



**Havering**  
LONDON BOROUGH

**Planning Committee**  
**7 July 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the total number of appeals, there is no chance of designation so the performance against the non-major target will not be published in this report, although it will still be monitored by officers.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**

<b>Total Number of Appeal Decisions -</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appeals Allowed -</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appeals Dismissed -</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>% Appeals Allowed -</b>	<b>34%</b>

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**

<b>Total Number of Appeal Decisions -</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Appeals Allowed -</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appeals Dismissed -</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>% Appeals Allowed -</b>	<b>50%</b>

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

<b>Date of Committee</b>	<b>Application Details</b>	<b>Summary Reason for Refusal</b>	<b>Appeal Decision</b>	<b>Summary of Inspectors Findings</b>
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 involving demolition of existing care home	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.
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.

<b>Borough</b>	<b>Major In Time</b>	<b>Rank - Majors</b>	<b>Minor and Others In Time</b>	<b>Rank - Minors and Others</b>
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
<b>Havering</b>	<b>98.0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>94.0%</b>	<b>5</b>
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
<b>Havering</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>10</b>
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 Lane, Upminster	Unauthorised use of first floor as 3 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 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 Gardens, Romford	Breach of Conditions – Car parking provision and refuse storage	
28 King Edward Avenue, Rainham	Unauthorised rear and side dormers	