

T: 0300 244 4000  
E: scottish.ministers@gov.scot

Mr Richard Stiff  
Chief Executive  
Angus Council

25 November 2016

Dear Mr Stiff

## **PLANNING PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK 2015-16**

Thank you for submitting your authority's annual Planning Performance Framework (PPF) report covering the period April 2015 to March 2016. Please find enclosed your feedback report, which is based on the evidence provided within your PPF.

I am very pleased that the quality of PPF reporting has again improved with many authorities setting out a very clear story of how the service is operating and detailing their priority actions for improvement. There have been general improvements across most of the categories however, there still remains high levels of inconsistency in planning authority decision making timescales across the country. This was also reflected through the recent publication of the statistics for the first quarter of 2016-17 which shows that certain authorities, and certain cases, are dragging the statistics down considerably. I asked officials to look into the reasons for delay in some of the lengthiest cases and will report on that to the High Level Group on Performance.

Planning performance improvement has come a long way in recent years and the PPF framework provides an excellent opportunity for authorities to set out the details behind their performance and showcase good practice and innovative ideas. I hope we can continue to work positively with authorities to improve monitoring processes and continue our collective commitment to improving services.

This is an exciting time for planning – the momentum of the independent planning review is continuing and we will be publishing a consultation outlining options for change in the winter, to inform the future Planning Bill. The consultation will cover a variety of options to enhance community involvement in planning; help deliver homes and infrastructure; simplify development planning and management processes; and focus on improving the service and reputation of planning. It is a challenging timetable but a fantastic opportunity to deliver real change.

Although there are some things that we need legislation to change, many of the panel's recommendations don't need legislation, they need a change in working practices, a recognition that planning creates the places where people work, live, learn and play. To achieve the outcomes we all want to see, authorities need to reposition planning to ensure that it sits at the very heart of the authority and has the resources available to it to make sure it provides the best service possible to developers, stakeholders and the authority in which it sits. To help achieve this we will shortly be launching a consultation on raising the planning fee maximum in an effort to move towards cost recovery. Following the planning bill we will consult further on potential reform of the fee regime.

I hope that you and your authority will actively participate as we progress, ensuring that we see real change throughout the planning community.



**KEVIN STEWART**

**CC: Kate Cowey, Head of Planning**

## PERFORMANCE MARKERS REPORT 2015-16

Name of planning authority: **Angus 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	<b>Decision-making:</b> continuous reduction of average timescales for all development categories [Q1 - Q4]	Amber	<p><b>Major Applications</b></p> <p>22 weeks is a significant improvement on the average decision times of 34.1 weeks last year. It is also well below the national average of 38.8 weeks.</p> <p>RAG = Green</p> <p><b>Local (Non-Householder) Applications</b></p> <p>Your decision making timescales have increased from 10.9 weeks to 11.1 weeks. However this remains quicker than the national average of 12.3 weeks.</p> <p>RAG = Amber</p> <p><b>Householder Applications</b></p> <p>Timescales have increased from 6.3 weeks to 6.7 weeks however this remains better than the national average of 7.5 weeks.</p> <p>RAG = Amber</p> <p><b>TOTAL RAG = Amber</b></p>
2	<p><b>Processing agreements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>offer to all prospective applicants for major development planning applications; and</li> <li>availability publicised on website</li> </ul>	Green	<p>You have 10 applications which were subject to a processing agreement with 2 of those for major applications. They are offered for all major planning applications.</p> <p><b>RAG = Green</b></p> <p>Processing agreements available and explained on website.</p> <p><b>RAG = Green</b></p>

3	<p><b>Early collaboration</b> with applicants and consultees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• availability and promotion of pre-application discussions for all prospective applications; and</li> <li>• clear and proportionate requests for supporting information</li> </ul>	Green	<p>47% of applications are subject to pre-application advice, a significant increase from 29% last year. Your website makes it clear this is available for all applications and dates for planning consultation at local offices are set out.</p> <p><b>RAG = Green</b></p> <p>Website makes clear that pre-application advice will give an indication of the likely outcome and should ensure the application is determined as quickly as possible. Where processing agreements are used these also set out clearly any additional information requirements.</p> <p><b>RAG = Green</b></p>
4	<p><b>Legal agreements:</b> conclude (or reconsider) applications after resolving to grant permission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reducing number of live applications more than 6 months after resolution to grant (from last reporting period)</li> </ul>	Green	<p>Time taken on major applications with legal agreements has reduced significantly due to reduced delays in issuing decisions on applications subject to a planning obligation.</p>
5	<p><b>Enforcement charter</b> updated / re-published within last 2 years</p>	Green	<p>Enforcement Charter published one year ago, March 2015.</p>
6	<p><b>Continuous improvement:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• progress/improvement in relation to PPF National Headline Indicators; and</li> <li>• progress ambitious and relevant service improvement commitments identified through PPF report</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>Major development timescales have reduced significantly, very slight increases for local developments, all below national average.</p> <p>Your enforcement charter is 1 year old however, your LDP is over 5 years old.</p> <p><b>RAG = Amber</b></p> <p>You have completed most of your committed service improvements from last year. You have identified a number of reviews and improvements for next year, a lot of these are linked to core business.</p> <p><b>RAG = Amber</b></p>
7	<p><b>Local development plan</b> less than 5 years since adoption</p>	Red	<p>LDP is over 7 years old.</p>
8	<p><b>Development plan scheme</b> – next LDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on course for adoption within 5 years of current plan(s) adoption; and</li> <li>• project planned and expected to be delivered to planned timescale</li> </ul>	Amber	<p>LDP scheduled to be adopted in September 2016 and it is noted that progress was made in the last reporting year.</p> <p><b>RAG = Red</b></p> <p>You have a project plan in place and the timescales for responding to requests by the reporter were adhered to, keeping any subsequent delays to a minimum.</p> <p><b>RAG = Green</b></p>

9	<b>Elected members engaged early</b> (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – <i>if plan has been at pre-MIR stage during reporting year</i>	N/A	
10	<b>Cross sector stakeholders* engaged early</b> (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – <i>if plan has been at pre-MIR stage during reporting year</i>  <i>*including industry, agencies and Scottish Government</i>	N/A	
11	<b>Regular and proportionate policy advice</b> produced on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>information required to support applications; and</li> <li>expected developer contributions</li> </ul>	Green	Policy and Guidance documents online cover full spectrum of planning applications with information required to support applications. It is noted your Action Programme with four Supplementary Guidance documents are due to be published this coming year.
12	<b>Corporate working across services</b> to improve outputs and services for customer benefit (for example: protocols; joined-up services; single contact arrangements; joint pre-application advice)	Green	You worked with Aberdeenshire to produce supplementary guidance on Planning Obligations and provide examples of working with internal partners.  Development Framework for Sunnyside Hospital showed close working between planning and other services.
13	<b>Sharing good practice, skills and knowledge</b> between authorities	Red	Your report lacks information on your involvement with your benchmarking group and fails to include other examples of cross-authority working.
14	<b>Stalled sites / legacy cases:</b> conclusion or withdrawal of old planning applications and reducing number of live applications more than one year old	Green	You cleared 10 legacy cases during the reporting year and now have 7 remaining which means that some new cases have reached legacy status. It is noted that some of these relate to Notified and called-in applications.
15	<b>Developer contributions:</b> clear and proportionate expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>set out in development plan (and/or emerging plan); and</li> <li>in pre-application discussions</li> </ul>	Green	Expectations are outlined in the emerging development plan and detailed supplementary guidance will follow in the next reporting year.  <b>RAG = Green</b>  You have outlined that contributions for affordable housing will be discussed at pre-application stage.  <b>RAG = Green</b>

## ANGUS COUNCIL

### Performance against Key Markers

Marker		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
1	Decision making timescales				
2	Processing agreements				
3	Early collaboration				
4	Legal agreements				
5	Enforcement charter				
6	Continuous improvement				
7	Local development plan				
8	Development plan scheme				
9	Elected members engaged early (pre-MIR)		N/A	N/A	N/A
10	Stakeholders engaged early (pre-MIR)		N/A	N/A	N/A
11	Regular and proportionate advice to support applications				
12	Corporate working across services				
13	Sharing good practice, skills and knowledge				
14	Stalled sites/legacy cases				
15	Developer contributions				

### Overall Markings (total numbers for red, amber and green)

<b>2012-13</b>	3	8	4
<b>2013-14</b>	2	4	7
<b>2014-15</b>	3	2	8
<b>2015-16</b>	2	3	8

### Decision Making Timescales (weeks)

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2015-16 Scottish Average
Major Development	40.2	30.1	34.1	22.0	38.8
Local (Non-Householder) Development	12.9	9.7	10.9	11.1	12.3
Householder Development	6.9	6.4	6.9	6.7	7.5