

Strategic Planning Committee 23 June 2022

Subject: Quarterly Planning Performance Update

Report.

Report Authors: Simon Thelwell, Head of Strategic

Development

Maria Bailey, Head of Development

Management

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This quarterly report produces a summary of performance on planning applications/appeals and planning enforcement for the previous quarter, January to March 2022.
- 1.2 Details of any planning appeal decisions in the quarters where committee resolved to refuse planning permission contrary to officer recommendation are also given.
- 1.3 The Government has set performance targets for Local Planning Authorities, both in terms of speed of decision and quality of decision. Failure to meet the targets set could result in the Council being designated with applicants for planning permission being able to choose not to use the Council for determining the application

2 RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted.

3 QUALITY OF PLANNING DECISIONS

3.1 In accordance with the published government standards, quality performance with regard to Major (10 or more residential units proposed or 1000+ sq m new floorspace or site area greater than 0.5 hectares), County Matter

(proposals involving minerals extraction or waste development) and Non-Major applications are assessed separately. If more than 10% of the total decisions in each category over the stated period were allowed on appeal, the threshold for designation would be exceeded. Due to the fact that 10% of the number of non-major decisions made exceeds the total number of appeals, there is no chance of designation so the performance against the non-major target will not be published in this report, although it will still be monitored by officers.

- 3.2 In December 2020, the then MHCLG announced that there would be two periods of assessment for the purposes of designation:
 - decisions between 1 April 2018 and 31 March 2020, with subsequent appeal decisions to December 2020 (as previously reported, the Council is not at risk of designation for this period).
 - decisions between 1 April 2019 and 31 March 2021, with subsequent appeal decisions to December 2021 (as previously reported, the Council is not at risk of designation for this period).
- 3.3 Although, no announcements regarding further periods for assessment have been made, it is considered that monitoring of the next rolling two year assessment periods should take place this would be decisions between 1 April 2020 and 31 March 2022 with subsequent appeal decisions to December 2022 and decisions between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2023 with subsequent appeal decisions to December 2023.
- 3.4 The current figures for April 2020 to March 2022 are:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 68

Number of appeals allowed: 1 % of appeals allowed: 1.5% Appeals still to be determined: 3

Refusals which could still be appealed: 3

County Matter Applications:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 1

Number of appeals allowed: 0 % of appeals allowed: 0%

Appeals still to be determined: 0

Refusals which could still be appealed: 0

3.5 Due to the low number of decisions that we take that are majors or county matters, any adverse appeal decision can have a significant effect on the figure. Based on the above, it is considered that at this time there is a risk of designation. The figure will continue to be carefully monitored.

3.6 The current figures for April 2021 to March 2023 are:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 39

Number of appeals allowed: 0 % of appeals allowed: 0% Appeals still to be determined: 3

Refusals which could still be appealed: 3

County Matter Applications:

Total number of planning decisions over period: 0

Number of appeals allowed: 0 % of appeals allowed: 0% Appeals still to be determined: 0

Refusals which could still be appealed: 0

- 3.7 Based on the above, it is considered that at this time there is a risk of designation. The figure will continue to be carefully monitored.
- 3.8 As part of the quarterly monitoring, it is considered useful to provide details of the performance of appeals generally and summarise any appeal decisions received where either the Strategic Planning Committee/Planning Committee resolved to refuse planning permission contrary to officer recommendation. This is provided in the tables below.

Appeal Decisions Jan-Mar 2022

Total Number of Appeal Decisions - 47
Appeals Allowed - 16
Appeals Dismissed - 31
% Appeals Allowed - 34%

Officer Comment – The average for the year is 39% appeals allowed which is above what has been the case in previous years and when benchmarked against the national and London average. In terms of benchmarking, the national average for the year ending December 2021 was 28%, with the London average being 29%. Appeal decisions are carefully monitored for any particular trends with appropriate advice to officers as necessary.

Appeal Decisions where Committee Decision Contrary to Officer Recommendation

Total Number of Appeal Decisions - 2
Appeals Allowed - 1
Appeals Dismissed - 1
% Appeals Allowed - 50%

Appeal Decisions Jan-Mar 2022 Decision by Committee Contrary to Officer Recommendation

| Date of Committee | Application Details | Summary Reason for Refusal | Appeal Decision | Summary of Inspectors Findings |
|---|---|---|--------------------|--|
| 17 Dec 2020 – Planning Committee | P1189.20 13 Burntwood Avenue, Hornchurch 1 x three storey, 6-bed detached dwelling, 3 x three storey, 5- bed detached dwellings, with associated parking and amenity space | Plot 4 unacceptable impact on adjoining residential amenity | Allowed | No direct views due to placement of windows and suitable separation from boundaries such that there is no harm to neighbouring amenity. |
| | involving demolition of existing care home | | | |
| 13 Aug 20 – Strategic Planning Committee | P0094.20 Neopost House, Rom Valley Way. Romford Erection of four blocks ranging from five (5) to nine (9) storeys to provide 82 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with car parking, associated cycle parking, Refuse Storage Facilities and Landscaping. | Poor quality accommodation due to single aspect and poor amenity space. | Dismissed | The proposed flats would suffer from overheating in future climate change scenario and therefore the quality of accommodation would be unsatisfactory. |

4 SPEED OF PLANNING DECISIONS

4.1 In accordance with the published government standards, speed of decision applies to all major and non-major development applications, with the threshold for designation set as follows:

Speed of Major Development (and County Matters) – 60% of decisions within timescale (13 or 16 weeks or such longer time agreed with the applicant)

Speed of Non-Major Development - 70% of decisions within timescale (8 weeks or such longer time agreed with the applicant)

- 4.2 In December 2020 MHCLG announced that there would be two periods assessed for the purposes of designation:
 - Decisions made between October 2018 and September 2020 (as previously reported, the Council is not at risk of designation for this period)
 - Decisions made between October 2019 and September 2021 (as previously reported, the Council is not at risk of designation for this period)
- 4.3 Although, no announcements regarding further periods for assessment have been made, it is considered that monitoring of the next rolling two year assessment period should take place this would be decisions between 1 October 2020 and 30 September 2022.
- 4.4 Performance to date on these is as follows:

October 2020 to March 2022 (to date)

Major Development (52 out of 54) – 96% in time

County Matter (0 out of 0) – N/A

Non-Major Decisions – (3009 out of 3168) 95% in time

- 4.5 The Council is currently not at risk of designation due to speed of decisions. The figure for future periods will continue to be monitored.
- 4.6 It is considered useful to provide some comparison on speed of decision on Major and Non-Major decisions with other London Boroughs. Obtaining directly comparable benchmarking data for the above period is not possible. However, comparison data on speed of decision for the year ending December 2021 is available and set out below. Performance in Havering is generally good compared to other boroughs for both measures.

| Borough | Major In Time | Rank - Majors | Minor and Others In Time | Rank - Minors and Others |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Barking and Dagenham | 100.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 1 |
| Barnet | 85.0% | 28 | 83.5% | 23 |
| Bexley | 91.0% | 23 | 69.0% | 31 |
| Brent | 100.0% | 1 | 83.0% | 24 |
| Bromley | 83.0% | 29 | 58.5% | 33 |
| Camden | 95.0% | 16 | 74.5% | 30 |
| City of London | 96.0% | 14 | 87.0% | 19 |
| Croydon | 73.0% | 32 | 66.5% | 32 |
| Ealing | 98.0% | 12 | 95.5% | 3 |
| Enfield | 92.0% | 20 | 92.5% | 10 |
| Greenwich | 100.0% | 1 | 93.5% | 8 |
| Hackney | 92.0% | 20 | 84.5% | 21 |
| Hammersmith and Fulham | 95.0% | 16 | 92.5% | 10 |
| Haringey | 100.0% | 1 | 92.5% | 10 |
| Harrow | 90.0% | 24 | 79.0% | 26 |
| Havering | 98.0% | 12 | 94.0% | 5 |
| Hillingdon | 100.0% | 1 | 90.5% | 17 |
| Hounslow | 75.0% | 31 | 86.5% | 20 |
| Islington | 100.0% | 1 | 93.5% | 8 |
| Kensington and Chelsea | 100.0% | 1 | 78.0% | 28 |
| Kingston upon Thames | 92.0% | 20 | 92.5% | 10 |
| Lambeth | 96.0% | 14 | 95.0% | 4 |
| Lewisham | 100.0% | 1 | 94.0% | 5 |
| Merton | 64.0% | 33 | 75.0% | 29 |
| Newham | 100.0% | 1 | 98.5% | 2 |
| Redbridge | 100.0% | 1 | 91.0% | 15 |
| Richmond upon Thames | 100.0% | 1 | 91.0% | 15 |
| Southwark | 80.0% | 30 | 84.0% | 22 |
| Sutton | 93.0% | 19 | 89.0% | 18 |
| Tower Hamlets | 86.0% | 27 | 91.5% | 14 |
| Waltham Forest | 94.0% | 18 | 94.0% | 5 |
| Wandsworth | 89.0% | 25 | 82.5% | 25 |
| Westminster | 88.0% | 26 | 78.5% | 27 |

5 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

5.1 There are no designation criteria for planning enforcement. For the purposes of this report, it is considered useful to summarise the enforcement activity in the relevant quarter. This information is provided below:

Jan – Mar 2022

Number of Enforcement Complaints Received: 142

Number of Enforcement Complaints Closed: 148

It is also worth noting that the performance of Havering in terms of enforcement notices served is amongst the best in the country. For year ending December 2021, Havering was fifth in the country, having served 70 enforcement notices and 10 breach of condition notices.

| Planning authority | Enforcement notices issued | Breach of condition notices served |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Barking and Dagenham | 51 | - |
| Barnet | 131 | 18 |
| Bexley | 11 | 4 |
| Brent | 121 | 17 |
| Bromley | 50 | 5 |
| Camden | 31 | 1 |
| City of London | 1 | - |
| Croydon | - | 2 |
| Ealing | 56 | - |
| Enfield | 16 | - |
| Greenwich | 6 | 1 |
| Hackney | 54 | 3 |
| Hammersmith and Fulham | 34 | 2 |
| Haringey | 62 | 14 |
| Harrow | 29 | 2 |
| Havering | 70 | 10 |
| Hillingdon | 47 | 2 |
| Hounslow | 8 | 2 |
| Islington | 11 | 2 |
| Kensington and Chelsea | 28 | 3 |
| Kingston upon Thames | - | - |
| Lambeth | 40 | 18 |
| Lewisham | 30 | 3 |
| Merton | 1 | - |
| Newham | 70 | - |
| Redbridge | 32 | 6 |

| Richmond upon Thames | 13 | - |
|----------------------|-----|---|
| Southwark | 5 | - |
| Sutton | 5 | - |
| Tower Hamlets | 7 | 3 |
| Waltham Forest | 42 | - |
| Wandsworth | 35 | 1 |
| Westminster | 104 | 9 |

| Number of Enforcement Notices Issued Jan-Mar 22: 14 | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Enforcement Notices Issued in Quarter | | | | |
| Address | Subject of Notice | | | |
| 12 Bridge Close, Rainham | Breach of Conditions – Extract | | | |
| | system operation and appearance | | | |
| Cranham Golf Course, St Marys | Unauthorised use of first floor as 3 | | | |
| Lane, Upminster | flats | | | |
| 27 Heath Drive, Romford | Unauthorised windows | | | |
| 2-4 Eastern Road, Romford | Unauthorised residential unit | | | |
| Rear of 9-11 Elm Road, Romford | Breach of Conditions – Accordance | | | |
| | with plans; details of materials; tree | | | |
| | protection | | | |
| 140 Straight Road, Romford | Unauthorised boundary wall, gates | | | |
| | and railings | | | |
| 115a Shepherds Hill, Romford | Breach of Conditions - Details of | | | |
| | material, boundary treatment, | | | |
| | highway access and cycle storage | | | |
| Rear of 230 South Street, Romford | Unauthorised use of building for 6 self-contained residential units | | | |
| 42 Fontayne Avenue, Romford | Unauthorised hard surface to front of | | | |
| 12 i emayire / Wender, Nermera | property | | | |
| 1 Highfield Road, Romford | Unauthorised rear dormer/roof | | | |
| | alterations and front porch | | | |
| 74-76 Brentwood Road, Romford | Unauthorised parcel collection | | | |
| | lockers | | | |
| 64 Berwick Road, Rainham | Unauthorised dormer windows | | | |
| Verve Apartments, Mercury | Breach of Conditions - Car parking | | | |
| Gardens, Romford | provision and refuse storage | | | |
| 28 King Edward Avenue, Rainham | Unauthorised rear and side dormers | | | |