

# West Devon Overview & Scrutiny (Internal) Committee



West Devon  
Borough  
Council

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Agenda</b>										
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday, 18th April, 2017</b>										
<b>Time:</b>	<b>2.00 pm</b>										
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Chamber - Kilworthy Park</b>										
<b>Full Members:</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chairman</b> Cllr Musgrave <b>Vice Chairman</b> Cllr Yelland</p> <p><i>Members:</i></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td>Cllr Cann OBE</td> <td>Cllr McInnes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Davies</td> <td>Cllr Mott</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Evans</td> <td>Cllr Moyse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Hockridge</td> <td>Cllr Ridgers</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Kimber</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Cllr Cann OBE	Cllr McInnes	Cllr Davies	Cllr Mott	Cllr Evans	Cllr Moyse	Cllr Hockridge	Cllr Ridgers	Cllr Kimber	
Cllr Cann OBE	Cllr McInnes										
Cllr Davies	Cllr Mott										
Cllr Evans	Cllr Moyse										
Cllr Hockridge	Cllr Ridgers										
Cllr Kimber											
<b>Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:</b>	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.										
<b>Committee administrator:</b>	Member.Services@swdevon.gov.uk										

**1. Apologies for absence**

**2. Confirmation of Minutes**

**1 - 8**

Meeting held on 8 November 2016

**3. Declarations of Interest**

Members are invited to declare any personal or disclosable pecuniary interests, including the nature and extent of such interests they may have in any items to be considered at this meeting.

If Councillors have any questions relating to predetermination, bias or interests in items on this Agenda, then please contact the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

**4. Items Requiring Urgent Attention**

To consider those items which, in the opinion of the Chairman, should be considered by the Meeting as matters of urgency

**5. Public Forum**

**9 - 10**

A period of up to 15 minutes is available to deal with issues raised by the public

**6. Hub Committee Forward Plan**

**11 - 14**

If any Member seeks further clarity, or wishes to raise issues regarding any future Hub Committee agenda item, please contact Member Services before **5.00pm on Thursday, 13 April 2017** to ensure that the lead officer(s) are aware of this request in advance of the meeting.

**7. Planning Peer Challenge Action Plan Update**

**15 - 30**

Report of the Specialists Manager

**8. Q3 - Performance Measures**

**31 - 44**

Report of the Specialist – Performance & Intelligence

**9. IT Update**

Verbal report of the Group Manager- Support Services & Commercial First

**10. Joint Local Plan Update - Standing Agenda Item**

**11. Task and Finish Group Updates**

**45 – 56**

**(a) T18 Programme – Concluding Report**

**12. Committee Decision Log**

**57 – 60**

**13. Annual Work Programme 2017/18: Initial Thoughts**

An opportunity for Members to suggest potential agenda items for consideration during the next Municipal Year.

**14. Member Learning and Development Opportunities Arising from this Meeting**

**This page is intentionally left blank**



In discussion, particular reference was made to:

- the Devolution agenda item. As an update, the Head of Paid Service informed that this agenda item was now likely to be deferred to a Hub Committee meeting in the new year; and
- the Joint Local Plan. The lead Hub Committee Member was invited to provide an update on the JLP and, in so doing, reference was made to:
  - o a Special Council meeting having been added to the Member Meeting Calendar to consider the JLP. The Committee was reminded that this meeting would be held on Tuesday, 28 February 2017;
  - o an update report on the five year land supply would be considered by the Hub Committee at its meeting on 29 November 2016. In referring to a recent appeal decision, the lead Hub Committee Member had since concluded that the Planning Inspector had used the wrong methodology to calculate the housing need in the Borough. Nonetheless, a number of previously held concerns were reiterated by Members. Further disappointment was also expressed that a recent case officer report presented to the Planning and Licensing Committee had given emphasis to the lack of a five year land supply, which it was felt conveyed the wrong message to Developers;
  - o two small sites having come forward during the recent consultation exercise. The lead Member confirmed that he was in the process of contacting the local ward Members for these potential sites;
  - o two Member Workshops being arranged during November to consider the draft policies that would underpin the JLP and specific site allocations;
  - o the Member Steering Group meeting on a fortnightly basis at Plymouth City Council offices;
  - o the project still working towards the timetable that the public examination would take place during the late summer / early autumn of 2017.

**O&S(I) 40 ECONOMY WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee considered a report that summarised the findings of the Economy Working Group.

The lead Hub Committee Member for the Economy provided a detailed introduction on the report and explained the justification for each of the nine recommendations made by the Working Group

In the subsequent discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (a) In respect of the inevitable cost pressures arising from the proposal to increase the Council's Establishment by virtue of employing a part-time Level 4 Economy Specialist, there was a general acceptance that this recommendation required more consideration prior to its presentation to the Hub Committee on 29 November 2016. In particular, the principle of investigating a matrix type approach (e.g. where the economy work strand was the responsibility of a number of different officers) was felt to require greater consideration;
- (b) A number of Members expressed their opposition at the recommendation to reduce funding from Villages In Action (VIA) from £8,000 to £4,000. In their opposition, these Members felt that VIA made an invaluable contribution to rural communities in the Borough and had a knock-on economic benefit. In support of the Working Group recommendation to reduce funding, other Members were of the view that the proposal to increase the funding to Business Information Point would need to be funded from somewhere and economic vibrancy was considered to be more critical than maintaining the current level of funding for VIA. When put to the vote, this part of the recommendation was declared **LOST**;
- (c) In stating the importance of supporting the voluntary sector, a Member also expressed her opposition to the proposal to reduce funding to South West Museum Development. Such were the heritage, cultural and tourism benefits arising from Museums that the Member felt it would be a retrograde step to reduce their funding;
- (d) Widespread support was expressed at the recommendation to financially support the Youth Markets initiative;
- (e) As a general point, a Member stated his regret that the recommendations of the Working Group were not sufficiently focused on creating wealth or charging for Council services;
- (f) In paying tribute to the work undertaken by the Working Group, some Members were of the view that the profile of the Economy agenda had now been raised and a way forward suggested. Therefore, it would be considered a great shame if the recommendation was not advanced to the Hub Committee on the basis of a lack of support for some relatively minor issues.

It was then **RECOMMENDED** to the Hub Committee that:

1. the proposed Our Plan Annual Delivery Plan (as outlined at Appendix 1 to the presented agenda report) be adopted for the period to March 2018;

2. funding be increased to Business Information Point for business support services from £8,340 in 2015/16 to £15,100 in 2016/17;
3. funding be reduced to South West Museum Development from £2,000 in 2015/16 to £1,000 in 2016/17;
4. the practice of the Council offering economy grants be ceased with immediate effect;
5. the Youth Markets initiative be supported from 2016/17 with funding of £1,000;
6. a part-time level 4 Economy Specialist be recruited to focus on the Council's economy work. Funding for this post in 2016/17 to be drawn from the Innovation Fund (Invest to Earn) Earmarked Reserve. Ongoing funding for this role will be via the staffing establishment, which is to be increased for 2017/18 onwards;
7. a West Devon Economy Working Group (comprising of 4 Members) be established; and
8. this Working Group submit periodic reports to the Hub Committee.

**\*O&S(I) 41 TRANSITIONAL RESOURCES MONITORING REPORT**

Consideration was given to report that provided Members with an update on the impact on services areas of the temporary, fixed-term transitional resources approved by the Council on 28 June 2016 (Minute CM 21 refers) to improve customer satisfaction and public perception of the Council.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (i) Officers were invited to expand upon the comment in the presented agenda report whereby the recruitment of apprentices had proven to be challenging. In so doing, officers informed that the volume of applications had been less than anticipated and, on several occasions, those who had applied had failed to turn up for an interview. Officers had subsequently sought feedback from the Department for Work and Pensions and had been informed that local authorities were not deemed to be exciting organisations to work for;
- (ii) A number of Members acknowledged the extreme work pressures that were being placed on Development Management Specialists and the Committee wished to put on record its gratitude for those officers who were working in very difficult circumstances;
- (iii) In recognising the risk that the upward trend in performance could be affected once the transitional resources had left, Members questioned the likelihood of this eventuality. In reply, officers confirmed that they were confident that, at the end of this period, the upward trend would be maintained and continued. The only exception where officers could not be so confident was the Development Management service, which was the one area that continued to give cause for concern;



- (iv) There was a general recognition that overall performance had now stabilised and was improving in certain areas. In sharing their own experiences, a number of Members subsequently welcomed and commended this performance trend.

It was then **RESOLVED** that the Committee note the contents of the Transitional Resources Monitoring Report and the progress made to date.

**\*O&S(I) 42    PROGRESS REPORT FOR CONTACT CENTRE**

The Committee was presented with the latest progress report on the performance of the Contact Centre.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (a) recent service improvements. Members welcomed both the recent improvements in the Contact Centre and the issues being resolved following the switchover to the new telephony system;
- (b) decreasing footfall. The Committee noted the comment that footfall continued to decrease across all sites and requested that this matter be kept under review.

It was then **RESOLVED** that the Committee:

1. continue to support the work being undertaken to improve Customer Services and monitor performance through regular updates; and
2. note and endorse the updated Action Plan.

**\*O&S(I) 43    OVERVIEW OF THE WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT**

The Group Manager – Support Services and Customer First provided a demonstration of the new Council website and advised that the underlying principles included it being:

- designed from the perspective of the customer and not the Council;
- accessible from a mobile phone;
- low band width and cloud hosted;
- critical to get it 'right first time';
- essential to reduce the number of webpages on the site. In expanding upon this point, officers informed that the current website contained 10,000 pages, with 30% of these not being viewed once in the last twelve months; and
- possible to deploy webchat.

Following the presentation, there was widespread support for the new website. In terms of next steps, it was noted that Members would be invited to test the new website (before it went live) in the next few weeks, prior to a Customer Focus Group then being invited to do the same. Ultimately, it was intended that the new website would go live early in the new year.

**\*O&S(I) 44 OMBUDSMAN ANNUAL REVIEW LETTER 2016**

The Committee was presented with a report that presented the Ombudsman's Annual Letter 2016 for review.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (a) Officers were congratulated for the positive nature of the Annual Review Letter and the fact that the Council received the lowest number of complaints in Devon. The view was expressed that this was an example of the benefits of an increased corporate emphasis being given to complaint handling;
- (b) It was confirmed that the Ombudsman would not get involved in a complaint until all aspects of the Council's own Complaints process had been followed.

It was then **RESOLVED** that the Committee has reviewed the Ombudsman Annual Letter for 2016 (as outlined at Appendix A of the presented agenda report) and welcomes the improved performance in this respect.

**\*O&S(I) 45 Q2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The Committee considered a report that presented the performance measures for Quarter 2. In summary, the report noted that performance had generally improved slightly in comparison to the previous quarter.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (a) the ability for Members to be able to see live performance dashboard information as and when they wished. To support Members in accessing and maximising the benefits of the dashboard information, a Member Drop-in session had been arranged;
- (b) performance information relating to the percentage of customer contact through online interaction. In emphasising the importance of channel shift, the Committee recognised that this was a key indicator to demonstrate whether or not customers were self-serving.

It was then **RESOLVED** that:

1. the performance levels against target communicated in the Balanced Scorecard and the performance figures supplied in the background and the exception report be noted; and
2. the Committee has reviewed the new online dashboards and has taken the opportunity to make comments (as outlined in the content of the minutes above).

**\*O&S(I) 46 TASK AND FINISH GROUP UPDATES**

**(a) T18 Programme – Interim Review**

As an update, a Group Member reminded the Committee of the terms of reference that were underpinning this review.

The next meeting was still to be reconvened and the main purpose of that meeting would be to consider a list of potential questions that would be asked of the identified key witnesses.

**\*O&S(I) 47 COMMITTEE DECISIONS LOG**

The latest version of the Committee decisions log was presented to the meeting and, with no debate or discussion, it was:

**RESOLVED**

That the published Decisions Log be noted.

**\*O&S(I) 48 DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2016/17**

The Committee took the opportunity to express its views in relation to its 2016/17 Work Programme.

In so doing, reference was made to the request made by the Overview and Scrutiny (External) Committee at its meeting held on 11 October 2016 whereby responsibility for considering the Joint Local Plan should be transferred to this Committee as a standing agenda item (Minute \*O&S(E) 38 refers). The Committee subsequently endorsed this request and agreed that its future work programme should be updated accordingly.

**\*O&S(I) 49 MEMBER LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES ARISING**

The Committee noted that Member Briefings were to be held in the upcoming months in relation to the Joint Local Plan and the Performance Dashboards.

Furthermore, Members were also reminded of the opportunity for them to trial and test the new Council website prior to it being launched.

(The meeting terminated at 4.35 pm)

-----  
Chairman

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## **PUBLIC FORUM PROCEDURES**

### **(a) General**

Members of the public may raise issues and ask questions at meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This session will last for up to fifteen minutes at the beginning of each meeting.

### **(b) Notice of Questions**

An issue or question may only be raised by a member of the public provided that they have given written notice (which may be by electronic mail) to Darryl White ([darryl.white@swdevon.gov.uk](mailto:darryl.white@swdevon.gov.uk)) by 5.00pm on the Thursday, prior to the relevant meeting.

### **(c) Scope of Questions**

An issue may be rejected by the Monitoring Officer if:

- it relates to a matter within the functions of the Planning and Licensing Committee;
- it is not about a matter for which the local authority has a responsibility or which affects the district;
- it is offensive, frivolous or defamatory;
- it is substantially the same as a question which has previously been put in the past six months; or
- it requires the disclosure of confidential or exempt information.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## WEST DEVON BOROUGH COUNCIL: HUB COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

This is the provisional forward plan for the six months starting 28 March 2017. It provides an indicative date for matters to be considered by the Hub Committee. Where possible, the Hub Committee will keep to the dates shown in the plan. However, it may be necessary for some items to be rescheduled and other items added.

The forward plan is published to publicise consultation dates and enable dialogue between the Hub Committee and all councillors, the public and other stakeholders. It will also assist the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committees in planning their contribution to policy development and holding the Hub Committee to account.

The Plan is published in hard copy and on the Council's website ([www.westdevon.gov.uk](http://www.westdevon.gov.uk))

**Members of the public are welcome to attend all meetings of the Hub Committee, which are normally held at Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, and normally start at 2.00 pm.**

**If advance notice has been given, questions can be put to the Hub Committee at the beginning of the meeting.**

The Hub Committee consists of nine Councillors. Each has responsibility for a particular area of the Council's work.

*Cllr Sanders – Leader*

*Cllr Baldwin – Deputy Leader*

*Cllr Sampson – Lead Member for Commercial Services*

*Cllr Moody – Lead Member for Customer First*

*Cllr Oxborough – Lead Member for Economy*

*Cllr Jory – Lead Member for Environment*

*Cllr Samuel – Lead Member for Health and Wellbeing*

*Cllr Edmonds - Lead Member for Resources and Performance*

*Cllr Parker – Lead Member for Our Plan and Strategic Housing*

Further information on the workings of the Hub Committee, including latest information on agenda items, can be obtained by contacting the Member Services Section on 01822 813662 or by e-mail to [member.services@westdevon.gov.uk](mailto:member.services@westdevon.gov.uk)

All items listed in this Forward Plan will be discussed in public at the relevant meeting, unless otherwise indicated for the reasons shown

**DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN BY THE HUB COMMITTEE**

<b>Service</b>	<b>Title of Report and summary</b>	<b>Lead Officer and Member</b>	<b>Relevant Scrutiny Cttee</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	<b>Anticipated date of meeting</b>
Customer First	<b>Community Housing Policy</b>	CB/	Internal	Council	28 March 2017
Customer First	<b>Request for Long Lease Renewal (EXEMPT report)</b>	GP/	Internal	Hub Committee	28 March 2017
Customer First	<b>World Heritage Site SPD</b>	TJ/Cllr Parker	Internal	Council	28 March 2017
Strategy & Commissioning	<b>Commercial Property Investment</b>	DA/Cllr Baldwin	Internal	Council	28 March 2017
Strategy & Commissioning	<b>Our Plan Annual Report</b>	NT/Cllr Sanders	Internal	Hub Committee	28 March 2017
Commercial Services	<b>Garden Waste</b>	JS/Cllr Sampson	Internal	Council	2 May 2017
Support Services	<b>100% Business Rates – Technical Consultation</b>	LB/Cllr Edmonds	Internal	Hub Committee	2 May 2017
Support Services	<b>Treasury Management (External Borrowing)</b>	LB/Cllr Edmonds	Internal	Hub Committee	2 May 2017
Support Services	<b>Insurance Contract</b>	LB/Cllr Edmonds	Internal	Hub Committee	2 May 2017
Strategy & Commissioning	<b>Commercial Property Investment Strategy</b>	DA/Cllr Baldwin	Internal	Council	2 May 2017
Support Services	<b>Medium Term Financial Strategy</b>	LB/Cllr Edmonds	Internal	Council	July 2017
Support Services	<b>Transformation Programme Closedown</b>	LB/Cllr Edmonds	Internal	Hub Committee	September 2017



**\* Exempt Item (This means information contained in the report is not available to members of the public)**

SJ – Steve Jordan – Executive Director Strategy and Commissioning and Head of Paid Service

SH – Sophie Hosking – Executive Director Service Delivery and Commercial Development

LB – Lisa Buckle – Finance COP Lead and s151 Officer

HD – Helen Dobby – Group Manager Commercial Services

SM – Steve Mullineaux – Group Manager Support Services

CB – Chris Brook – COP Lead Assets

JS – Jane Savage – Lead Specialist Waste Strategy

IL – Ian Luscombe – COP Lead Environmental Health

CBowen – Catherine Bowen – Monitoring Officer

DA – Darren Arulvasagam – Group Manager Business Development

SLT – Senior Leadership Team

IB – Isabel Blake – COP Lead Housing, Revenues and Benefits

LC – Lesley Crocker – COP Lead Communications



**West Devon  
Borough  
Council**



# Agenda Item 7

Report to: **Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee**

Date: **18 April 2017**

Title: **Planning Peer Challenge Action Plan Update**

Portfolio Area: **Customer First – Cllr Jeff Moody**

Wards Affected: **All**

Relevant Scrutiny Committee: **N/A**

Urgent Decision: **N** Approval and clearance obtained: **Y**

Date next steps can be taken: in line with Action Plan  
(e.g. referral on of recommendation or implementation of substantive decision)

Author: **Drew Powell** Role: **Specialist Manager**

Contact: **Ext 1240 drew.powell@swdevon.gov.uk**

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **That the Panel:**

- 1. Note the progress made in implementing the Peer Challenge Action Plan, and**
- 2. Make any recommendations for further improvements within the planning function.**

## **1. Executive summary**

1.1 The report outlines progress with implementing the Peer Review Action Plan arising from the Planning Peer Challenge Visit conducted between 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

1.2 Effective Development Management supports the Councils priorities and objectives and also supports the local economy.

## **2. Background**

2.1 During 2015 and 2016 performance within the Development Management service had been adversely affected by a number of internal and external factors. In order to take an objective view of the function, the Council invited the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) to undertake a planning improvement peer challenge.

2.2 The challenge took place during between the 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> April 2016 and many Members will have had input to the process. In addition staff, Parish and Town Councils, Developers, Agents and other Stakeholders were engaged.

2.3 The Report identified a number of key areas where improvements could be made. As a result, a comprehensive Action plan was developed which included actions, timescales and responsible officers.

2.4 It was agreed that the Action Plan would be owned and developed by the Planning and Licensing Committee and that key performance data would be reported to them on a monthly basis.

2.5 In addition performance against the Plan would be monitored by the Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee on a quarterly basis.

## **3. Outcomes/outputs**

3.1 The Peer Challenge Report provided a comprehensive assessment of the Councils planning function and identified both the strengths and areas for improvement.

3.2 The development, implementation and ongoing monitoring of a robust Action Plan by the Planning and Licensing Committee in order to address the findings and key recommendations of the Report will ensure that improvements are delivered.

## **4. Action Plan Update**

4.1 An update version of the Action Plan is attached at Appendix 1 which outlines progress against each of the agreed actions. Members will note that progress has been generally good across the board with the only exception being Actions A19-21 which have been delayed due to resources but are now in hand.

4.2 The Agents Forums re-introduced as a result of the review have proved to be very popular. Three joint South Hams and West Devon

events have been held at the Watermark Centre in Ivybridge and have been well attended by individual Agents and volume house builders alike. As a result of the forums we have introduced an Agents Hotline hosted by Case Management, the ability to upload plans and supporting documents directly through the website and held technical sessions around drainage requirements.

4.3 Another key function of the forums has been the introduction of the Specialists and Case Managers to the Agents. This has engendered better working relationships and allowed cases/issues to be discussed and resolved in an informal setting.

4.4 Recruitment of permanent staff still remains a challenge locally and nationally. In order to look ahead we are exploring apprenticeships and placements with universities to try and attract officers with a planning background to the area.

4.5 The challenge of reducing the 'out-of-time' applications remains. Whilst the number has reduced markedly, it has been recognised that further dedicated resource is necessary. Subject to confirmation, an experienced officer is being brought in on a six month contract to tackle these cases whilst permanent staff can focus on newer cases. This will be funded within the existing specialist establishment.

4.6 New powers allowing Councils to increase planning application fees are likely to come into place in the late summer. Councils were invited to apply to increase their fees by 20%, which we have done, and the resulting income must be ring-fenced for supporting delivery of the planning function. Officers are presently determining where that resource could be best utilised to secure further improvement in planning performance and wider economic benefits.

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1 Delivery against the agreed Action Plan is progressing well and overall performance of the service is good. There are still areas for further improvement and the potential, through powers to increase fees, to secure additional focused resources is being explored and will be the subject of a future report to Members

## 6. Implications

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance	Y	The Council Constitution includes the provision for the Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee to

		set its own work programme. In so doing, the Committee has requested receipt of this report.
Financial	N	There are no significant financial implications directly related to this service update report.
Risk	Y	There are well rehearsed reputational risks associated with the performance of the Development Management Service. Whilst there have been a number of factors that have previously had an adverse impact on the service, this report evidences that performance is improving.
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity	N	There are no equality and diversity implications directly related to this report.
Safeguarding	N	There are no safeguarding implications directly related to this report.
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder	N	There are no community safety or crime and disorder implications directly related to this report.
Health, Safety and Wellbeing	N	There are no health, safety and wellbeing implications directly related to this report.
Other implications	N	N/A

### **Supporting Information**

#### **Appendices:**

Appendix 1: Peer Challenge Action Plan (update March 2017)

#### **Background Papers:**

Planning Improvement Peer Challenge – Final Report June 28 2016

## Planning Peer Challenge – Action Plan

The following plan outlines the specific actions that will be taken to respond to the Peer Challenges recommendations. Reporting back on delivery against the actions will include the outcome/outputs of the action.

Overall monitoring of performance improvement will be through the new suite of key performance indicators detailed in Recommendation 9 and through delivery of the Joint Local Plan

Peer Challenge Recommendation	Comments/Actions completed	Proposed Action	Timescale	Lead Officer(s)	Status (plus comments)
1. Develop and embed the T18 model to respond more specifically to the context and challenges of the DM service. Specifically consider issues relating to how the T18 model can deal with the whole end to end processes of negotiating and determining proposals, to achieve better accountability,	<p>1.1 The model is being developed and implemented within Development Management to reflect these recommendations.</p> <p>1.2 Under present trials L6 Senior Case Managers ('Junior planners') handle lower level householder apps from cradle to grave. The majority of other cases will be managed by Case Managers (CM) – ie they will push the application through the process and ensure that dates are met, consultations gathered, applicants/neighbours kept informed of progress etc. The Specialist will be accountable and responsible for the decision having assessed the application. Accountability will be clear; we will effectively have a CM managing the</p>	A1. Extend trial to all CM/Specialists dealing with planning applications.	September 2016	Drew Powell Kate Hamp	<p>Complete</p> <p>Roles now defined – further embedding of case management role as processes are refined.</p>

<p>increased capacity and a greater customer focus.</p>	<p>application and a Specialist determining the application.</p> <p>1.3 The Community of Practice Lead will be responsible for ensuring that the DM process is delivered efficiently and lawfully.</p> <p>1.4 The weekly list for Parish and Town Councils has now been amended to identify the relevant Case Manager and Specialist (if relevant).</p> <p>1.5 The need for an accountable officer to be contactable by agents, applicants, Parish's etc is fully recognised.</p>				
<p>2. Act on the findings of resource reviews, especially at the case manager level, so as to ensure that sufficient capacity to deliver an effective and customer facing DM service.</p> <p>This should include developing a strategy for dealing with</p>	<p>2.1 Recent reports to West Devon Hub Committee (minute) and South Hams Executive (minute) detail the resources at Case Manager level already identified to support transition.</p> <p>2.2 There has been an initial focus on securing a marked improvement in determination performance (with extension of time agreements) in order to minimise the risk to the Councils from</p>	<p>A2. Review staffing levels during transition to ensure post transition levels will be sufficient to sustain performance</p> <p>A.3 As part of the new approach to</p>	<p>February 2017</p> <p>August 2016</p>	<p>Drew Powell Kate Hamp</p> <p>Drew Powell</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Transition resources under review now that W2 and APP processes are in place</p> <p>Complete</p>



<p>applications more efficiently within the time limits without the need for excessive recourse to extension of time agreements, and also to ensure that applicants and the public have a single point of contact.</p>	<p>new performance measures proposed within the Housing and Planning Bill.</p> <p>2.3 See 1.4 and 1.5 above</p>	<p>performance management (see also 9.1) we will also be measuring determination performance in line with the relevant 8 and 13 week statutory targets.</p>			
<p>3. Work with the IT partner to ensure that the recognised IT problems, especially in relation to the planning constraints and history, and the labelling of plans, are tackled as a matter of urgency. In doing this ensure that the web site is easy to use and learn from currently high performing customer</p>	<p>3.1 Since the visit there have been major improvements in terms of functionality in relation to planning history and constraints. There remains issues with the stability and functionality of the website and it is accepted that further development/improvement is necessary.</p>	<p>A.4 Review present action plan to develop the website in line with best practice and to facilitate self-serve and channel shift in line with operating model principles.</p>	<p>September 2016</p>	<p>Mike Ward</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>New website and improved functionality on planning search in place – further development in progress</p>

<p>focussed planning services.</p>					
<p>4. Urgently reinstate regular local agent's forums.</p>	<p>4.1 The frequency of forums has reduced during transition but the need for an active dialogue is fully recognised by officers.</p>	<p>A.5 A joint Developer/Agent forum will take place w/c 22 August 2016 at the Watermark Centre in Ivybridge.</p> <p>A.6 Training on how agents can self-serve using new software will be given at future forums.</p> <p>A.7 Specialists and Senior Case Managers will attend the Forums to facilitate and build closer working relationships</p>	<p>August 2016</p>	<p>Pat Whymer</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Third forum held on 16<sup>th</sup> March</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p>

<p>5. Facilitate engagement with Town and Parish Council representatives to develop appropriate protocols to ensure that the concerns of these stakeholders are fully taken into account, and that feedback is given to them where a recommendation that differs to their views is reached.</p>	<p>5.1 The current consultation on the Joint Local Plan has specifically targeted workshops with all town and parish councils. Responses from town and parish councils will be addressed and responded to as the Joint Local Plan progresses. Further engagement will be planned and set out in the Joint Local Plan Engagement Strategy.</p>	<p>A.8 Consult Town and Parish Councils and establish direct liaison during current and future consultation phases.</p>	<p>In line with JLP programme</p>	<p>Tom Jones Lesley Crocker</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
		<p>A.9 Provide clear summary of Town and Parish Council comments and an explanation of any divergence from their comments in the officer report. A copy of the report to be provided to T/P Councils with the decision notice</p>	<p>October 2016</p>	<p>Pat Whymer</p>	<p>Complete</p>
	<p>5.2 Councils have dedicated staff resource focussed on Neighbourhood Plans and targeted support package.</p>	<p>A.10 Offer direct planning training sessions</p>	<p>November 2016</p>	<p>Pat Whymer</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

<p>Also engage with the town and parish councils on expectations around support for neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p>Current JLP consultation raises following for consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supporting the emerging Networks in West Devon and South Hams.</li> <li>Entering into a Neighbourhood Plan Agreement with each group to clearly establish the intended purpose of the Plan, the relationship to the Joint Local Plan and roles &amp; responsibilities of those involved.</li> </ul>	<p>T/P Councils either individually or by cluster</p> <p>A.11 Establish liaison arrangements in JLP Engagement Strategy</p> <p>A.12 Update Neighbourhood Plan Protocol to incorporate updated support package and clarify support level to NP networks and individual NP groups.</p>	<p>September 2016</p> <p>October 2016</p>	<p>Tom Jones</p> <p>Tom Jones</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Complete</p>
<p>6. Ensure timely processes and mechanisms for adoption of a Local</p>	<p>6.1 Local Development Scheme is under current review by the Joint Local Plan (JLP) Member Steering Group.</p>	<p>A.13 Maintain as standing item for JLP Member Steering Group and issue as</p>	<p>In line with JLP programme</p>	<p>Tom Jones</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

<p>Development Scheme (LDS) as part of the rapid progression of the South West Devon Joint Local Plan to adoption.</p>	<p>6.2 Currently under watching brief to take into account any impacts on work programme in response to economic uncertainties</p> <p>6.3 Adoption of LDS already delegated to senior officers in consultation with lead members – allowing for speedy adoption once timing is clarified.</p>	<p>soon as reasonable.</p>			
<p>7. Keep the communities, planning agents and stakeholders regularly informed of and involved in the South West Devon Joint Local Plan’s progress recognising the benefits of maintaining an expeditious timeline for adoption</p>	<p>7.1 Current and future consultations to be undertaken in line with Engagement Strategy adopted by all three Local Planning Authorities (SH, WD, Plymouth). This includes involvement of all stakeholders.</p>	<p>A.14 Implement JLP Engagement Strategy. Review and update as necessary.</p>	<p>In line with JLP Programme</p>	<p>Lesley Crocker</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>8. Engender strong leadership of the Planning Committees through regular training and appropriate</p>	<p>8.1 All Members receive training on Planning matters as part of their induction. Additional training is undertaken in advance of becoming a DM/P&amp;L Committee Member, and</p>	<p>A.15 Review and, where necessary, develop and implement a new training</p>	<p>March 2017</p>	<p>Pat Whymer Darryl White</p>	<p>Complete</p>

<p>updates on planning policy (including on the 5 year land supply for housing). General planning training should be made available to help non-planning committee members to be more effective local community leaders.</p>	<p>offered to other Members subject to availability.</p> <p>8.2 The Planning Advisory Service were engaged to deliver Member training during 2015/16.</p>	<p>programme for planning committee members with wider membership invited and supported.</p>			
<p>9. Report a suite of performance indicators directly to the Planning Committees and where necessary Cabinet and Hub, including productivity and performance of Planning Committee itself. KPIs including quality, value and customer focus and land supply, should be reported via a performance dashboard</p>	<p>9.1 A range of KPIs have been reported through to different Committees in the past, most recently through O&amp;S (Internal) at WD and O&amp;S at SH.</p>	<p>A.16 A suite of KPIs, covering the suggested areas, will be developed and reported to Development Management/Planning and Licensing Committee on a monthly basis. The KPI's will provide trends over time and be supported by</p>	<p>September 2016</p>	<p>Drew Powell</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Full suite of PIs reported to DM at each committee and used for internal Performance Management</p> <p>Further data will soon be available from W2 that will allow internal and external consultee performance to be measured</p>

<p>to demonstrate the Service's contribution to wider corporate objectives.</p>		<p>narrative by exception.</p>			
<p>10. Ensure there are adequate resources to focus on economic growth and affordable housing. This should include reviewing the approach of viability assessments paid for by planning applicants, and developing a pool of knowledge about comparables including values and build rates across the relevant market areas.</p>	<p>10.1 It is considered that there is suitable in-house resource to manage affordable housing issues although there will be the need to engage external support on occasions.</p> <p>10.2 A Member working group has now been set up with responsibility for economic growth. The outcomes arising from this group will determine future resource provision.</p> <p>10.3 An initial assessment of how viability assessments are commissioned has been undertaken and harmonisation of approach between the two councils is being considered.</p> <p>10.4 An identified gap in in-house knowledge with regard to viability has been addressed during the recruitment of a Specialist into the Assets Community of Practice – an example of utilising transferable skills across the organisation</p>	<p>A.17 A review of our approach to viability and how we can ensure consistency and efficiency – in terms of cost and timeliness – will be undertaken</p>	<p>December 2016</p>	<p>Alex Rehaag</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Complete</p> <p>Negotiations with developers has resulted in viability being funded by them in most cases</p>

	in line with the key principles of the new operating model.				
11. Review in 12 months' time the operation of the Schemes of Delegation to examine whether even greater harmonisation would be beneficial.		A.18 A review of the Scheme of Delegation will be undertaken in conjunction with the Chairs of Committee	July 2017	Pat Whymer	On schedule
12. Further evaluate the risks at this time of moving to a Local Authority Controlled Company.	12.1 Since publication of the Report, the councils have received the Price Waterhouse Cooper Report evaluating the risks. Proposals are presently being reported to Members through Hub and Executive.	Pending decision by Members	N/A	N/A	The Local Authority Controlled Company was considered by Council on 2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2017. At this meeting, Council agreed with the Joint Steering Group recommendation to not form a Local Authority Controlled Company in its



					proposed form at this time.
13. Ensure sufficient focus, capacity and consistency in delivering a high quality pre application service to provide greater certainty to customers and allow more time for helping shape development to meet community needs. Enhanced pre application engagement should also include delivering informal pre planning briefings to members of the Committees on significant major developments.	13.1 There has been a reduction in performance with regard to turn around times for pre-applications during transition. This has resulted in a reduction in volume.	A.19 Review pre-application process and charges.	October 2016	Pat Whymer	A19-21 Rescheduled for July 2017 as included in the Fees and Charges report
	13.2 SHDC negotiated and agreed its first Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) in June 2016. PPA's offer a mutually beneficial way for applicants and the councils to secure timely development.	A.20 Develop a Planning Performance Agreement protocol to include standard agreement template and charging policy.	November 2016	Tom Jones	
		A.21 Develop a protocol to ensure early engagement of Members on major developments.	November 2016	Pat Whymer	
14. Review Committee site visit protocols to ensure planning		A.22 Undertake a review of site visit protocols in	September 2016	Pat Whymer	Complete

decision making is as efficient as possible.

conjunction with relevant Committees

# Agenda Item 8

Report to: **Overview & Scrutiny (Internal)**

Date: **18<sup>th</sup> April 2017**

Title: **Q3 Performance Measures**

Portfolio Area: **N/A**

Wards Affected: **All**

Relevant Scrutiny Committee:

Urgent Decision: **N** Approval and clearance obtained: **Y / N**

Date next steps can be taken:  
(e.g. referral on of recommendation or implementation of substantive decision)

Author: **Jim Davis** Role: **Specialist – Performance & Intelligence**

Contact: **EXT:1493**  
**Email: jim.davis@swdevon.gov.uk**

---

## **Recommendations:**

1. Members note the performance levels against target communicated in the Balanced Scorecard and the performance figures supplied in the background and the exception report.
2. Members review the online dashboards: these include ones for O&S, Planning, and the CST, and feedback on any changes or requests for additional information.

## **1. Executive summary**

Performance measures for Quarter 3 have continued their upward trajectory improving slightly compared with the previous quarter and no measure at 'red' for this quarter.

Due to lead times this report is presented later than normal but the most up to date data is available on the online dashboards.

The new dashboards have been developed in conjunction with Cllr Edmonds to display information in an easy to understand, graphical way. These are available online from any web-enabled device and can be used

to monitor performance in between the O&S reporting cycle. There is a regular update of the previous month's figures that occurs by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month, for SLT to keep on top of performance issues.

The performance of the transactions on the website continues to improve well above the early 20% target. Over a quarter of Workflow360 transactions came in online during Quarter 3 and with the implementation of the new website and simplified customer journeys in March over 36% of Workflow360 processes are now being received that way. The portions of the DFG processes (Disabled Facilities Grants) completely under our control were turned around the same working day as applications were received during Quarter 3.

## **2. Background**

The Balanced Scorecard has suffered from scope creep over the years where some measures are reported to Committee for interest rather than to fulfil a scrutinising role and generates questions rather than helps to provide answers. The new web-based performance dashboards provide monthly information up-to-date information to provide context against the report that comes to Committee and access to a much larger range of data to access if desired.

The T18 measures were becoming less useful at this stage of the programme with little change each quarter. They have been replaced with a section on online uptake that will focus on online transactions and will be extended in the coming quarters in line with the new website and the improved data available on its uptake.

## **3. Outcomes/outputs**

**Appendix A** is the balanced scorecard – this contains the high level targeted performance information.

**Appendix B** is an information and exception report. This contains the data only performance information for context and the detail of the targeted measures which have fallen below target in the quarter being reviewed.

**Appendix C** contains the description of the targets chosen for the Balanced Scorecard

## **4. Options available and consideration of risk**

Dashboards can be tailored by type, interest or area. We have created a customer contact centre dashboard, a planning and planning enforcement dashboard, and a replica of the information that forms part of this report. Other dashboards can be created to explore other areas of concern/interest.

## 5. Proposed Way Forward

- 1) The Balanced Scorecard and background report as shown in the Appendices are approved.
- 2) Members view dashboards online and consider what other information they would want to be shown through the dashboards.

## 6. Implications

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance	N	Whilst there are no statutory performance measures anymore, some are still reported nationally. We collect these in the same format as required to improve consistency. Other measures are to improve efficiency or to understand workload.
Financial	N	
Risk	Y	Poor performance has a risk to the Council's reputation and delivery to our residents. These proposals should give Scrutiny the ability to address performance issues and develop robust responses to variation in delivery
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity	N	
Safeguarding	N	
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder	N	
Health, Safety and Wellbeing	N	
Other implications	N	

## **Supporting Information**

### **Appendices:**

Appendix A – Corporate Balanced Scorecard  
Appendix B – Background and Exception Report  
Appendix C – Corporate Balanced Scorecard Targets

### **Background Papers:**

None

<b>Process checklist</b>	<b>Completed</b>
Portfolio Holder briefed	<b>Yes</b>
SLT Rep briefed	<b>Yes</b>
Relevant Exec Director sign off (draft)	<b>No</b>
Data protection issues considered	<b>Yes</b>
If exempt information, public (part 1) report also drafted. (Committee/Scrutiny)	<b>NA</b>

# Corporate Balanced Scorecard

## Community/Customer

Q2	Q3	
		Overall waste recycling rate % <i>(Awaiting data from DCC)</i>
		Residual waste per household
		Average no. of missed bins
		<b>CST:</b> Average Call Answer Time
		<b>CST:</b> % of enquiries resolved at first point of contact

## Online uptake

Q2	Q3	
		<b>Ratio of benefits web/post submissions (IEG4)</b>
		<b>Ratio call/web submissions (W2)</b>

Updated measures to replace the T18 programme measures that added little extra information.

Additional measures to better quantify online uptake and benefit to the council will be developed as the new website goes live.

## Processes

Q2	Q3	
		% of planning applications determined within time frame
		Major(Statutory)
		Minor
		Other

Q2	Q3	
		Avg End to End time Benefits New Claims
		Avg End to End time Benefits Change of circumstances

## Performance

Q2	Q3	
		<b>EH:</b> % of nuisance complaints resolved at informal stage
		Avg days short term sickness/FTE
		Complaint response speed

## Key

	Below target performance
	Narrowly off target, be aware
	On or above target

**This page is intentionally left blank**



# Information Report

Non-targeted (data-only) performance measures that will be reported every quarter to provide context and background information – not suitable for the Balanced Scorecard page as no targets applicable or relevant.

Performance measure	Managed By	Q3 15/16	2015/16	Q3 2016/17			16/17	Comment (If Applicable)
			YTD or Total		Total	Avg Time (Days)	YTD or total	
<b>Planning Enforcement</b>	Pat Whymer	-	-	Enforcement cases closed: 24 Live enforcement cases: 74 Enforcement cases received: 31  Backlog closed: 26 Backlog remaining: 72			-	More recent figures available on the covalent dashboards
<b>All: Complaints received</b>  Complaints logged against each Service per quarter. Highlights changes over time and the effects of initiatives.	Area	Complaints rec. last qtr Q2 2016/17		Total	Avg Time (Days)	Total no. of complaints YTD	This breakdown of area and average time to complete timings is only available for the completed complaints.  53 complaints were logged during the quarter. 2 were for other public sector bodies (DCC & Police). 31 were service issues that were dealt with immediately and aren't formal complaints. There are only 2 remaining active processes that could be service issues or formal complaints but haven't been completed yet.  <b>Note:</b> Service Issues – Some issues are logged as complaints as the customer has a justified concern. Often these are simple issues resolved by talking with the customer so don't form part of our formal complaints process but still are captured for improvement and analysis purposes  <u>Ombudsman Complaints</u>  None received during the quarter	
	Council Tax/NNDR	5	Council Tax/NNDR	3	6	11		
	Customer Services	6	Customer Services	-	-	9		
	Planning	4	Planning	10	39	18		
	Waste	1	Waste	7	28	10		
	Commercial Services	-	Commercial Services	-	-	1		
	Parking	-	Parking	-	-	1		
	Benefits	-	Benefits	-	-	1		
	EH	2	EH	-	-	2		
	Housing	1	Housing	-	-	1		
	Total	19	Total	20	29	34		
Service Issues	19	Service Issues	31	20	55			

Performance measure	Managed By	Q3 15/16	2015/16	Q3 2016/17	16/17	Comment (If Applicable)
			YTD or Total		YTD or total	
<p><b>All: Compliments received</b></p> <p>Compliments logged against each Service per quarter. Highlights changes over time and the effects of initiatives.</p>						<p>Compliments process has been built in W2 and went live at the end of the quarter. Information should be feeding through but there has been limited uptake of the process internally.</p>
<p><b>Long term sickness (days)</b></p> <p>Number of days lost due to long term sickness</p>	Andy Wilson	138	YTD 375	25	123	<p>Equivalent to 0.29 days/FTE. Low numbers of staff in WD means that any long term sickness has a disproportionate effect on days/FTE</p> <p>Avg of 1.96days/FTE per quarter for 2015/16</p>
<p><b>Short term sickness (days)</b></p> <p>Number of days lost due to short term sickness</p>	Andy Wilson	21.2	YTD 73	62.7	176.5	<p>Equivalent to 0.74days/FTE for the quarter.</p> <p>This figure reflects the reduced number of employees on the Establishment following voluntary redundancies during 2015. Avg of 0.4days/FTE per quarter for 2015/16</p>
<p><b>CS: Top 5 call types</b></p>	Anita ley			<p>1) Revenues Move 2) Call in wrong queue 3) General -Other enquiry - Dealt with 4) Housing - New Enquiry call, transferred to CM 5) EH - New Enquiry call, transferred to CM</p>	-	<p>Last Qtr 1) WD Planning - Current Application 2) WD Council Tax - paperless DD 3) WD Council Tax -Balance Enquiry 4)WD Planning - Duty Officer - book an appointment 5)WD Council Tax - make a payment over the phone</p> <p>Call in wrong queue was part of initial set up for phone system. Resolved now</p>
<p><b>CS: Top 5 website views/trend</b></p>	Kate Hamp			<p>Issue with extracting information</p> <p>Moving to the new website and re-focusing on transactions, this measure will highlight processes started rather than page hits</p>	-	<p><i>Last qtr</i> 1. Planning 2. Contact Us 3. Recycling &amp; Waste 4. Council Tax 5. Do It Online</p>
<p><b>CS: % of customer contact through online interaction</b></p> <p>Demonstrating channel shift</p>	Kate Hamp			26.2%	Q1 23.8%	<p>This figure is Q3, Oct-Dec, we are now receiving (March) over 36% of W2 requests via the web. We had over 17,000 accounts being registered. The refresh of the website has</p>

Performance measure	Managed By	Q3 15/16	2015/16	Q3 2016/17	16/17	Comment (If Applicable)
			YTD or Total		YTD or total	
						<p>removed the need to login making it simpler and easier for customer to interact with us.</p> <p>A number of processes have gone online recently including TENS, planning enforcement, food safety and every process already online has been updated to smooth the customer journey. A number of processes for businesses will be online during April</p>
<b>CS: Total number of online transactions</b>	Kate Hamp		-	Workflow360(W2): 4266	<i>Via Workflow 360:13037</i>	<p>Number of online interactions continues to increase as well as the percentage of all contact through online means.</p> <p>We are expecting almost twice the level of online transactions in Q4 as the new council tax processes go online.</p>
<b>CS: % of calls resolved at first point of contact</b> Percentage of calls which are resolved at initial contact with CST	Anita Ley	65%	65%	-	-	<p><i>Measure no longer captured in new phone system. Online CST dashboard has more measures data updated monthly and broken down into call types and answer speed.</i></p>
<b>Nuisance complaints Received</b>	Ian Luscombe		-	24	160	<p>The nuisance process (covering noise, odours, smoke, etc) in Workflow360, has been updated to simplify the process for case managers and specialists and ensure consistency of use.</p>
<b>EH: Average time taken for Disabled Facilities Grants (Fast track) (work days)</b> The total time, from when the application was received until the works are completed. Only a small portion of this is under direct control of the Council.	Ian Luscombe		-	Same working day	1	<p>This is the portion of the process completely under the council's control (from application to approval). Our target is completion within 5 days.</p> <p>All applications received during the quarter were completed in the same working day as they were received.</p>

## Exception Report:

No measures were at red this quarter.

Performance measure	Managed by	Prev Status	Last Qtr	Oct 2016	Nov 2016	Dec 2016	Q3 2015/16		Action Response
			Q2	Value	Value	Value	Value	Target	

Explanation and value of targets for Balanced Scorecard measures

*Italics for obsolete or updated figures*

Measure	Target	Explanation
Overall waste recycling rate %	58%	A combination of recycling, re-use & composting for household waste. A self-set stretching target based on historic collection rates and current ambitions
Residual waste per household	81kg/qtr	The residual waste left after recycling and re-use. Equivalent to c.12-13kg per fortnightly collection per household
Average Call Answer Time	1 min	Simple statistic to judge overall call answer speed. Can mask the complexity of call answer times but provides useful yardstick for comparing performance over time. If capacity exists in CST then answering calls in 20secs is common and simple. Answering calls consistently around the minute (or any) timeframe occurs only when incoming calls are being matched with the speed calls are being completed. As an example with our avg call and wrap up time of 7 mins this target is passed with only 2 extra calls being received per minute. Each additional extra 2 calls/minute would add another 1 minute wait to all callers wait time.
<i>% of enquiries resolved at first point of contact</i>	<i>60%</i>	<i>In contrast to the measure above, this focuses on when the customer gets through, can CST deal with the issue at hand. Driving increased success in this measure pushes up call times so has a negative impact on call answer speed.</i>
% of Applications determined within time frame Major	60%	Statutory performance measure target
% of Applications determined within time frame Minor	65%	Old statutory performance measure target
% of Applications determined within time frame Other	80%	Old statutory performance measure target
Avg End to End time Benefits New Claims	24 days	Time for processing new claims
Avg End to End time Benefits Change of circumstances	11 days	Time for processing changes to existing claims

% of nuisance complaints resolved at informal stage	90%	Handling nuisance complaints informally saves time and money and often provides a more satisfactory outcome for all involved
Avg days short term sickness/FTE	1.5days/qtr	Private sector average of c.6 days/year, Public sector average of c.8 days has informed this initially stretching target. Agile working has had a very positive impact on sickness as people feeling under the weather have remained at home, working and reduced the likelihood of transfer of communicable infections to colleagues. Better sickness reporting via W2 will increase confidence in this figure and speed of reporting. Will be measured monthly from April onwards.
Complaint response speed	30 days	Time to respond to a Level 1 complaints
<i>T18: Programme timescales on track</i>	<i>Against Plan</i>	<i>Performance against programme timelines. Recently re-baselined following agreement of milestones with Civica</i>
<i>T18: Performance vs. Budget</i>	<i>Under/over spend</i>	<i>Measure to compare the forecast spend on the programme at the end of the period to the actual spend. To judge budget control. Green: Actual spend less than planned Amber: Overspend of less than 5% Red: Overspend greater than 5%</i>
<i>T18: No. of Processes live</i>		<i>Against baselined projection for the month. There is a rolling programme of processes being worked on together by the BDT and the services that is dependent on system fixes and adoption/buy in from the organisation.</i>
T18: Ratio call/web submissions	10% increasing over time Updated to 20%	Ratio for customers calling vs self servicing using integrated processes online. Customers currently fill in online forms but this then requires input into our systems. The new integrated approach inputs directly to our system and routes work where needed. Initially requires creation of account before first submission so expectation of slight drop off in ratio to begin with and then increasing as more customers sign up. Communication initiatives will be coordinated at key times during the year, for example, with annual council tax bills to drive sign ups so a stepwise increase in submissions is expected.



**This page is intentionally left blank**



Report to: **Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee**

Date: **18 April 2017**

Title: **T18 REVIEW TASK AND FINISH GROUP FINAL REPORT**

Portfolio Area: **Strategy & Commissioning**

Wards Affected: **All**

Relevant Scrutiny Committee:

Urgent Decision: **N** Approval and clearance obtained: **Y**

Date next steps can be taken:  
(e.g. referral on of recommendation or implementation of substantive decision)

**Any recommendations will be presented to the next Hub Committee meeting for consideration**

Author: **Katharine Hoare  
(on behalf of T18 Review Task & Finish Group)**

Contact: [Cllr.caroline.mott@westdevon.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.caroline.mott@westdevon.gov.uk)  
[Khoare@westdevon.gov.uk](mailto:Khoare@westdevon.gov.uk)

---

**Recommendations:**

**That the Overview & Scrutiny (Internal) Committee**

**NOTE the Task & Finish Group findings (as outlined at Appendix 1) and RECOMMEND to the Hub Committee that the conclusions be noted and, where appropriate, adopted for future significant projects.**

## **1. Executive summary**

- 1.1 In accordance with the adopted terms of reference for this review, the Task and Finish Group is required, in the first instance, to report its findings and conclusions to the Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1 During consideration of the Transitional Resources report by the Hub Committee at its meeting on 7 June 2016 (Minute HC 07 refers), the following recommendation was made to the Council

*"The Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee be asked to undertake an interim review of the T18 Programme, with the Terms of Reference for this Review being agreed by the Executive Director (Strategy and Commissioning) in consultation with the lead Hub Committee Members for Customer First and Economy".*

- 2.2 This recommendation was subsequently approved by the Council at its meeting on 28 June 2016. In the discussion on this report, the point was made by Members that 'the intention of this review was not to apportion any blame to individuals, but to undertake an open and transparent enquiry to ensure that lessons could be learned for the future'.

- 2.3 At its meeting on 19 July 2016, the Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee considered this request (Minute O&S (I) 17(a) refers) and approved the following broad terms of reference for the Review:

*"The Overview and Scrutiny (Internal) Committee is requested to undertake an interim review of the T18 programme. In undertaking the review, the Task and Finish Group is asked to focus on the:*

- *timescales of the programme and the reasons for these;*
- *capacity during transition;*
- *leadership and continuity from 2104 until present;*
- *approach to project management; and*
- *impact on service delivery.*

*The review should be conducted in a way that highlights what went well and what could have been done better, does not allocate blame but provides a report that is based on lessons learnt and how these lessons are being applied."*

- 2.4 The Committee nominated Cllrs Davies, Evans, Mott, Musgrave, Ridgers and Yelland to serve on this Task & Finish Group. In addition, the Group also appointed Cllr Cheadle to join the Review following its first meeting.

### **3. Outcomes/outputs**

- 3.1 The Group met on 5 occasions and, at its first meeting, nominated Cllr Mott to serve as Chairman;
- 3.2 In addition to these collective Group meetings Members also met in smaller groups to interview key witnesses. These witnesses were identified by virtue of being critically involved either from the offset or during the implementation of the transformation programme;
- 3.3 During the review, the Group was also supported and advised by the Head of Paid Service; the Monitoring Officer; the 151 Officer and the Strategy and Commissioning Senior Case Manager and the Group would like to thank officers for their support and witnesses for their honesty during this Review;
- 3.4 Each of the Group’s findings and conclusions are outlined in the Appendix and Group Members are confident that, if each of these are adopted, then some of the issues and problems that were encountered during the Transformation Programme would not re-occur in future projects.

### **4. Options available and consideration of risk**

- 4.1 The Group is of the view that the corporate risks associated with undertaking significant projects will be minimised if the proposed recommendations are adopted.

### **5. Implications**

Implications	Relevant to proposals Y/N	Details and proposed measures to address
Legal/Governance		The Council Constitution permits the Council to appoint Task & Finish Groups to undertake service reviews in accordance with their approved and clearly defined Terms of reference.
Financial		There are no direct financial implications of the report. The finance workstream of the T18 Transformation Programme is summarised in Appendix A

Risk		The Group considered that a number of associated project management risks will be mitigated by its findings and recommendations being adopted.
Comprehensive Impact Assessment Implications		
Equality and Diversity		There are no equality and diversity implications directly related to this report.
Safeguarding		There are no Safeguarding implications directly related to this report.
Community Safety, Crime and Disorder		There are no Community Safety and Crime and Disorder implications directly related to this report.
Health, Safety and Wellbeing		There are no health, safety and wellbeing implications directly related to this report.
Other implications		

### **Supporting Information**

#### **Appendices:**

Appendix A T18 Review – Report by the Chairman of the Group, Cllr Caroline Mott

#### **Background Papers:**

Reports and minutes from Special Council's on 4 November 2013, 25 March 2014, 24 June 2014 and 31 March 2015

Reports and minutes from Council 22 July 2014, 7 October 2014 and 9 December 2014

Reports and minutes from Hub Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016

T18 Steering Group notes

<b>Process checklist</b>	<b>Completed</b>
Portfolio Holder briefed	<b>Yes</b>
SLT Rep briefed	<b>Yes</b>
Relevant Exec Director sign off (draft)	<b>Yes</b>
Data protection issues considered	<b>Yes</b>

If exempt information, public (part 1) report also drafted. (Cabinet/Scrutiny)	<b>N/A</b>
--	------------

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Task and Finish Group – T18

The task and finish group were requested by the O&S Internal to undertake an interim review of the T18 programme and were asked to focus on:

- Timescales of the programme and the reasons for these
- Capacity during transition
- Leadership and continuity from 2014 until present
- Approach to project management
- Impact on service delivery; and
- what went well and what could have been done better, does not allocate blame but provides a report that is based on lessons learnt and how those lessons are being applied.

The T18 project was described by many of those interviewed as 'the most challenging project ever taken on by the Council' and involved a complete transformation of roles, responsibilities and processes. Introduced principally to save money (largely by reducing headcount) it demanded complex management in order to undertake fundamental change while maintaining output (services to the public).

### **Governance**

There was a positive response by the SLT Members particularly regarding the improvement in service delivery. The latest Performance Indicators, the improving Call Centre response times and the increasing breadth of enquiry that they are dealing with on 'the front line' and the increasing success of Case Management activities are all encouraging. It was also noted that the financial targets had all been achieved throughout the T18 programme other than the cost of additional resourcing agreed in June last year. The turnaround of planning applications continues to improve but work is still required in this area. There was also some concern regarding the Agile Working arrangements which may require attention and are to be reviewed. The original handover of responsibilities to the newly appointed Officers was clearly poor. A number of references indicated the departing Director had much of the T18 Blueprint details "in her head". The handover was carried out immediately the new Directors started. A better arrangement would have been to allow the new Directors to settle in before any form of T18 handover. The IT development clearly caused problems particularly with service delivery. The failure of Civica to deliver on time and the relevant contractual failing are still subject to ongoing negotiation as outlined in the IT section. The near total changeover at a senior management level clearly caused a major issue in terms of continuity. The added pressures of elections and the Boundary Change requirements all resulted in a very challenging time for senior officers. The lack of project management procedures and associated disciplines must be addressed in any future major development or activity of this nature.

## **Project Ownership & Management**

The project was conceived by the Senior Management Team (SMT) and according to interviewees it was anticipated that several of the SMT would remain to own the project and drive it through to conclusion. In the event, only two (of 8) of the SMT remained in the Council's employment. There were many factors responsible for this exodus but one significant one was the decision taken to require everyone (including the SMT) to apply for new posts or take redundancy. The consequence of the SMT's departure was that for key stages of the T18 implementation senior leadership was not in place to exercise the necessary control.

Possibly as a result of the above exodus, many of the expected aspects of project management were not put in place to ensure the project could be monitored effectively. This coupled with the less than satisfactory oversight by the Steering Group resulted in the drop in performance of the Council's outputs not being adequately understood of mitigating actions being put in place as soon as they should have been.

**We concluded that more should have been done to understand and mitigate the impact of the T18 methodology on the SMT in order for core staff to be retained until the project was stable in terms of delivery. Additionally, adherence to more formal project reporting, particularly of issues caused by under-resourcing or late IT delivery, would have enabled members to better understand the program and assist the SLT to resolve issues.**

## **Information Technology**

A key requirement and dependency of the T18 programme has been the implementation of new IT systems. These in turn have been dependent on contracts with outside bodies including Civica, Ignite (responsible for the T18 Blueprint) and IESE. Delivery of the new systems was typically 6 – 9 months late but contracts lacked relevant penalty clauses, therefore the overall timetable was consequently disrupted. Council Tax and Housing Benefits modules were both delivered very late. Although the Council adopted the 'Eastbourne Model' much of the development was carried out 'inhouse'. An absence of project management and resources resulted in further delays in the provision of the new IT systems. The early staff reduction was driven by a financial imperative but the consequence of these reductions particularly the impact on service levels was not identified. IT development was also affected by unexpected staff losses in that area. The delayed implementation of new systems and the poor performance of the Website resulted in significant delays to seeing the benefits of 'Channel Shift' where transactions and enquiries are processed online.

It was severely underestimated how much work was needed to add additional features to the basic package. There was also a question with members as to the ability of Civica to deliver.

**We concluded that there was insufficient due diligence on the maturity of the intended IT solution prior to commencing the program. That there**



**is a clear need for all contracts with outside bodies to be comprehensive and identify all deliverables, penalty clauses etc. with professional scrutiny of the draft contract recommended. The T18 Programme report to Full Council dated 4th November (4.15) recommended that “the governance (of the programme) should use existing structures”. This clearly resulted in a complete lack of Project Management disciplines for the duration of the programme which in turn had a particularly detrimental impact on the delivery of the new IT systems. The need for such disciplines needs to be recognised for all such future exercises coupled with clear Terms of Reference identifying Objectives, Timescales, Responsibilities and Resources.**

### **Reporting (Member to Member)**

A Joint Steering Group, made of members from both South Hams and West Devon, was established and the terms of reference called for monthly meetings. From the interviews we conducted it was clear that effectiveness of the T18 Joint Steering Group in terms of reporting to members was varied. The JSG met formally twice, however, they continued to meet informally with their meetings being unrecorded and the outcomes unreported. This resulted in a lack of clarity and consistency in information being reported to members which impacted on their understanding of the cause behind the lack of service delivery.

**We concluded that the JSG should have operated on a more formal basis and had a higher profile among members with a well-defined reporting structure.**

### **Reporting (Officer to Member)**

Six members of the SMT, left the Council under redundancy terms. This included those who were the instigators of the T18 concept. Our research has identified that there was no clear blueprint to the project, limited mapping, no handover notes or written processes. This made it extremely challenging for the new Senior Leadership Team (SLT) to pick up and get to grips with T18 and its consequences. In the absence of established management metrics to monitor against, there was an inconsistency in the types of reports submitted to members. This, in conjunction with new members being elected who had limited background knowledge of the concept, resulted in weakened scrutiny.

**We concluded that a project as comprehensive as T18 should have clear, written, procedures in place to minimise disruption in the event of any significant changes and provide a consistent baseline for reporting against.**

### **Finance**

Actual T18 spend is predicted to be £2.794 million by completion, while the budget was £2.83 million (set in December 2014). Therefore the actual cost is £36,000 less than budget.

The most difficult to predict costs at the outset were the Redundancy and Pension strain costs. The budget allowed was £1,520,000 (54% of all costs), with the actual cost being £1,478,954 – £41,000 less than budget, however the contingency costs of £175,000 were taken up by Redundancy and pension strain costs and transition costs.

Overall ICT costs over ran by £72,062 which equates to 10.2%. £780,052 against a budget of £708,000. This was made up of:

- ICT technology implementation, workstream development and project management actual cost £656,052 against a budget of £615,750. To be noted that the element of the overspend which relates to project management costs is £83,782 (overspend of £13.7%) and there were therefore underspends on the contract elements of the ICT.
- ICT software actual cost of £124,000 against a budget of £92,250. 34.4% overspend.

Budget areas Training/Accommodation and Design of the Model actual costs were materially below budget.

Finance reports were provided quarterly to the T18 Monitoring Group in line with Staff redundancy process and external information on Pension strain. Monthly updates were supplied to the T18 Senior Leadership Team.

**In any future large scale financial projects monthly reporting should be mandatory to Member and officer managing groups. Also for further investigation into the overspend on IT development and software costs.**

## **HR**

Staff numbers were reduced primarily through voluntary redundancies, with a small number not offered alternative employment after going through the behaviour assessment process. Morale was found to be low due to a number of factors and it became evident that more staff should have been retained through the transition stage. This was especially noticed in planning where several experienced officers left with a national shortage of officers. New ways of working take time to settle in and staff seem to be adapting to the agile working.

**The impact of not having the systems in place before large scale staff reductions continue to have a large effect on services and customer satisfaction.**

**Project Performance** - Given the size and complexity (especially around IT) of the issues outlined above it would be surprising had the project proceeded smoothly. While we have some sympathy for the SMT put in place to deliver the project we concluded that they should have shared their difficulties with Members earlier in order to negotiate increased resources to mitigate service degradation. For too long Members were advised to 'hold their breath as we are just about to turn the corner' when in truth some areas within the project were not in good shape.

**We concluded that the SMT were in an unenviable position but should have been more willing to share difficulties with Members in order to secure the necessary resource to maintain reasonable service delivery. The group acknowledges the effort from all staff that have helped to deliver this project against difficult circumstances.**

**This page is intentionally left blank**



West Devon  
Borough  
Council

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY (INTERNAL) COMMITTEE – DECISIONS LOG

Meeting Date	Report Title and Minute Ref.	Decision / Action	Officer / Member	Officer comments
8 November 2016	Hub Committee Forward Plan <b>O&amp;S(I) 39</b>	As an update, the Head of Paid Service informed that the Devolution agenda item was now likely to be deferred to a Hub Committee meeting in the new year.	Steve Jordan	Report presented to the Hub Committee and Council at their meetings on 28 February 2017.
8 November 2016	Economy Working Group <b>O&amp;S(I) 40</b>	<p>It was <b>RECOMMENDED</b> to the Hub Committee that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the proposed Our Plan Annual Delivery Plan (as outlined at Appendix 1 to the presented agenda report) be adopted for the period to March 2018;</li> <li>2. funding be increased to Business Information Point for business support services from £8,340 in 2015/16 to £15,100 in 2016/17;</li> <li>3. funding be reduced to South West Museum Development from £2,000 in 2015/16 to £1,000 in 2016/17;</li> <li>4. the practice of the Council offering economy grants be ceased with immediate effect;</li> <li>5. the Youth Markets initiative be supported from 2016/17 with funding of £1,000;</li> <li>6. a part-time level 4 Economy Specialist be recruited to focus on the Council's economy work. Funding for this post in 2016/17 to be drawn from the Innovation Fund (Invest to Earn) Earmarked</li> </ol>	Darren Arulvasagam	Alternative recommendations were agreed by the Council at its meeting on 6 December 2016 (Minute 46(d) refers)

		<p>Reserve. Ongoing funding for this role will be via the staffing establishment, which is to be increased for 2017/18 onwards;</p> <p>7. a West Devon Economy Working Group (comprising of 4 Members) be established; and</p> <p>8. this Working Group submit periodic reports to the Hub Committee.</p>		
8 November 2016	Transitional Resources Monitoring Report <b>O&amp;S(I) 41</b>	A number of Members acknowledged the extreme work pressures that were being placed on Development Management Specialists and the Committee wished to put on record its gratitude for those officers who were working in very difficult circumstances.	Steve Mullineaux	
8 November 2016	Progress Report for Contact Centre <b>O&amp;S(I) 42</b>	<p>The Committee noted the comment that footfall continued to decrease across all sites and requested that this matter be kept under review.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> That the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. continue to support the work being undertaken to improve Customer Services and monitor performance through regular updates; and</li> <li>2. note and endorse the updated Action Plan.</li> </ol>	Anita Ley  Anita Ley	
8 November 2016	Overview of the Website Development <b>O&amp;S(I) 43</b>	Ultimately, it was intended that the new website would go live early in the new year.	Steve Mullineaux	Website now gone live.
8 November 2016	Ombudsman Annual Review Letter 2016 <b>O&amp;S(I) 44</b>	<b>RESOLVED</b> that the Committee has reviewed the Ombudsman Annual Letter for 2016 (as outlined at Appendix A of the presented agenda report) and welcomes the	Catherine Bowen	

		improved performance in this respect.		
8 November 2016	Draft Work Programme <b>O&amp;S(I) 48</b>	In so doing, reference was made to the request made by the Overview and Scrutiny (External) Committee at its meeting held on 11 October 2016 whereby responsibility for considering the Joint Local Plan should be transferred to this Committee as a standing agenda item (Minute *O&S(E) 38 refers). The Committee subsequently endorsed this request and agreed that its future work programme should be updated accordingly.	Steve Jordan / Darryl White	Implemented

**This page is intentionally left blank**