contact

phen Dickson – stephen dickson@edinburgh.gov.

Measuring the quality of new development and places

We continue to assess the quality of the new development being built across the city using measures such as the Edinburgh Quality Indicators and the *Edinburgh People Survey* 2015.

The *Quality Indicators* survey was undertaken in August 2015 and this year split the survey in to 4 parts. This allowed respondents the opportunity to either focus on buildings in their local area or (should they choose) across the city. This approach has been used to inform a recent review of the *Portobello Conservation Area Character Appraisal*.

The <u>Edinburgh People Survey (EPS)</u> is the largest face-to-face satisfaction survey undertaken by any UK local authority and provides data at local level. In 2015, a total of 5,170 adults were interviewed as part of the EPS. One specific question in the survey relates to new buildings and spaces in the local neighbourhood area. As the result shows, the majority (72%) saw these as an improvement to the area. This is up slightly on the 2014 survey.



- In total, 46% of respondents reported that new buildings or public spaces had been developed in their neighbourhood in the last 5 years.
- Of these, 72% saw these developments as an improvement to the area.
- These findings are very similar to 2014 data -44% aware of new buildings and 70% saw them as an improvement.
- The perception that new developments have been an improvement was highest amongst students (82%).
- Respondents in middle and older age group tended to be less positive (67% of 35+) than younger respondents (81% of under 35s).

Edinburgh People Survey 2015 – new buildings and spaces

Quality of service and engagement

- Open for business
- Certainty
- Communications, engagement and customer service

Open for business

The service continues to work with and engage a wide range of stakeholders through a number of forums, surveys, events and formal consultations. This past year saw the conclusion of the 'Customer 1^{st'} project. This resulted in a new *Planning and Building Standards Customer Charter* being implemented and a Customer Engagement Strategy agreed to help guide the service in how it communicates, informs and engages all its customers.

The Edinburgh Development Forum

The *Edinburgh Development Forum* continues to meet as a group for developers and agents to engage with the Council and the planning service. The Forum provides an opportunity for those investing in the city to understand better the context for development in the City and for early engagement in the planning process. In December 2015, the Forum welcomed Alex Neil MSP, Cabinet Secretary with the responsibility for planning, to join its meeting and discuss the Forum's progress since it was formed in 2009.

The Edinburgh Planning Concordat

Work is progressing on a review of the Edinburgh Planning Concordat. This document promotes collaborative working between the Council, developers and Community Councils. The opportunity is being taken to refresh it and make it more accessible and meaningful to local communities to encourage better engagement with the development industry.

We continue to work closely with Community Councils particularly on all aspects of the planning process including the Second Proposed Local Development Plan. In March this year, a liaison meeting was held with developers and community council representatives to discuss the review of *the Planning Concordat* and the relationship between the development industry and local community representatives. This meeting was key to the content of the refreshed concordat. The aim of the review is to reinforce the importance of collaborative working between the Council, the community and the development industry when promoting an "open for business" approach in Edinburgh.

Certainty

The Development Plan

A plan-led system is dependent on a robust development plan. The current development plan remains robust with only 13 applications granted contrary to the development plan. This is 0.4% of the 3688 decisions made in 2015-2016.

It is acknowledged that delays in adopting the plan have created some uncertainty and the focus remains on adopting the Plan. However, the proposed LDP Action Programme continues to provide a focused approach to delivering infrastructure through estimating costs of essential infrastructure, identified funding sources, and specifying any funding gaps. The section on Governance includes this as a case study.

Certainty for Our Customers

The delivery of the Customer Engagement Strategy sets a framework for how we engage all our customers, defining customer groups, their needs and improving the opportunities to engage in the planning process. The strategy focuses on improving *digital participation* in planning to reach as wide an audience as possible.

Detailed guidance is available to create certainty for most straightforward householder applications. We have a *suite of guidance* helping potential applicants to design acceptable schemes.

Charters on service areas, such as Street Naming, ensure that the customer knows what to expect. Audits are carried out at regular intervals, to ensure consistency of output, decision making, and meeting of target timescales.

Certainty in Application Processing

Each case is dealt with on its own merits and positive decisions cannot always be guaranteed. Teams have regular review meetings to ensure that cases are on track, including one to one meetings with team managers. The aim is to ensure the applicant is aware of potential problems. Catching these cases early is key to certainty in the process.

21 out of the 195 applications with Committee decisions issued in 2015-16 were the result of the Development Management Sub-Committee taking a different view to the officer recommendation. Out of 3688 applications determined, this is only 0.6%.

Out of these, 4 were granted and 17 were refused. However, the figures also show that 52% of delegated refusals were overturned by the Edinburgh Local Review Body and 32.8% of appeals were allowed.

We continue to embed planning processing agreements (PPAs) as a priority for major development. In 2015-16, 56.3% of major applications had a PPA and 77.8% met the target committee date. Consultee meetings are held for every major application to provide constructive discussion about the level of information needed for each application. Major applications and more complex local developments are project managed with Committee dates set in advance so all parties are aware of the target date.

Communications, engagement and customer service

Customer 1st project

The Customer 1st project has been formally concluded and is now monitoring the benefits from this process. The project delivered a number of changes to the delivery of the planning service including improving online information, focussing helpdesk times to 9am-1pm and improving the planning guidance to make it clearer where to find information and support customers in using more online

services such as ePlanning. The number of pre-application enquiries (for householder development) has reduced as a result of this change to *our service* in line with more officer time now focussing on dealing with the statutory application process.

We have been making greater use of the *Council's consultation hub* as a means to engage a wide range of people in changes to policy and procedures. Delib (who host our Consultation Hub) specifically noted the 'Draft Strategic Plan' and 'Quality of Edinburgh's Built Environment' consultations as 'good examples of interesting, informative and consultation design'. We intend to develop the use of the consultation hub to use the Dialogue system (online discussion board) as used in the recent *Scottish Government review of planning.*

We recognise that not all customers are online and continue to use drop in sessions in public places such as libraries for projects such as the review of conservation areas. Publicly accessible internet (free wi-fi and computers) in Council libraries is helping to address some of these issues.

Customer Service Excellence

The Planning and Building Standards service was re-accredited in November 2015 with *Customer Service Excellence* as part of a wider service area. This accreditation recognises our commitment to improving the customer journey and experience. This year the assessor was 'particularly impressed with Planning and Building Standards and their Engagement Strategy and customer segmentation matrix'.



Customer segmentation matrix - our customers

Case Study 4 – Queensferry Placemaking and the Place Standard

The Queensferry Placemaking Exercise was developed and coordinated by Planning in partnership with Queensferry and District Community Council and Queensferry Ambition.

It piloted *the Place Standard tool,* developed by A+DS, the Scottish Government and NHS Scotland. The simple question and answer tool was used to structure discussions with local people about "their place" and to prioritise actions to improve health and wellbeing locally. The events took place between August and October 2015 with three sessions for the public and one for pupils from the local high school.

Why Queensferry?

Queensferry was identified as an area of significant change happening or being planned such as:

- Queensferry Crossing
- Forth Bridge world heritage site designation
- Local Development Plan housing allocation
- High Street improvements
- To ensure the community had a say and did not feel overwhelmed, the Place Standard was used to get a response to this level of change.

Place Standard Exercise

Around 150 residents took part in the exercise. They were asked a series of questions to identify areas where Queensferry succeeds as a place and where improvements would help.

Action

Using the views of the local community to producing the Place Standard compass, the outcomes were *shared publically*.

From this exercise, developers are clear on issues within Queensferry and can ensure new developments help to mitigate or address some of these issues.

Council service providers also came together and discussed how the results provided an evidence base for future service planning and priorities. The *Neighbourhood Partnership* is considering how it could help to involve local people in decisions about spending priorities in Queensferry.



The pilot of the Place Standard tool, as a mechanism for community engagement, has helped inform the new locality improvement planning agenda under the Council's Transformational Change programme.

Feedback

86% participants found the exercise 'Good' or 'Really Good'. Keith Giblet, Queensferry & District Community Council said,

"I have never experienced this number of Council Services around one table talking about Queensferry and don't just welcome it, I am inspired by it"



Case Study 5 - Student Housing: supplementary guidance

The City has seen a 26.6% increase in the number of full time students at the three universities in the Council's area (University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh Napier University and Heriot-Watt University) between 2001 and 2012. The number of full time students since 2011/12 has remained almost constant at just under 44,000 rising to 44,898 in 2013/14.

Last year we undertook consultation on draft guidance for Student Housing. The finalised guidance sets out to encourage new student accommodation in specific locations and generally across the city

but moves away from applying specific concentration levels. In recent years, student housing has been consented on sites which would previously have delivered much need housing. Given the continued need to deliver housing, including the use of brownfield sites, it is appropriate to ensure that the accommodation needs of students is balanced with the needs of the wider community. The guidance will address this though the requirement for housing as part of larger proposals.





Protecting our historic environment

The City has 49 conservation areas with the majority first designated between 1971 and 1998. Character appraisals continue to play an important role in planning decisions by providing a basis of understanding of that character and appearance to guide decision-making. They can also assist owners and developers in formulating proposals.

The ongoing review of character appraisals has seen the revised versions of Leith, Queensferry and Inverleith Character Appraisals. The current review of the Portobello conservation area character has seen the use of a short online survey, allowing respondents the opportunity to comment on new buildings in the area.

World Heritage Site Management Plan

A review of the 2011–2016 World Heritage Site Management Plan is now underway with discussions progressing with our partners at Historic Environment Scotland and Edinburgh World Heritage. The new Plan will be informed by workshops, whilst events such as <u>World</u> <u>Heritage Day</u> will help to raise the profile of this important designation.



Dublin Street looking to Fife



World Heritage Day the National Museum of Scotland

Edinburgh Biodiversity Action Plan

A new *Edinburgh Biodiversity Action Plan 2016 - 2018* has been approved. The Plan has over 250 actions to be delivered by the Edinburgh Biodiversity Partnership – made up of over 30 members. The Plan demonstrates our commitment to collaborative working, putting local communities at the heart of the Plan.

Planning applications – online submissions and performance

Around 69% of all applications were made online through ePlanning. This service guides applicants through the application process and ensures that all the necessary information is provided. We have undertaken a lean review of the validation process and we intend to update our guidance in the coming year.

Invalid applications account for around 28.5% of applications which is an increase from 25.3% last year. This increase is in part due to the stricter line we are taking with the quality of the submissions we receive. This was an outcome of the lean review we undertook on the validation process which will see improved submissions over time and we expect this figure to reduce in the coming year. Holding training events with agents is helping to address this issue.

Legacy applications

We continue to work on our 'legacy applications'. Currently there are 163 applications which predate 31 March 2015. During the reporting period, 65 applications over a year old were determined or withdrawn. The Planning Committee has now *agreed a position* that from 15 June 2015, any "minded to grant" decision subject to the conclusion of a legal agreement should have an interim minded to grant decision notice issued. This should state 'the required legal agreement should be concluded within 6 months of the date of the notice. Thereafter a report will be sent back to Committee with a likely recommendation that the application be refused.

Customer Engagement Strategy

The *Planning and Building Standards Customer Engagement Strategy* was approved in December 2015. This aligns with the Council's Transformational Change programme to deliver improved services with fewer resources. The strategy focuses on supporting our customers in the move to online channels including our website, eDevelopment and social media.

Our *pre-application service* has been re-focused with direct contact available for the major and more complex applications. Customers using our website are clearly directed to where they can find the relevant planning information. *Online pre-application advice* forms now allow us to capture what we need to be able to answer these enquiries quicker.

Community Councils and Community Planning

We continue to work closely with community councils. In October and December 2015, we held training for community councils on the planning system. This covered the Development Plan, major applications, making planning decisions and enforcement. The feedback was positive from attendees and we will continue running these events in the future.

The Planning service is working closely with our Community Planning colleagues with the priority to create better links between Community Planning and Spatial Planning. Training has been held with staff on the importance of the emerging Council structure as we move to locality based delivery and the opportunity this brings to create successful places.

Connecting to Our Customers

Our planning web pages continue to be reviewed and refocused to meet the needs of all our customer groups. We are promoting the use of our online resources such as tree information, online submissions (applications and comments) and getting customers to self help as much as possible.

This year for the *SOCITM Better Connected* review gave us four stars for our online process on 'how to object to a planning application'. The reviewer commented,

"Really well promoted from all entry points of the website, it would be difficult not to get on the right path for this user journey. It was great that I was always signposted via the content page which was nicely presented so that it was easy to scan and well written. The online service was prominently linked to for online comment, monthly lists were available to get the 'monthly applications, although it would be nice to see one button that says 'Current applications'. At last I have found a council site that I can use the mapping on. The results that I found once going to the larger map were displaying. Great."

The *Planning Service Twitter account* continues to grow in interest and remains the most followed local planning authority in Scotland with over 2150 followers – over 400 new followers since the last PPF. The use of social media is now an embedded aspect of how we communicate and will be used to support 'channel shift'. The *Planning Edinburgh blog* continues to increase in popularity with 215 subscribers and over 60 blog posts to date.

The Planning and Development Management Sub Committees continue to be *webcast* live which increases transparency and allows people to view this process at a later date.

Case study 6 - Customer 1st project

The Customer 1st project had a wide ranging remit to review existing processes and new ways of working to improve the customer experience in the context of reducing resources. The project was linked to the Council's overall objective for 'channel shift' where customers are supported in the move to self serving online. Outcomes of the Customer 1st project included:

- Introducing a call handling service for helpdesk enquiries
- Staff training on call handling
- Changing the *planning and building standards helpdesk* opening hours
- Improved web content
 - Providing an online pre-application form
 - emphasising the use of online transactions such as *ePlanning*
 - Tree data maps now useable on mobiles and tablet devices
- Organising events with agents to help improve the submission of applications
- Awareness raising of the changes through social media, tweets and planning blog



Customer satisfaction: complaints and compliments

During 2015 the Planning and Building Standards service received 180 complaints and 131 compliments. Staff training on complaints is now delivered annually and focuses on 'lessons to be learned' from internal investigations and examples of the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman complaints.



Complaint trends since 2013

Governance

Effective Management Structures – ensuring management structures are effective and fit for purpose

Staff Structures and Resources

During 2015/16, the Planning and Building Standards service embedded the new management structure which was implemented in October 2014. The change to an area based structure has been an effective working model with closer liaison between the managers in the east, west and city wide teams to achieve better joined up working. In addition, there is effective matrix management so that managers dealing with householder applications, for example, work closely together to improve performance and ensure consistency of working practices. This is now beginning to show signs of working well with performance improving particularly in the 3rd and 4th quarters of 2015/16 as the new ways of working take hold.

A further organisational change was implemented in November 2015, when the Planning and Building Standards Service was joined up with the Council's Transport service to form a new Planning and Transport Service within a new Directorate of Place. Consultation on a new team structure was undertaken for this service in the latter quarter of the 2015/16. The Council's new locality based structure will closely align with the new team structure that has been working effectively in Planning and Building Standards since October 2014. This is providing a new opportunity to address placemaking objectives in a joined up manner.

The new Planning and Transport service is led by a leadership team made up of a Head of service and 6 senior managers. This meets weekly to set the direction of the Service in the context of the wider department and the Transformational Change programme in the Council.

Planning income has been consistent in 2015/16 and staff resources have been relatively static with a number of temporary staff ensuring numbers are maintained. However there has been a loss of support staff and this means that overtime working is required to clear backlogs and keep the validation process as efficient as possible. In 2016/17, a new system will be in place for the provision of support staff in the service and this may have repercussions in terms of application performance.

The new management structure has included a team dealing with service improvements and this has led to a number of changes to working practices in response to lean reviews and working protocols led by the new team. These are discussed in more detail below.

Corporate and Partnership Working

The Local Development Plan Action Programme brings together Council services to agree on service priorities to deliver the requirements for the future development of the City. Discussions are ongoing and, as part of this process, working protocols are being developed which have an input to the Action Programme. In particular, there is a new protocol with Children and Families on how school infrastructure will be delivered.

PPF4, covering 2014/15, set out the work we were doing on other protocols with other services in the Council. The protocol with Environmental Assessment has been completed but not implemented as changes to the structure of Council services may have an impact on how the protocol is delivered. This will become clear in 2016/17.

In addition, the flooding protocol could not be delivered due to a lack of staff resources in the Bridges and Structures section. This affected the ability to give consultation responses and discuss a protocol that would work in practice. Instead, a self certification process for flood risk assessment was piloted in 2015/16 with a view to its implementation in 2016/17. As part of this pilot, case officers have to establish if the development poses a flood risk and then has to send a out a request for a self certified package of information.

Partnership working remains a strong ethos for the service and working as part of SESplan has been particularly significant this year. Strong bonds remain with the Edinburgh World Heritage Trust and the Edinburgh Biodiversity Partnership. Close liaison with other authorities through bodies such as Heads of Planning Scotland and the Uniform Users Group is vital to successful networking.

Case Study 7 – Action Programme

One of the main issues for a local development plan with high levels of housing growth has been infrastructure provision. The Council's solution is based on the newly-introduced statutory requirement to prepare and update an Action Programme.

We have used this for infrastructure planning by putting significant effort into cumulative assessments of the impact of plan-led growth on infrastructure, such as the transport network or school capacities. We have updated its Proposed Action Programme several times, ensuring that it consists of site-specific actions with increasingly detailed information on cost and timing of delivery. In this way, the Action Programme provides a vehicle for the wider Council to co-ordinate and prioritise capital investment, as well as a transparent basis for collecting developer contributions while ensuring that housing and other growth is delivered.

The Action Programme is now reported to the Council's Finance and **Resource Committee and is** governed by an oversight group chaired by the Chief Executive. The role of the Action Programme as a corporate document has potential to be widened to reflect the asset strategies of community planning partners, for example by including specific actions on primary healthcare infrastructure capacity.



This approach is key to how the Council is making the development plan the spatial expression of the community plan. It also has potential to assist efficient planning of revenue costs for the growing city.

Training

A full programme of training has been delivered for both planning staff and elected members during 2015/16. This is set out in more detail in the next section on Continuous Improvement. Many of these topics align with our ethos of strong partnerships and corporate working and include:

- learning from complaints (working with Corporate Governance)
- planning conditions (working with planning consultees)
- SUDS (working with Road Construction Consent colleagues)
- Developer contribution guidance (working with Action Programme members)
- SESPlan and Housing Land Supply (working with SESPlan)
- The Place Standard (working with Neighbourhood teams)
- Edinburgh World Heritage Site (working with Edinburgh Word Heritage)

International Partnership: Edinburgh-Krakow partnership

There is a long and positive relationship between Edinburgh and Krakow stretching back to a European funded project in 1993 where the (then) Edinburgh District Planning Department was involved in the development of an Action Plan for Kasimierz, the Jewish Quarter of Krakow. The two cities have co-operated via a formal Partnership Agreement that has since been extended and re-signed every five years.

In April and September last year, two workshops were held (one in Krakow and one in Edinburgh) with key staff from each city. As both cities are world heritage cities, a common theme of heritage management is of mutual interest. Two topics were explored during the workshops:

- community engagement and Placemaking, and
- the protection, enhancement and maintenance of setted surfaces

As these areas are currently of particular interest to both cities, considerable benefit was gained from the exchange of knowledge and practice and this has been used in the delivery of our services in Edinburgh.

The workshops were a great success in focussing on both sharing experiences with fellow professionals and seeing processes in action on the ground. This was also successful from a cultural exchange perspective providing an opportunity to see how the respective different cultures and planning regimes operate.



Lean Processes

From September 2015, the Planning and Building Standards service started to implement a series of lean reviews to create efficiencies to improve performance. This fitted with the Council's Transformational Change programme which aspires that the Council of the future will be lean and agile.

Five lean reviews were carried out:

- 1. Tree applications and enquiries
- 2. Enforcement process.
- 3. Validation process (planning and building warrant applications)
- 4. Building warrant process
- 5. Internal consultations

Progress on the action plans has been good and significant actions include changes to the tree application process to resist time-consuming email applications, moving customers towards online information, a new 6 point process for dealing with enforcement enquiries, a new process for dealing with planning applications that are permitted development and a fast track process for building warrant applications

Case Study 8 – The Tree Service Lean Review

Over 2 days, a team made up of professional, technical and support staff, re-engineered the process for dealing with tree applications. The resulting action plan has now been delivered –emailed tree applications are no longer processed and applicants are advised to apply online, phone enquiries now go through a centralised line, the Trees Charter has been embedded into the Customer Charter and standard email responses have been set up directing customers to the *Private Trees* page on the Council website which has been updated.

Communication on the changes included an agents' drop in event including a demonstration of the e.planning system, a blog, letters to agents and automated email responses. Since the implementation of the changes on 19 January 2016, 89.4% of tree applications have been made online. Previously the figure was just 3.3%. Efficiency has improved allowing tree officers to concentrate on statutory application processing.

Stakeholder Feedback

During 2015/16, a number of events were held with agents and their representative bodies to discuss the changes being made in the service in terms of ways of working and customer service. The key message was to ask them to understand resources were limited and they would have to make better use of the Council's online systems to find information. Outcomes from lean reviews were discussed and future actions explained. Discussions were constructive and positive and the feedback informed final service delivery models.

Quotes following agents' events:

"Many thanks to you and your colleagues. That was a very frank and informative discussion."

Ian Jameson, Ross, Smith and Jameson

"It's a difficult task trying to provide a service with cuts to funding ever present. I commend you for doing the job you do & going out to your stakeholders & running these sessions."

Suzanne McIntosh Planning

Financial Management and Local Governance

Our Business Plan 2016-17 sets out the following financial priorities:

- To deliver service efficiencies through workforce savings required to meet Council budget targets by reducing management costs by (£0.12), by deleting two team manager posts (out of 18) and non-managerial costs by £0.696 by deleting 6 professional grade posts out of 83
- To identify new funding opportunities to support the delivery of priority infrastructure needs in the Local Development Plan Action Programme
- To explore opportunities, for savings from shared resources and partnership working with stakeholders in built and natural heritage initiatives and programmes
- Monitoring fee income on a monthly basis
- Developing the business cases to match staff resources to workload
- Supporting the national campaign for revised structure for planning fees

Culture of Continuous Improvement

Staff training and development

The service continues to support training and development opportunities through the Staff Development Group. The group is made up of representatives from across the service and cascades a range of training opportunities. The group makes innovative use of a modest training budget by tailoring training to meet priority service needs. These include further education, legislative updates, design skills, attendance at conferences and seminars. This coming year, the group will broaden its activities to reflect the increased multi-disciplinary nature of the new Planning and Transport Service and the opportunities for sharing training and development needs.

Elected members training

For over 10 years the Planning Committee has had an awareness raising and workshop programme. This helps to build awareness and understanding of planning issues, and has improved relations with partner organisations and key stakeholders, including government agencies, local partners and the development sector.

Over the past year, workshops have provided in depth discussion of current issues and policy development. Shorter awareness raising sessions set the context for members understanding or partner organisations work and wider Council initiatives. The programme is flexible enough to allow for priority issues to come forward as workshop topics.

Member training is important to ensure compliance with the Councillor's Code of Conduct which requires planning decisions to be taken by appropriately trained members. Major decisions are being taken by councillors and the training they receive ensures they keep up-to-date with current and emerging issues. The training and awareness-raising demonstrates the Council's commitment to continuous improvement.

| The Local Development Plan | Student housing |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Air Quality | Housing Need and Demand Assessment |
| World Heritage Site | Service performance and priorities |
| Major planning applications | Adverts |
| Infrastructure and Delivery | Density and parking standards |
| Community engagement | Local Review Body |
| Recently completed developments and Placemaking | Committee procedures |

Planning Committee Workshop and Awareness Raising 2015 – 2016

Officers from the service continue to be heavily involved in Heads of Planning Scotland, working closely with other planning authorities to promote continuous and consistent improvements in Planning in Scotland. Senior managers from the City Councils of Glasgow-Edinburgh hold liaison meetings every 6 months to discuss common themes and shared challenges.

Service Improvements

In 2015-16 our Service Plan focused on a number of key improvements. The full objectives are included in Part 4 of this PPF but the following are examples of what we have achieved:

- Promotion of our place-making role by pioneering the use of the Place Standard in Queensferry working with the local community and neighbourhood team to set out a programme of what is needed to improve the sense of place in this area;
- Preparing and implementing our Customer Engagement Strategy and updating our Customer Service Charter - these set out the level of service that can be expected and how we will deliver this;
- Undertaking a programme of lean reviews, improving efficiency in many areas including tree applications, enforcement complaints and validation of applications; and
- Working with SESplan to set out the vision for the Edinburgh City Region in the Main Issues Report.

The Planning and Building Standards Business Plan for 2016-17 sets out our main service priorities, which includes:

- Meeting our statutory duties by adopting a new local development plan, publishing and implementing its action programme and by preparing and adopting supplementary guidance, and finalising a replacement strategic development plan and ensuring that it is aligned with the Community Plan;
- Delivering a joined up agenda for place-making by reviewing Planning, Transport and related strategies to meet statutory requirements and community needs;
- Meeting performance in application and warrant processing and deciding on enforcement cases and meeting published targets;
- Ensuring the new e-Building Standards system is operating smoothly without any drop in performance; and
- Reducing the number of customer complaints.

Summary

The City of Edinburgh Council has demonstrated its commitment to continuous improvement with the delivery of its Planning functions through a range of performance and service initiatives over the past year. The challenge of managing and accommodating population and economic growth in a sensitive built and natural environment has been proactively managed to achieve quality outcomes. These are evidenced in this PPF and will be compared through benchmarking and other collaborative working arrangements and initiatives in partner planning authorities. The Council promotes a culture of learning as part of its core values.

Part 3

Supporting Evidence

This Planning Performance Report has been compiled using information from a range of sources including:

- SESPlan
- The Edinburgh Local Development Plan
- Development Plan Schemes
- Planning Guidelines
- Planning Enforcement online form and charter
- Planning Committee reports
- Regular Planning Edinburgh blogs
- Planning and Building Standards Customer Care Charters
- The City of Edinburgh Council webcasts
- SOCITM Better Connected Review (Website review)
- The Edinburgh People Survey
- Feedback from events with stakeholders including community councils, planning agents, Edinburgh
 Development Forum
- Planning and Building Standards Lean Reviews

Part 4

Service Improvements 2016 - 17

The Planning and Transport Business Plan for 2016/17 sets out a number of key objectives to deliver a high performing planning service in Edinburgh. These are set out in the table below. The targets for delivery are 31 March 2017. In the coming year we will:

| Key Projects | Key actions |
|--|--|
| Local Development Plan | Adoption and finalisation of Action Programme and preparation of supplementary guidance. |
| Strategic Development Plan | Finalise a revised plan. |
| Open Space Strategy | Review and revise the strategy. |
| The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan | Review and replace the management plan for the site. |
| Biodiversity Action Plan | Finalisation, promotion and implementation of plan. |
| Non-statutory guidance | Review and update non-statutory guidance on planning |
| Customer engagement | Implement customer engagement changes and operational processes through lean reviews and channel shift programmes |
| Place making | Develop a joined up spatial policy approach to delivering the sustainable economic growth of Edinburgh and the wider city region |
| Financial Management | Deliver service efficiencies, including shared resources, and funding opportunities to deliver the Council's Action Programme |
| Planning fees | Monitor monthly fee income and put in charging structures for pre- application advice, subject to new legislation |

Delivery of our service improvements in 2015 - 16

| Key Projects | Key actions |
|---|--|
| Adopt the Proposed LDP by end of March 2016 | Second proposed Local Development Plan submitted to Scottish Ministers May 2015. Awaiting report. |
| Promote our placemaking role to put Planning and Building Standards at the heart of placemaking across the City. | <i>Place Standard exercises</i> held in Queensferry with outcomes being developed. |
| Prepare and implement a Customer Engagement strategy and new Customer Service Charter | Both approved in December 2015 and now in place. |
| Refresh and review Edinburgh Planning Concordat | Underway |
| Produce a Building Standards scorecard using relevant Scottish Government template to show how we have met the quarterly performance targets, verifier standards and address key themes as part of Building Standards National Framework. | Completed. |
| 90% of approved major developments within the year to show added value quality improvements | As the data in the back office systems has not been completed, it is not possible to confirm that this target has been met. |
| 90% of householder applications determined within 2 months | Target met - 91.3% determined within 2 months |
| 75% of non-householder applications determined within 2 months | 68.4% - whilst not met this is and improvement on 58.1% last year |
| 75% of Listed Building Consent applications determined within 2 months | 71.9% - target missed due to removing legacy cases from the system which impacted on this figure |
| Seek to minimise the overall average time taken to grant a building warrant measured from the date of lodging to the date of granting the warrant | Due to legislative change and other practice this is expected to improve in the coming year as backlogs are cleared |
| Building Warrant Applications – 90%of first reports issued within 20 days | 60.2% issued within 20 days – whilst target missed, performance has improved since the Building Standards lean review. Legislative changes on 1 October 2015 impacted on performance. |
| Review the implementation of Manager Assimilation Action Plans identifying areas where further training and support is needed to manage the service and champion corporate values | Partially completed. The review of the Planning service as part of Transformational Change will see further management development. |
| Lean Reviews of Statutory Processes to pinpoint areas for improved service delivery | Five lean reviews were undertaken and actions progressed. |
| Set out the vision for the Edinburgh City Region via SESPLAN and ensure engagement includes young people | Second SESplan Main Issues Report published 21 July 2015 - 245 responses were received which was higher than previous consultations. |
| Promote our collaborative approach with other service areas by implementing a range of joint working initiatives including new and refreshed working protocols and service level agreements | Ongoing - new Council structure will see change with locality working included in new/revised protocols. |
| eBuilding Standards Project delivered in line with Scottish Government milestones | Ongoing and progressing towards delivery. |

Part 5

Official Statistics

| Edinburgh ^{1′2} | | Post-3rd August 2009 applications | | 2015/16 All applications | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | Total number of decisions | Average time (weeks) | Total number of decisions | Average time (weeks) | Proportion of Decisions | |
| MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS | | | | | | |
| Without Legal Agreement | 2 | 13.5 | 2 | 13.5 | | |
| With Legal Agreement | 11 | 32.8 | 12 | 36.9 | | |
| MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS | | | | | | |
| All Major Developments | 13 | 29.9 | 14 | 33.6 | | |
| Minerals | 0 | | 0 | - | | |
| Housing | 6 | 28.5 | 7 | 36.2 | | |
| Business and Industry | 0 | 20.5 | 0 | 50.2 | | |
| • | | - | | - | | |
| Waste Management | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| Electricity Generation | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| Freshwater Fish Farming | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| Marine Finfish Farming | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| Marine Shellfish Farming | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| Other Developments | 7 | 31.0 | 7 | 31.0 | | |
| LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS | | | | | | |
| Without Legal Agreement | 2,223 | 9.0 | 2223 | 9 | | |
| With Legal Agreement | 27 | 41.2 | 27 | 41.2 | | |
| LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS | | | | | | |
| All Local Developments | 2250 | 9.4 | 2250 | 9.4 | | |
| Local: Less than 2 months | 1779 | 7.3 | 1779 | 7.3 | 79.1% | |
| Local: More than 2 months | 471 | 17.1 | 471 | 17.1 | 20.9% | |
| Local Developments (non-householder) | 864 | 11.6 | 864 | 11.6 | | |
| Local: Less than 2 months | 535 | 7.0 | 535 | 7.0 | 61.9% | |
| Local: More than 2 months | 329 1386 | 19.0 8.0 | 329 1386 | 19.0 8.0 | 38.1% | |
| Householder Developments Local: Less than 2 months | 1244 | 7.4 | 1244 | 7.4 | 89.8% | |
| Local: More than 2 months | 142 | 12.9 | 142 | 12.9 | 10.2% | |
| Housing | 183 | 15.8 | 183 | 15.8 | | |
| Local: Less than 2 months | 99 | 7.4 | 99 | 7.4 | 54.1% | |
| Local: More than 2 months | 84 | 25.8 | 84 | 25.8 | 45.9% | |
| Business & Industry | 45 | 8.8 | 45 | 8.8 | | |
| Local: Less than 2 months | 34 | 7.3 | 34 | 7.3 | 75.6% | |
| Local: More than 2 months | 11 | 13.5 | 11 | 13.5 | 24.4% | |
| Other Developments Local: Less than 2 months | 514 326 | 10.7 6.9 | 514 326 | 10.7 6.9 | 63.4% | |
| | | | | | | |
| Local: More than 2 months | 188 | 17.2 | 188 | 17.2 | 36.6% | |
| OTHER CONSENTS | | | | | | |
| All Other Consents | 1421 | 9.3 | 1421 | 9.3 | | |
| Listed bldg+con. area consents Advertisements | 941 322 | 10.1 8.2 | 941 322 | 10.1 8.2 | | |
| Hazardous substances consents | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| Other consents and cetificates | 158 | 6.4 | 158 | 6.4 | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS | | | | | | |
| Local Developments subject to EIA | 0 | - | 0 | - | | |
| AMSCs subject to EIA | 3 | 19.7 | 3 | 19.7 | | |
| APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO | | | | | | |
| Planning/Legal Agreement | 38 | 38.8 | 39 | 39.9 | | |
| Local Review | 54 | 7.0 | 54 | 7.0 | | |

| Edinburgh ^{1′2} | | August 2009 ications | 2015/16 All applicati |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| PROCESSING AGREEMENTS | Total number of decisions | % within agreed timescales | |
| All Processing Agreements | 180 | 76.7% | |
| Major Applications | 18 | 77.8% | |
| Local Applications | 124 | 79.8% | |
| EIA Developments | 0 | - | |
| Other consents | 38 | 65.8% | |
| APPLICATIONS APPROVED/DELEGATED | Percentage | | |
| Percentage of Applications Approved | | | |
| Percentage of Applications Delegated | | | |
| LOCAL REVIEWS AND APPEALS | Total number of decisions | Original decision upheld % | |
| Local Review | 54 | 48.1% | |
| Appeals to Scottish Ministers | 72 | 54.2% | |
| ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY | Number | | |
| Cases Taken Up | 584 | | |
| Notices Served | 42 | | |
| Reports to Procurator Fiscal | 0 | | |
| Prosecutions | 0 | | |
| Number of breaches resolved | n/a | | |

Part 6

Workforce and Financial Information

| | | City Wide | East | West | Other |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|------|------|-------|
| | No. Posts | 6 | 5 | 5 | |
| Managers | Vacant | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Main grade posts | No. Posts | 36 | 22 | 23 | 2 |
| Main grade posts | Vacant | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Technician | No. Posts | 6 | 3 | 3 | |
| lechnician | Vacant | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Office Support/ Clerical | No. Posts | 4 | 8 | 8 | 2 |
| | Vacant | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | | 56 | 43 | 43 | |

From 1 December 2015, the former Planning and Building Standards service was merged into a new Planning and Transport service under single head of service. The data in this table shows only those posts which make a substantive contribution to the delivery of the Planning functions of the new service.

The category of "Managers" includes both service manager grade and team manager (line manager) grade posts. Two of the three service managers have planning and building standards responsibilities and are based on geographic areas of the city. The third service manager has responsibility for planning policy (and transport and environmental policy) and some planning activities on a city wide basis.

Workforce costs

| | 2015-16 Budget £ | 2015-16 Costs (Actual) £ |
|---|------------------|--------------------------|
| City Wide Team | 2,090,473 | 1,898,761 |
| East Team | 1,292,013 | 1,140,145 |
| West Team | 1,379,166 | 1,402,060 |
| Other (support staff, reception staff and plan store) | 504,677 | 451,001 |
| TOTAL | 5,266,330 | 4,891,967 |

Appendix 1

Performance Markers Report 2014-15

Name of planning authority: City of Edinburgh Council

The High Level Group on Performance agreed a set of performance markers. We have assessed your report against those markers to give an indication of priority areas for improvement action. The high level group will monitor and evaluate how the key markers have been reported and the value which they have added.

The Red, Amber, Green ratings are based on the evidence provided within the PPF reports. Where no information or insufficient evidence has been provided, a 'red' marking has been allocated.

| No. | Performance Marker | RAG rating | Comments |
|-----|--|---------------|--|
| 1 | Decision-making: continuous reduction of average timescales for all development categories [Q1 - Q4] | Amber | Major Developments A slight improvement in decision making timescales from 27.9 to 26.5 over the year, which is still better than the national average of 46.4 weeks. RAG = Green Local (Non-Householder) Timescales have lengthened slightly from 10.7 weeks last year to 11.6 weeks this year, however this is still quicker that the national average of 12.9 weeks. RAG = Amber Householder Development Timescales have lengthened slightly from 7.5 weeks to 7.7 weeks, this now takes you to slightly longer decision times than the national average of 7.5 weeks. RAG = Red TOTAL RAG = Amber |
| 2 | Processing agreements: offer to all prospective applicants for major development planning applications; and availability publicised on website | Green | Processing agreements continue to be offered for all major applications. 20 out of 33 major applications subject to a processing agreement with 80% meeting the timescales set out. Good evidence of using agreements for local developments as well. Availability and template published on website. |

| 3 | Early collaboration with applicants and consultees availability and promotion of pre-application discussions for all prospective applications; and clear and proportionate requests for supporting information | Green | You have increased the number of applications which were subject to pre-application discussions from 23% up to 36%. You have indicated that you will be refocusing the pre- app service to focus on major and complex local applications with guidance produced for more straightforward applications. You have provided good evidence of the approach you take to ensure that information requests are clear and proportionate for applicants for instance through the convening of case conferences. |
|---|---|-------|---|
| 4 | Legal agreements: conclude (or reconsider) applications after resolving to grant permission reducing number of live applications more than 6 months after resolution to grant (from last reporting period) | Green | Timescales improving for major applications, taking on average 29.8 weeks compared to 33.4 weeks last year. Local applications with a legal agreement have increased to 33.1 weeks from 25.7 weeks last year. Both remain quicker than the national average. You have committed to reviewing current practice to help speed up the process however, you have noted that you are content to hold applications until applicants are ready to sign a legal agreement. |
| 5 | Enforcement charter updated / re- published within last 2 years | Green | Charter published August 2013 |
| 6 | Continuous improvement: progress/improvement in relation to PPF National Headline Indicators; and progress ambitious and relevant service improvement commitments identified through PPF report | Amber | You have reduced the time taken to decide major applications however the time taken to decide both local and householder applications has increased. You have a good record of providing pre-application discussions and using processing agreements. However your LDP is out of date. You have completed the majority of your commitments for last year and have made a good range of ambitious commitments for the year ahead. |
| 7 | Local development plan less than 5 years since adoption | Red | Both local plans are over 5 years old. |
| 8 | Development plan scheme – next LDP: on course for adoption within 5 years of current plan(s) adoption; and project planned and expected to be delivered to planned timescale | Red | Your LDP will not be adopted within the required 5 year timescale and has been delayed by the requirement to consult on a second proposed plan. You have provided a good explanation of the processes you have gone through however you have provided little evidence of your approach to project managing the LDP process. |

| 9 10 | Elected members engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – <i>i</i> f p/an has been at pre-MIR stage during report <i>i</i> ng ye <i>a</i> r Cross sector stakeholders* | n/a n/a | |
|---------|--|------------|--|
| | engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – if plan has been at pre-MIR stage during reporting year *including industry, agencies and Scottish Government | | |
| 11 | Regular and proportionate policy advice produced on: information required to support applications; and expected developer contributions | Amber | You have produced validation guidance which covers supporting information requirements. You intend to extend this guidance to provide clarity on requirements for different types of applications. RAG = Amber Your LDP Action Programme outlines infrastructure requirements and you have 2 planning obligations officers who are involved in the application process from the outset. RAG = Green |
| 12 | Corporate working across services to improve outputs and services for customer benefit (for example: protocols; joined- up services; single contact arrangements; joint pre- application advice) | Green | You have a range of protocols in place with other council services and other new ones close to finalisation. You have provided good examples of working with the Edinburgh Biodiversity partnership, flooding and environmental assessment colleagues and collaboration through the Edinburgh 12 initiative. You have also convened a LDP Action Group which brings together a range of cross service stakeholders. |
| 13 | Sharing good practice, skills and knowledge between authorities | Green | You have provided a range of examples of sharing good practice on subjects such as social media. You also engage in a number of groups and forums including the Edinburgh Civic Forum and Edinburgh Developers Forum who were both invited to provide feedback on your previous PPF report. You have mentioned that you participate in benchmarking and regular liaison with Glasgow City Council and your SOLACE benchmarking groups. |

| 14 | Stalled sites / legacy cases: conclusion or withdrawal of old planning applications and reducing number of live applications more than one year old | Amber | You have cleared 66 cases within the last year however, there are a high number (203) of cases remaining. It is noted that a new process has been implemented in the current year and we look forward to hearing about the impact this has had in your next report. |
|----|--|-------|---|
| 15 | Developer contributions: clear and proportionate expectations • set out in development plan | Green | Your LDP action programme details the infrastructure requirements for allocated sites alongside costings, responsibility for delivery, funding options and contribution requirements. RAG = Green |
| | (and/or emerging plan); and • in pre-application discussions | | Officers are involved early on in the process to set out any potential developer contributions and you have increased this resource to 2 officers. RAG = Green |