Heads of Planning Scotland

# PLANNING PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

## ANNUAL REPORT GUIDANCE NOTES

### VERSION 9

**Version Issued 18th February 2020**

# INTRODUCTION

The Planning Performance Framework (PPF) is the Planning Authorities annual report on the planning service. The PPF was developed by the Heads of Planning Scotland (HOPS) and the Scottish Government to provide a document with a range of qualitative and quantitative indicators to document planning activities.

The PPF is entering its ninth reporting year. This is expected to be the last year of the PPF in its current format. HOPS remain committed to the use of the framework as the PPF is one of the best ways to showcase the work of planning authorities across the country.

This document provides written guidance and a template to assist local authorities in the preparation of their PPF report. The PPF has been designed to be flexible and to evolve as experience grows. Authorities may deviate from the template if they feel that it is appropriate.

HOPS support performance improvement. Authorities are encouraged to keep in regular contact with their peer review partner authority throughout the process and attend appropriate training workshops and benchmarking meetings with their SOLACE Benchmarking Family[1]. The Heads of Planning Scotland Members Knowledge Hub Group should be used for wider for discussion and collaboration.

The PPF document can be used as promotional tool or an audit document or both. It is encouraged that local authority leadership is consulted to get a steer on how they envisage the PPF to be used. Many authorities take their PPF report to committee. HOPS recommend the report is taken to committee after feedback has been provided by the Scottish Government.

If you have any comments on the Planning Performance Framework or the guidance, or would like information about how to access the Knowledge Hub, please email trevor.moffat@improvementservice.org.uk

---

- [1] Family 1 – Eilean Siar, Argyll & Bute, Shetland Islands, Highland, Orkney Islands, Dumfries & Galloway, Aberdeenshire, Scottish Borders (Moray and Cairngorms NPA are also part of this group)
- Family 2 – Perth & Kinross, Stirling, South Ayrshire, East Ayrshire, North Ayrshire, East Lothian, Fife (Loch Lomond & Trossachs NPA are also part of this group)
- Family 3 – Angus, Clackmannanshire, Midlothian, South Lanarkshire, Inverclyde, Renfrewshire, West Lothian, East Renfrewshire
- Family 4 – North Lanarkshire, Falkirk, East Dunbartonshire, Aberdeen City, City of Edinburgh, West Dunbartonshire, Dundee City, Glasgow City

# GUIDANCE NOTE STRUCTURE

SECTION 1 - Time table for PPF 9 (2020)

SECTION 2 – Peer Review

SECTION 3 - What makes an excellent planning performance framework?

SECTION 4 – Guidance Notes and Template

SECTION 5 – Performance Markers

# SECTION 1 - Time table for PPF 9 (2020)

| | |
|---|---|
| Final PPF Guidance Published | 18th February 2020 |
| Peer Review Partners Notified | 18th February 2020 |
| PPF Workshops held by benchmarking groups | by the end of April 2020 |
| PPF Submission Date | 31st July 2020 |
| Peer Review Partners to provide feedback to each other | by the end of September 2020 |
| Peer Review Meetings held by benchmarking groups | TBC |
| Scottish Government Feedback | TBC |

**Your annual PPF Report must be submitted to the Scottish Government planning mailbox at: chief.planner@gov.scot**

**The deadline for submission of reports is 31st July 2020**

**The decision to put your report to committee is for each authority to consider however the timing of this should not mean your report is late in being submitted.**

# SECTION 2 – Peer Review

**Peer Review Partners**

Each Local Authority is assigned a peer review partner, as set out in the table below, this partner will provide feedback on the PPF produced in 2020. It is also encouraged that partner authorities have dialogue throughout the whole PPF preparation process. Email addresses for the key contacts at each authority will be provided separately.

## 2020

### Group 1

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Moray* | and | Dumfries and Galloway |
| Shetland Islands | and | Aberdeenshire |
| Highland | and | Argyll and Bute |
| Orkney Islands | and | Scottish Borders |
| Cairngorms | and | Western Isles |

### Group 2

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Perth and Kinross | and | East Lothian |
| Stirling | and | North Ayrshire |
| Loch Lomond* | and | East Ayrshire |
| South Ayrshire | and | Fife |

### Group 3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Midlothian | and | East Renfrewshire |
| South Lanarkshire | and | Inverclyde |
| Renfrewshire | and | Angus |
| West Lothian | and | Clackmannanshire |

### Group 4

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| North Lanarkshire | and | Glasgow |
| Falkirk | and | Edinburgh |
| East Dunbartonshire | and | West Dunbartonshire |
| Aberdeen | and | Dundee |

*Authorities reallocated due to previous error.

**Peer Review Advice**

The Local Authority Peer Review process has been in place now for four years. The following recommendations have been given by several authorities as means of ensuring the process is as valuable as possible.

1. Make contact with your peer review partner as early as possible.
2. Set dates in the diary for the peer review meetings at an early stage. This may be one meeting before submission of the PPF and a reciprocal one after submission.
3. Agree an agenda based on the expected outcomes from the peer review meeting.
4. Keep an audit trail of the outcomes of the peer review, what you have learnt and how it might inform future PPFs. Creating a storyboard creates a visual memoir and this can be useful to pass on to future peer review partners.
5. Pre-submission. Some authorities share their draft reports with their peer review partners to:
    a. Note whether the PPF report addresses all of the Key Markers and National Headline Indicators.
    b. Give feedback on style, wording, layout etc.
    c. Give a sense check of case studies to be used.
6. Post submission. All authorities are required to make contact with their peer review partner:
    a. Provide feedback to HOPS.
    b. Face to face meetings are encouraged. Involving as many staff as possible to share learning.
    c. Site visits have been seen as hugely beneficial to those authorities that have previously carried them out. Often tied into staff training days they allow staff to see the developments described in the PPF reports. This allows staff to get feedback on issues which would not normally be covered in PPF reporting.

# SECTION 3 - What makes an excellent planning performance framework?

**Clarity on Why**

1. Political support and buy-in to the achievements of the Planning Service by obtaining Committee approval and discussion, including the sharing of the Scottish Government's feedback comments and RAG markings.

**How?**

2. Effective leadership and buy in from senior management, a project management approach to preparation and staff inclusive participation.

3. Relevant staff with a knowledge and understanding of other PPFs with an emphasis on how they showcase continuous improvements and what their particular aspects of best practice are for adoption.

4. A coherent report structure which presents the "journey of improvement" undertaken by the local planning authority over the last 5 years.

5. A PPF which is concise, well presented, easy to read with proportionate and appropriate use of tables, graphs, photographs and case studies which is submitted on time. Selective and relevant use of case studies to evidence achievements made and improvements introduced by the Planning Service.

6. The PPF format identifies a clear target audience with different and customised versions of the PPF for different stakeholder groups e.g. Community Councils, Developers etc.

**Post PPF Preparation**

7. Participation in and using feedback from HOPS peer review meetings and benchmarking group discussions to enhance and inform your next PPF.

8. PPF links in to the wider corporate processes and performance management initiatives across the Council.

9. Wider use of the PPF to assist in Team development days or staff training e.g. a visit to another LPA to check out their case studies on site.

# SECTION 4 – Guidance Notes and Template

**Overview**

The PPF defines and measures how a planning authority is achieving a high-quality planning service. The report begins with a qualitative story of that year's performance supported by case studies. The information and policy that sits behind this performance story is then included prior to the considering of what improvements are desired in the coming year. It then provides more measured information on the authorities' work programmes called National Headline Indicators (NHI). This is followed by the Scottish Government Annual Official Statistics for that Authority. It ends with a snapshot of the workforce and planning committee meeting information for that planning authority.

The PPF report is split into 7 parts, as detailed below:

- Part 1: Qualitative Narrative and Case Studies
- Part 2: Supporting Evidence
- Part 3: Service Improvements
- Part 4: National Headline Indicators (NHI)
- Part 5: Official Statistics
- Part 6: Workforce Information
- Part 7: Planning Committee Information

This guidance document gives further information on each of these parts and provides a suggested template where relevant.

**Part 1: Qualitative Narrative and Case Studies**

It is helpful to structure this narrative accordingly:
- Quality of Outcomes
- Quality of Service and Engagement
- Governance
- Culture of Continuous Improvement

A good PPF will tell the story of your service's performance in the past year by:
- Being concise and focused – use lots of hyperlinks and references but keep the explanation short. Ensure that the narrative explains which measure of a quality planning service that you are addressing. Where relevant, link this to the key markers of performance.
- Thinking about your audience – the PPF reports are now more directed towards a range of local stakeholders than as an audit report for Scottish Government scrutiny. It should read like an annual report. Ask for feedback from stakeholders and include quotations.
- Using lots of case studies – these assist stakeholders' understanding of a quality service and provide a rich resource for identifying good practice through benchmarking with partners. Use a case study to evidence different measures of performance by cross referencing rather than by repetition.
- Showing the journey of improvement – link back to the targets you set for the year and forwards to your next year targets. Be prepared to be honest and critical, identifying areas where you can do better and address these in your service improvement plan for the year ahead.

**Quality of Outcomes**

The focus is on demonstrating the added value delivered by planning. Consider examples to illustrate performance, such as:
- In the context of the development plan, use case studies to show how planning policies and guidance have delivered high quality development on the ground.
- The role of urban design panels, local award schemes, feedback from independent sources.
- Local environmental improvements, regeneration and town centres activities and enhancements.

**Quality of Service and Engagement:**

Evidence under this subheading should demonstrate the planning service's positive actions to support sustainable economic growth, initiatives to work consistently with stakeholders and deliver a positive customer experience, such as:
- Evidence of success from development plan action programmes, pre-application processes, policy in practice.
- Protocols and relationship management to ensure reliability of advice and working timescales with stakeholders.
- Clear project management for development planning.
- Communications strategy with customer service charters, customer surveys and local forums.

**Governance:**

Performance measures under this subheading should illustrate how structures and processes are proportionate, effective and fit for purpose, such as:

• Alignment of staffing resource, procurement and innovative working practices to address priorities.
• Strong collaboration between services, corporate working processes, shared services or joint working arrangements.
• Training of officers and members to support corporate working.
• Use of lean processes to deliver efficiencies.
• Feedback from stakeholders about outcomes from ways of working.

**Culture of Continuous Improvement**

This should focus on improvements and changes since the last PPF report.

• Demonstrating a culture of continuous improvement should focus on how the past 12 months' builds on evidence in the previous PPF and:
• Addresses the areas set out in the service improvement plan.
• Evidences ongoing training of staff, management and members in priority areas.
• Clear vision and programme as basis for service improvements.

**Template for Part 1: Case Studies**

The example template sets out a method of presenting cases studies in the PPF report. Using the template allows for easier reference to the elements of a high quality planning service for those marking reports, and also highlights key areas of work for other PPF readers. Please note that the use of this template is not mandatory and it can be amended to suit the planning authorities report.

Please note the main area of work and main stakeholders cover a wide range of topics and stakeholders, it is not the intention for each authority to cover all of the examples listed. Please use a best fit approach and only resort to using the "Other" option if necessary.

| Case Study Title: |
| --- |
| |
| **Location and Dates:** |
| |
| **Elements of a High Quality Planning Service this study relates to** (please select all that apply)**:** |
| • Quality of outcomes<br>• Quality of service and engagement<br>• Governance<br>• Culture of continuous improvement |
| **Key Markers** (please select all that apply)**:** |
| *Note which key markers 1-15 this case study relates to* |

| **Key Areas of Work** (please select the **main area** of work covered - 1 to 2 options maximum): | |
| --- | --- |
| • Design | • Interdisciplinary Working |
| • Conservation | • Collaborative Working |
| • Regeneration | • Community Engagement |
| • Environment | • Placemaking |
| • Greenspace | • Charrettes |
| • Town Centres | • Place Standard |
| • Masterplanning | • Performance Monitoring |
| • Local Develop Plan & Supplementary Guidance | • Process Improvement |
| • Housing Supply | • Project Management |
| • Affordable Housing | • Skills Sharing |
| • Economic Development | • Staff Training |
| • Enforcement | • Online Systems |
| • Development Management Processes | • Transport |
| • Planning Applications | • Active Travel |
| | • Other *(please note)* |

| **Stakeholders Involved** (please select the **main stakeholders** - 1 to 2 options maximum): | |
| --- | --- |
| • General Public | • Planning Committee |
| • Hard to reach groups | • Authority Planning Staff |
| • Local Developers | • Authority Other Staff |
| • Key Agencies | • Other (*please note*) |

| **Overview:** |
| --- |
| *A description of the activities which have taken place during the case study period.* |
| **Goals:** |
| *A description of how the case study aimed to contribute to the wider goals and outcomes of the planning service.* |
| **Outcomes:** |
| *A brief description of what the case study has demonstrated so far and any follow up work which will take place because of it. If the project is still underway please note what is still to be completed.* |
| **Name of key officer** |
| *Note the name of the lead officer for the project* |

**Part 2: Supporting evidence**

Explain (briefly) what information the authority has drawn on when compiling this report, such as:

- what customer input there has been which has influenced the report and/or authority actions;
- whether there has been any audit or management/process reviews, and the relevant findings;
- partnership work with others;
- formal and informal benchmarking;
- other Council reports and initiatives.

Include hyperlinks in the Supporting Evidence section and in the body of the main report, where possible.

**Checklist for Part 2:  Qualitative Narrative and Case Studies**

Each authority should add this very short tick box table to reference the case studies presented in Part 1. Please note that there is no requirement to cover every single topic listed below. This is designed to be collated by HOPS and issued to all authorities after the submission of the PPF. The goal is to have an easy to reference list of topics covered in the PPF to allow other authorities planners easier access PPF case studies on issues that they are dealing with. This supports the promotion of collaboration and knowledge sharing amongst planning authorities.

| Case Study Topics | Issue covered by case study (pg number) | Case Study Topics | Issue covered by case study (pg number) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Design | | Interdisciplinary Working | |
| Conservation | | Collaborative Working | |
| Regeneration | | Community Engagement | |
| Environment | | Placemaking | |
| Greenspace | | Charrettes | |
| Town Centres | | Place Standard | |
| Masterplanning | | Performance Monitoring | |
| LDP & Supplementary Guidance | | Process Improvement | |
| Housing Supply | | Project Management | |
| Affordable Housing | | Skills Sharing | |
| Economic Development | | Staff Training | |
| Enforcement | | Online Systems | |
| Development Management Processes | | Transport | |
| Planning Applications | | Active Travel | |
| Other: please note | | | |

**Part 3: Service improvements**

**Service improvements in the coming year**
- Keep the focus on improvement activity rather than carrying out core/routine work or tasks.
- Be clear about Service Improvement actions and their purpose - there should be a flow of information through the report from problem to solution.
- Aim to ensure that Service Improvement Commitments are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Related).

State key commitments and actions for future service improvements. There is no maximum or minimum number of commitments to be made here – but it might be best to have a small number, focused on specific and practical service improvements.

**Delivery of service improvement actions committed in previous year**
Based on the service improvement plan from the previous year, report on the commitments made and the specific actions carried out in relation to each commitment, including any evidence of the results of those actions.

**Template for Part 3: Service Improvements 2020-21**

In the coming year we will:

- 
- 

Delivery of our service improvement actions in 2019-20:

| Committed improvements and actions | Complete? |
|---|---|
| *[Commitment]*<br>• *[Actions carried out / evidence]*<br>• | *[Yes/No]* |
| *[Commitment]*<br>• *[Actions carried out /evidence]*<br>• | *[Yes/No]* |
| *[Commitment]*<br>• *[Actions carried out /evidence]*<br>• | *[Yes/No]* |

## Part 4:  National Headline Indicators (NHI)

The National Headline Indicators (NHI) are a detailed list of work programme information that each planning service needs to collate in-house. They are designed by HOPS to allow for ongoing measurement of performance. The template below allows for 2018/19 and 2019/20 to be recorded in the same manner as it has been in previous years. Additional guidance on completion is included in the coloured sections within the template itself.

**A: NHI Key outcomes - Development Planning:**

| Development Planning | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Local and Strategic Development Planning**: | | | |
| Age of local/strategic development plan(s) at end of reporting period<br><br>*Requirement: less than 5 years* | **years and months** | **years and months** | *Number of years and whole months passed starting from date(s) existing local or strategic development plan(s) were adopted /approved.* |
| Will the local/strategic development plan(s) be replaced by their 5th anniversary according to the current development plan scheme? | **Y/N** | **Y/N** | *Using the development plan scheme in force on 31st March at the end of the reporting year, is the expected adoption/ approval date of each plan less than 5 years after the date the current plan was adopted/approved?* |
| Has the expected date of submission of the plan to Scottish Ministers in the development plan scheme changed over the past year? | **Y-earlier/ Y-later/ N** | **Y-earlier/ Y-later/ N** | *Comparison of the development plan scheme at the start of the reporting period with the one in force at the end of the reporting period* |
| Were development plan scheme engagement/consultation commitments met during the year? | **Y/N** | **Y/N** | *Both the timing and nature of engagement should be considered here.  Exceeding the commitments given in qualitative terms should not be seen as requiring a negative response.  However, commitments missed by more than a month should be reported and justified.* |

| Effective Land Supply and Delivery of Outputs[2] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Established housing land supply | **units** | **units** | *This indicator will usually be captured by a Housing Land Audit on an annual basis. The most up-to-date figure should be given, with the base date also being reported. All housing tenures should be included.*<br><br>*Established housing land supply: the total housing land supply including both unconstrained and constrained sites. This will include the effective housing land supply, plus the remaining capacity for sites under construction, sites with planning consent, sites in adopted local development plans and where appropriate other buildings and land with agreed potential for housing development*<br><br>***Circular 2/2010 Glossary****<br>http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/212607/0103970.pdf* |
| 5-year effective housing land supply programming | **units** | **units** | *This indicator will usually be captured by a Housing Land Audit on an annual basis. The most up-to-date approved figure should be given, with the base date also reported. All housing tenures should be included.*<br><br>*Effective housing land supply: the programming of that part of the established housing land supply which is free or expected to be free of development constraints, and will therefore be available for the construction of housing in the next 5 years. This is influenced by the rate of delivery.*<br><br>***Circular 2/2010 Glossary****<br>http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/212607/0103970.pdf<br>**SPP(2014)** para 110 & 125<br>http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0045/00453827.pdf* |

---

[2] Audit Year

Please provide the housing land audit year utilised and state whether draft or final. The most up to date audit available at the time of submitting the PPF should be utilised which will either be the draft 2020 or final 2019.

| 5-year effective land supply total capacity | units | units | *This indicator will usually be captured by a Housing Land Audit on an annual basis. The most up-to-date approved figure should be given, with the base date also report. All housing tenures should be included.*<br><br>*Effective housing land supply total capacity: this is the total remaining capacity of the part of the established housing land supply which is free or expected to be free of development constraints, and will therefore be available for the construction of housing in the next 5 years. For example, if a site of 110 units is delivering 20 units per annum, the 5-year effective land supply is 100 units and the 5-year effective land supply total capacity is 110 units.*<br><br>*Circular 2/2010 Glossary*<br>*http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/212607/0103970.pdf*<br>*SPP(2014) para 110 & 125 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0045/00453827.pdf* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5-year housing supply target | units | units | *This is the total number of additional homes (all tenure) that the development plan seeks over the following 5-year period. Under SPP (2014) this is called the housing supply target, although previously this was often referred to as the housing requirement. However, for the avoidance of doubt, it is not the housing land requirement which includes a margin of flexibility to ensure the housing supply target can be met. If the target is updated in light of historic completions, this should be specified.* |
| 5-year effective housing land supply (to one decimal place) | years | years | *Calculation of the 5-year supply using the figures provided above (5-year effective housing land supply & 5-year housing supply target) using the following formula:*<br><br>$$= \left( \frac{5\text{-}year\ effective\ housing\ land\ supply\ (units)}{5\text{-}year\ housing\ supply\ target\ (units)} \right) * 5$$<br><br>**SPP (2014)** *para 110 & 125*<br>*http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0045/00453827.pdf* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Housing approvals | **units** | **units** | *Total number of units (all tenures) consented during the reporting period.* |
| Housing completions over the last 5 years | **units** | **units** | *Total number of new homes (all tenures) completed over the preceding 5-year period.* |
| Marketable employment land supply | **ha** | **ha** | *This indicator will usually be captured by a business or employment land audit on an annual basis.  The most up-to-date figure should be given, with the base date also reported.*<br>*Marketable employment land – land which as well as meeting business requirements, such land should have a secure planning status, be serviced or serviceable within 5 years, and be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.*<br><br>***SPP2 (2003)*** *para 10 (http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/47007/0026443.pdf) and*<br>***SPP (2014)*** *para 101 (http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0045/00453827.pdf).* |
| Employment land take-up during reporting year | **ha** | **ha** | *Quantity of land removed from the marketable supply due to the start of work on site during the reporting year (or the most recent 12-month period available), specifying the period concerned.* |

**B: NHI Key outcomes – Development Management:**

| Development Management: | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Planning** | | | |
| Percentage and number of applications subject to pre-application advice | # % | # % | *Planning applications decided during the year on which the planning authority had provided pre-application advice to the applicant normally including written advice. A number and percentage for this indicator is required.* |
| Percentage and number of major applications subject to processing agreement | # % | # % | *Applications decided during the year for which there had been a processing agreement, shared and understood and agreed between the applicant and planning authority, including a scheduled timetable for handling of the application. A number and percentage for this indicator is required.* |
| **Decision Making** | | | |
| Application approval rate | % | % | *Percentage figures; to be provided by the Scottish Government (Analytical Services), drawn from the data provided by planning authorities.* |
| Delegation rate | % | % | *Percentage figures; to be provided by the Scottish Government (Analytical Services), drawn from the data provided by planning authorities.* |
| Validation | % | % | *The percentage of applications which are validated upon first receipt.* |
| **Decision-making Timescales** | | | |
| Major Developments | weeks | weeks | *Average number of weeks from receipt of a valid planning application to decision. Figures to be provided by the Scottish Government (Analytical Services), drawn from the data provided by planning authorities. The figures used in the PPF report should be based on 'all applications' and not 'post – August 2009 applications'.* |
| Local developments (non-householder) | weeks | weeks | - |
| Householder developments | weeks | weeks | - |
| **Legacy Cases** | | | |
| Number cleared during reporting period | # | # | *Applications which are more than one-year-old. Provide details of the number of legacy cases cleared during the reporting period and the number remaining (as at 31 March).* |
| Number remaining | # | # | - |

## C: Enforcement activity

| | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|---|
| Time since enforcement charter published / reviewed<br>Requirement: review every 2 years | months | months | *Position as at 31 March. The number of months since the authority's enforcement charter was last published or reviewed and re-published.*<br><br>*Include hyperlink to the latest version of the charter.* |
| Complaints lodged and investigated | # | # | *Total enquiries made or complaints lodged about possible planning breaches which have been investigated.* |
| Breaches identified – no further action taken | # | # | *Potential breaches of planning control investigated.* |
| Cases closed | # | # | *Cases closed within this timeframe.* |
| Notices served | # | # | *Formal notices served including; enforcement notices; breach of condition notices; planning contravention notices; stop notices; temporary stop notices; fixed penalty notices, and Section 33 notices* |
| Direct Action | # | # | *Cases where direct action has been taken to resolve the breach* |
| Reports to Procurator Fiscal | # | # | *Reports passed to the Procurator Fiscal* |
| Prosecutions | # | # | *Number of prosecutions on planning enforcement activity led by the authority* |

**D: NHI Key outcomes – Commentary**

| Commentary | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|
| **Short contextual statement** | |
| Reasons/factors which have influenced performance and any increase/decrease | *You can use the text box to refer to the NHI table and provide a short contextual statement, focussing on reasons/factors which have influenced your authority's performance and any increase or decrease on past results. Authorities should focus on decision making timescales, however this text box can also be used to provide relevant context for the development land supply and delivery figures, such as the area or percentage of land covered by environmental designations or national parks. It should be used to explain any obvious 'jumps' in figures between years whether this is housing land supply, housing approvals or other changes which would benefit from further context.* |

# Part 5: Scottish Government Official Statistics

Scottish Government Official Statistics are drawn from quarterly returns by planning authorities. They are collated into an annual set of figures that is published on the Scottish Government website. The template below allows the information from these returns to be recorded in a consistent format. Additional guidance on how to access the statistics is included within the template itself.

## A: Decision-making timescales (based on 'all applications' timescales)

| Timescales | 2019-20 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Overall** | | | | |
| **Major developments** | # | **weeks** | **weeks** | ***Decision-making timescales***<br>*Information on decision-making timescales for planning and other applications will be provided by the Scottish Government (Analytical Services), drawn from the data provided by planning authorities. The figures used in the PPF report must be based on the 'all applications' timescale. You can simply copy/paste in the 2017-18 full year table we publish for the authority on the Scottish Government website. You can use the information you receive prior to its publication on the web.* |
| **Local developments (non-householder)** | # | **weeks** | **weeks** | |
| • Local: less than 2 months | (%) | | | |
| • Local: more than 2 months | (%) | | | |
| **Householder developments** | # | **weeks** | **weeks** | |
| • Local: less than 2 months | (%) | | | |
| • Local: more than 2 months | (%) | | | |
| **Housing Developments** | | | | *www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Planning/Publication* |
| **Major** | # | **weeks** | **weeks** | |
| **Local housing developments** | # | **weeks** | **weeks** | *It is important that the statistics give an accurate and reliable account of the timescales for handling applications. There will be an opportunity for planning authorities, when providing their data to the Scottish Government, to highlight particular cases where substantial, and clearly unavoidable, delays have occurred. Additionally, the planning authority should highlight at that time any applications where there has been written agreement between the authority and the applicant that no action should be taken on the application during a specified period. The figures provided by the Scottish Government for this* |
| • Local: less than 2 months | (%) | | | |
| • Local: more than 2 months | (%) | | | |
| **Business and Industry** | | | | |
| **Major** | # | **weeks** | **weeks** | |
| **Local business and industry developments** | **#** | **weeks** | **weeks** | |
| • Local: less than 2 months | **(%)** | | | |
| • Local: more than 2 months | **(%)** | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *section may therefore have been reasonably adjusted to provide a more accurate marker of performance.*<br><br>*For applications where the authority and applicant have agreed a timescale different from the 2 month and 4 month targets, for example where there are processing agreements in place, the statistics on decision times will be adjusted to reflect these agreements.* |
| **EIA Developments** | # | weeks | weeks | |
| **Other Consents**<br>• *As listed in the guidance(right)* | # | weeks | weeks | *Consents and certificates: Listed buildings and Conservation area consents, Control of Advertisement consents, Hazardous Substances consents, Established Use Certificates, certificates of lawfulness of existing use or development, notification on overhead electricity lines, notifications and directions under GPDO Parts 6 & & relating to agricultural and forestry development and applications for prior approval by Coal Authority or licensed operator under classes 60 & 62 of the GPDO.* |
| **Planning/legal agreements**<br>• Major: average time<br>• Local: average time | #<br>#<br># | weeks<br>weeks | weeks<br>weeks | *Legal obligations associated with a planning permission; concluded under section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 or section 69 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973* |

**B:  Decision-making: local reviews and appeals**

| Type | Total number of decisions No. | Original decision upheld | | | | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2019-20 | | 2018-2019 | | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | |
| **Local reviews** | | | | | | *Information on local review and appeal decisions will be provided by the Scottish Government (Analytical Services), drawn from the data provided by planning authorities.* |
| **Appeals to Scottish Ministers** | | | | | | |

**C:  Context**

*Text box: short contextual statement – focus on reasons/factors which have influenced performance and any increase/decrease*

## Part 6:  Workforce Information

Workforce information should be a snapshot of the authorities planning staff in position on the **31st of March 2020**. The information requested in this section is an integral part of providing the context for the information in parts 1-5.  The template below allows the information to be recorded in a consistent format, additional guidance on what to include is within the template itself.

| | Tier 1<br>*Chief Executive* | Tier 2<br>*Director* | Tier 3<br>*Head of Service* | Tier 4<br>*Manager* | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Head of Planning Service** | | | | | *Please note the tier of the most senior member of planning staff* |

| Staff Age Profile | Headcount | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|
| Under 30 | | *Approximate age profile of the staff noted above* |
| 30-39 | | |
| 40-49 | | |
| 50 and over | | |

| RTPI Chartered Staff | Headcount | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|
| Chartered staff | | *Approximate numbers of staff which are MRTPI* |

| Staff Structure | Structure Diagram | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|
| Noting the roles and job titles of staff within the planning authority hierarchy | | *Due to changes in local authority structures it has become increasingly difficult to measure the different ways in which to allocate staff to roles. HOPS have decided it is a better representation to include a staff structure diagram. Examples of these can be found below:*<br>*Inverclyde PPF 2018 page 37 or Fife PPF 2018 page 56* |

| |
|---|
| *Text box: short contextual statement – please describe the staffing set up* |

**Part 7:  Planning Committee Information**

The template below allows the information on the number of meetings and site visits during 2019-20 to be recorded in a consistent format, additional guidance on what to include is within the template itself.

| Committee & Site Visits | Number per year | Guidance on what to include |
|---|---|---|
| Full council meetings | | |
| Planning committees | | *References to committees also include National Park Authority Boards.* |
| Area committees | | *Where relevant* |
| Committee site visits | | *Number of sites (i.e. applications) visited by committee.* |
| Local Review Body | | *This relates to the number of meetings of the LRB.  The number of applications going to LRB are reported elsewhere.* |
| LRB site visits | | *Number of sites (i.e. applications) visited by the LRB.* |

# SECTION 5 - Performance Markers

National oversight of the performance of the Scottish Planning System is taken by a High-Level Group, chaired by the Minister for Local Government and Communities. Heads of Planning Scotland sit on this group alongside COSLA and the RTPI. In 2013 the group agreed a set of "Performance Markers" which allow the Scottish Government a consistent basis to consider performance.

Thus, the PPF feedback reports provided by the Scottish Government stem purely from an assessment of whether these markers have been met.  It is therefore essential that your PPF report provides the information needed by the Scottish Government to consider your performance against the markers. The content of your PPF report is your opportunity to provide the evidence and explanations in support of the performance story illustrated by the statistics.

The template below is for information only, setting out these markers, shows the measure that Scottish Government will apply, the policy background to the marker being applied and suggests where in your PPF you can evidence that this marker has been met. It is up to each planning authority if they wish to include a similar table for ease of referencing their PPF report content to the Performance Markers.

| | Performance Marker | Measure | Policy Background to Marker | Part of PPF report best suited to evidence this marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **DRIVING IMPROVED PERFORMANCE** | | | |
| 1 | Decision making: authorities demonstrating continuous evidence of reducing average timescales for all development types | - | Official Statistics and PPF reports | NHI<br>Scottish Government Official Statistics |
| 2 | Project management: offer of processing agreements (or other agreed project plan) made to prospective applicants in advance of all major applications and availability publicised on planning authority website | Y/N | Modernising the Planning System (Audit Scotland); SG website / template | NHI<br>Quality of Service and Engagement; |
| 3 | Early collaboration with applicants and consultees on planning applications:<br>- availability and promotion of pre-application discussions for all prospective applications<br>- clear and proportionate requests for supporting information | Y/N<br><br>Examples | White Paper; Delivering Planning Reform; Planning Reform Next Steps | NHI<br>Quality of Service and Engagement |
| 4 | Legal agreements: conclude (or reconsider) applications within 6 months of 'resolving to grant[3] | Reducing number of live applications more than 6 months after resolution to grant (from same time last year) | Official statistics; PPF reports; evidence of delays to major developments | Quality of Service and Engagement Governance |
| 5 | Enforcement charter updated / re-published | Within 2 years | Planning Act (s158A) | NHI |

---

[3] This will require production of supporting guidance, following wider stakeholder input

| 6 | Continuous improvements: <br> - show progress/improvement in relation to PPF National Headline Indicators <br> - progress ambitious and relevant service improvement commitments identified through PPF report | Progress on all commitments | Delivering Planning Reform; PPF Report | Culture of Continuous Improvement <br> Service Improvement Plan |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROMOTING THE PLAN-LED SYSTEM** | | | | |
| 7 | LDP (or LP) less than 5 years since adoption | Y/N | Planning Act (s16); Scottish Planning Policy | NHI <br> Quality of Outcomes <br> Quality of service and engagement |
| **8** | Development plan scheme demonstrates next LDP: <br> - on course for adoption within 5-year cycle <br> - project planned and expected to be delivered to planned timescale | Y/N <br> Y/N | Planning Act (s16); Scottish Planning Policy | NHI <br> Quality of Outcomes <br> Quality of service and engagement |
| 9 | Elected members engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation | Evidence of activity | | Quality of Service and Engagement <br> Governance |
| 10 | Cross-sector stakeholders, including industry, agencies and Scottish Government, engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation | Evidence of activity | | Quality of Service and Engagement <br> Governance |
| 11 | Production of regular and proportionate policy advice, for example through supplementary guidance, on information required to support applications | Evidence of activity | | Quality of Service and Engagement |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SIMPLIFYING AND STREAMLINING** | | | |
| 12 | Corporate working across services to improve outputs and services for customer benefit (e.g. protocols; joined-up services; single contact; joint pre-application advice) | Examples from the year | | Quality of Service and Engagement Governance |
| 13 | Sharing good practice, skills and knowledge between authorities | Evidence of activity to pass on and adopt good practice | Delivering Planning Reform; Planning Reform Next Steps | Culture of continuous improvement |
| | **DELIVERING DEVELOPMENT** | | | |
| 14 | Stalled sites/legacy cases: conclusion/withdrawal of planning applications more than one-year-old | Reducing number of applications more than one-year-old (from same time last year) | | Governance |
| 15 | Developer contributions: clear expectations<br> - set out in development plan (and/or emerging plan,) and<br> - in pre-application discussions | Y/N<br>Examples | | Quality of service and engagement |

Further information is provided below on markers 11 and 15, which call for evidence on policy advice and examples of developer contribution expectations respectively.

**Marker 11 – Regular and Proportionate Policy Advice**

Authorities need to provide clear evidence and information to demonstrate how this is being achieved and delivered. This could include the following:

- A description of published guidance and advice with reference to particular examples. If you have specific advice on information required to support applications, explain what this is and how it is proportionate. If applicable, provide evidence of where policy advice or guidance has been developed in response to particular issues. This could include feedback from customers, market conditions or to improve matters such as efficiency, certainty and consistency.
- Include feedback/customer testimonies, where possible.
- Use case studies/examples, where possible, to help demonstrate how the policy advice is regular and proportionate.
- Provide evidence that the policy complies with Circular 3/2012 and key themes promoted.
- If you have protocols in place (for example a shared service), be sure to explain them.

**Marker 15 – Developer Contributions**

Authorities need to be clear on how the LDP and supplementary guidance ensures this. Evidence could include the following:

- Examples/reference to the LDP policy/supplementary guidance specifically covering this and how it is clear, with a description of how it is applied in practice.
- Aim to include reference to Circular 3/2012 on planning obligations and how the policy/supplementary guidance aligns with this.
- Explain and provide some evidence of how developer contributions are set out and achieved at pre-application stage – examples, case studies, customer feedback and testimony.