

PERFORMANCE MARKERS REPORT 2017-18

Name of planning authority: **Comhairle nan Eilean Siar**

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

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

No.	Performance Marker	RAG rating	Comments
1	Decision-making: continuous reduction of average timescales for all development categories [Q1 - Q4]	Amber	<p>Major Applications The one major application decided during the reported year took 36.9 weeks to process. This is slower than the Scottish average of 33.6 weeks. RAG = Amber</p> <p>Local (Non-Householder) Applications Your timescales of 9.7 weeks are slower than the previous year and are faster than the Scottish average of 10.7 weeks. RAG = Amber</p> <p>Householder Applications Your timescales of 7.5 weeks are slower than the previous year and are slower than the Scottish average of 7.3 weeks. However, your timescales are faster than the statutory timescale of 8 weeks. RAG = Green</p> <p>Overall RAG = Amber</p>
2	<p>Processing agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> offer to all prospective applicants for major development planning applications; and availability publicised on website 	Red	<p>You have not entered into any processing agreements during the reporting year and it is not clear from your report whether you offer these to prospective applicants. RAG = Red</p> <p>It is not clear from your report if you advertise processing agreements on your website. RAG = Red</p> <p>Overall RAG = Red</p>
3	<p>Early collaboration with applicants and consultees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> availability and promotion of pre-application discussions for all prospective applications; and clear and proportionate requests for supporting information 	Green	<p>You state that around 50% of applications involve pre-application discussions and you have provided some examples of how this has improved the applications which have been submitted. You also state that 100% of the respondents to your customer service survey were happy with the pre-application service you provide. RAG = Green</p> <p>The case studies you provide demonstrate how your approach to requesting supporting information is clear and proportionate. RAG = Green</p> <p>Overall RAG = Green</p>
4	Legal agreements: conclude (or	Amber	Your average timescales for determining major applications

	reconsider) applications after resolving to grant permission reducing number of live applications more than 6 months after resolution to grant (from last reporting period)		with legal agreements are faster than last year and the Scottish average. Local applications with legal agreements are determined slower than the Scottish average but faster than last year. You continue to project manage the conclusion of outstanding legal agreements.
5	Enforcement charter updated / re-published within last 2 years	Red	We note that you replaced your enforcement charter in April 2018. Unfortunately, this was just out with the reporting period.
6	Continuous improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • progress/improvement in relation to PPF National Headline Indicators; and • progress ambitious and relevant service improvement commitments identified through PPF report 	Amber	Your LDP and enforcement charter are out of date and your LDP is not on track for replacement. There has been some slippage with regards to your decision making timescales, including those with a legal agreement, and on progress towards your legacy agreements. RAG = Red You completed 3 out of your 5 improvement commitments with the other 2 ongoing. You have identified a good range of improvement projects for the year ahead. RAG = Green Overall RAG = Amber
7	Local development plan less than 5 years since adoption	Red	Your LDP was 5 years and 4 months old at the end of the reporting period.
8	Development plan scheme – next LDP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on course for adoption within 5 years of current plan(s) adoption; and • project planned and expected to be delivered to planned timescale 	Red	Your LDP will not be replaced within the required 5 year timescale. RAG = Red It is noted that you have experienced some staff shortages during the reporting year. However, you have not evidenced within your report how you have project managed the preparation of your LDP to ensure that there will be minimal delay in replacing your existing LDP. RAG = Red Overall RAG = Red
9	Elected members engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – <i>if plan has been at pre-MIR stage during reporting year</i>	N/A	
10	Cross sector stakeholders* engaged early (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	Regular and proportionate policy advice produced on information required to support applications.	Green	Your case studies show how development briefs assisted in ensuring applications are submitted in line with your policy aspirations. Your LDP sets a clear policy framework with supplementary guidance brought forward where relevant.
12	Corporate working across services to improve outputs and services for customer benefit (for example: protocols; joined-up services; single contact	Green	Evidence of single points of contact for applicants is provided. The Emergency Services Network replacement is a good example of collaborative working. And elsewhere, the use of the Place Standard tool on a community planning partnership demonstrates the whole planning team getting

	arrangements; joint pre-application advice)		involved to improve customer outputs.
13	Sharing good practice, skills and knowledge between authorities	Green	You provided some examples of sharing good practice, one includes an officer attending a conference about thatched roofs, and later working with HES on the Thatched Buildings Café project.
14	Stalled sites / legacy cases: conclusion or withdrawal of old planning applications and reducing number of live applications more than one year old	Amber	You have not cleared any cases during the reporting year, with 5 cases still awaiting conclusion. Based on this and last year's figures, 4 reached legacy status during the reporting year.
15	Developer contributions: clear and proportionate expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out in development plan (and/or emerging plan); and • in pre-application discussions 	Amber	<p>Policy on Developers contributions is set out in your LDP with standalone policy for wind farms also in place. RAG = Green</p> <p>It is not clear from your report how developer contributions are set out and discussed during pre-application discussions. RAG = Red</p> <p>Overall RAG = Amber</p>

COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR COUNCIL
Performance against Key Markers

Marker		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
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			N/A
10	Stakeholders engaged early (pre-MIR)	N/A	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)

2012-13	3	4	6
2013-14	0	5	8
2014-15	0	0	13
2015-16	0	0	15
2016-17	0	1	14
2017-18	4	5	4

Decision Making Timescales (weeks)

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2017-18 Scottish Average
Major Development	-	44.9	28.5	-	-	36.9	33.6
Local (Non-Householder) Development	11.3	10.5	12.3	8.9	8.1	9.7	10.7
Householder Development	8.2	7.8	7.1	7.1	6.1	7.5	7.3