



Minutes

Title of meeting	PINS Board Meeting		
Date	18 July	Time	12:30
Venue	Brunel, Temple Quay House, Bristol		
Chair	Sara Weller (SW) – Chairman		
Present	Jayne Erskine (JE) – Non Executive Director David Holt (DH) – Non Executive Director Susan Johnson (SJ) – Non Executive Director Sarah Richards (SR) – Chief Executive Tony Thickett (TT) – Director, Wales Ben Linscott (BL) – Director of Inspectors Navees Rahman (NR) – Director of Corporate Services		
In attendance	Simon Gallagher (SG) – Director of Planning, DCLG Mark Southgate (MS) – Director, Major Casework (item 5) Tom Warth (TW) – Head of Volume Casework (item 5) Mark Warren (MW) – Head of Finance (item 5 & 7) Tim Guy (TG) – Director, Transformation (item 6) Natasha Perrett (NP) – Board Secretary		
Observer	Rebecca Phillips (RP) – Inspector Sub-Group Leader, Wales		

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 16 February 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
6.	Mark Southgate transferred to Sarah Richards	MS to take forward the principles and next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to reflect the experience of all customers • measures should reflect end-to-end experience (and start point, receipt to decision or valid to decision) • they should be simple to understand • they should be comparable, so customers in different casework areas can more easily compare relative performance • a backstop should be added to the measures with a maximum time to deliver • when customers reach the 	6.10	Action closed – PINS Board agreed to close this action as it has been superseded by the actions agreed at the 14 September 2017 Board, item 6b on the agenda – Measures.

		maximum time to deliver, make sure we have clear action points.		
7.	Mark Southgate transferred to Sarah Richards	Think about unintended consequences of change measures and be clear about what happens for a customer when we are not able to fulfil the commitment.	6.12	Action closed – PINS Board agreed to close this action as it has been superseded by the actions agreed at the 14 September 2017 Board, item 6b on the agenda – Measures.

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 18 May 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
2.	Ben Linscott, Mark Southgate and Phil Hammond	Bring to the September/ November Board an assessment of the impact of the new Government and the impact on the pipeline of work to PINS and inspector resource.	4.3 & 8.1	November Board
6.	Sarah Richards	Publish performance ranges to the Appeal Casework Portal and to make clear what we will do if an appeal is submitted with missing documents.	5.6	Ahead of 6th September 2017 – for September Board meeting.
7.	Tim Guy & Sarah Richards	Consider how the transformation programme will improve performance to reduce the average time over the lifetime of its delivery.	5.14	Action closed – PINS Board agreed to close this action as it has been superseded by the actions agreed at the 14 September 2017 Board, item 6b on the agenda – Measures.
10.	Mark Southgate	Scenario plan how we resource beyond the need at band 3 and discuss with the department the cost of being over resourced in the band 3 pool. Bring a review of band 3 resource requirements to the September Board.	6.7 & 6.9	Complete – see attached update paper

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 18 July 2017

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
1.	Natasha Perrett	Update the target deadline for action 9 from the May minutes should be September not October.	2.3	Complete – amendment made to the People Committee forward planner.
2.	Mark	Look at how we improve	5.3	Complete – see

	Southgate	performance, considering new assumptions around inspector intake, what does the trajectory look like and what do we need to do to bring performance back on track.		attached action update paper.
3.	Mark Southgate & Mark Warren transferred to Sarah Richards	Provide more data on the variability of performance and show the individual outliers with an aim to narrow the variability.	5.4	Complete - Item 6b on the September agenda
4.	Mark Southgate & Sean Canavan transferred to Sarah Richards	Produce better Local Plan KPIs.	5.4	Complete - Item 6b on the September agenda
5.	Natasha Perrett/ Katie Hartwright	People Committee to explore the increase in staff absence at the September meeting.	5.6	Complete - item 4 on the September People Committee agenda.
6.	Mark Southgate	Consider, if you were to move one to two day inquiries into the bespoke process what would you need to put in place e.g. a strong complaints process, potential charging for dual tracking, understand which customers will be affected by this change and more active customer satisfaction tracking in this area.	5.9	Complete - see attached action update paper
7.	Mark Southgate & Tom Warth	Come back to the September Board with a proposed new approach to hearing and inquiry measures, what are the risks and provide assurance on how we mitigate the risks.	5.12	Complete - see attached action update paper
8.	Tim Guy	Update the Board at the September meeting on the Transformation Programme and process for capturing benefits.	6.2	Complete - Item 5 on the September agenda
9.	Tim Guy	Update the Board at the November meeting on progress on benefits realisation and the more detailed business case following outputs of the IWSP	6.13	15th November 2017 - for the November Board.

		discovery phase.		
10.	Natasha Perrett	<p>Forward planner updates:</p> <p><u>September</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KPIs reporting – s78 Written Representations progress and the drivers of variability and better Local Plans reporting. • Hearings and Inquiries – new target proposals for bespoke timetable, addressing the mitigation of risks and highlight the pros and cons. • Remove the holding slot for a manifesto update. • Transformation Programme update and process for tracking and capturing benefits. • Add analysis of absence to the September People Committee forward planner. <p><u>November</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transformation Programme – benefits realisation progress and business case following outputs of the IWSP discovery phase. 	8.1	Complete

Minutes

1.0	<p>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed staff observer Rebecca Phillips to the Board.</p> <p>1.2 The Chair called for Declarations of Interest (DoI) of which there were none.</p>
2.0	<p>Minutes of 18 May & 8 June Board Meetings – Part one</p> <p>2.1 No further amendments were received for the May and June minutes.</p> <p>2.2 TT confirmed the Wales Stakeholder event will take place on 11 October.</p> <p>2.3 The target deadline for action 9 from the May minutes should be September not October.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>2a) Subject to the amendment at 2.3, both sets of minutes reflect a true and accurate record of May and June meetings.</p>

3.0	<p>Committee minutes</p> <p>a) Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee (CQPSC) – 18 July</p> <p>3.1 SJ update the Board on the key messages from the CQPSC meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Steering Group (PSG) update - CQPSC were given a sense of NI casework, policy implications and the impact this is having on the organisation and resources. CQPSC Dashboard – there was a long discussion around performance and the likelihood of hitting the required ministerial targets. There has been an increase in the propensity to appeal and a higher turnover in Inspector resource which is having an impact on our workload and resource forecasting. These changes are outside of the trend and pattern we have seen previously. Customer Strategy – the Committee was pleased to see the Customer Strategy and that the customer is a critical thread throughout the Transformation programme. The Committee asked the team to make sure we do not carry out so much discovery that we are not able to get to delivery. The Committee also asked for customer metrics to be looked at in a different way, asking the question ‘are we easy to do business with as an organisation?’ Digital Strategy – the Committee was pleased to see the customer is at the heart of the strategy. The Committee discussed how the Digital Strategy drives value in the organisation, and suggested the Digital Strategy is shared in the organisation to raise awareness and to create a digitally minded workforce. Quality measures –the Committee reviewed the analysis and discussed the effort needed upfront to stop challenges later in the appeal process. The Committee will look at this again at the October meeting. <p><u>Agreed:</u></p> <p>3a) To note the update from the CQPSC Chair.</p>
4.0	<p>PINS update</p> <p><u>CEO Report</u></p> <p>4.1 The Board discussed the engagement challenges as the Transformation Programme gains momentum. A number of events have taken place in Temple Quay House. Pete Bond and Charlotte Hollis have been working with Inspectors to make sure we engage with our home based workforce and bring this work to life.</p> <p>4.2 It was agreed it is important to make sure the engagement and communication is two way and we must make sure people talk to us as well as being talked too. SR explained work is underway to look at how we make sure Inspectors are able to engage with the Transformation work. TT explained the People Workstream is looking at how we engage and give</p>

people opportunities to get involved. SR is keen to bring staff into the various projects which form the Transformation Programme.

4.3 There was some discussion around the SEO and Sub Group Leader talent management work which had taken place at Management Team. SR explained this work is feeding into succession planning. SG suggested taking talent management to the next level by considering how we might join up requirements across into DCLG, and how DCLG might support development programmes in PINS.

Ministers and priorities

4.4 SG gave an update on Alok Sharma's activity since he was appointed as Housing and Planning Minister. Understandably, the Grenfell tragedy has taken up much of the Ministers time and has been his priority.

4.5 Going forward there will continue to be a focus on delivering the Housing White Paper.

Agreed:

4a) To note the CEO's update.

4b) To note Simon Gallagher's update.

5.0

Performance

Review of PINS Board dashboard

5.1 The performance team are currently reviewing all of the management information (MI) across the organisation and how the MI is produced for all meetings. The team will be engaging with the Committee Chairs as part of the review.

5.2 There had been discussion about performance and interpretation of the data at the CQPSC meeting that morning. It was agreed the dots on the graph, arrows signposting future performance and narrative included in the dashboards needed to link together.

5.3 Having explored the stable position reported against s78 planning appeals, MS explained the factors behind this behaviour which are the propensity to appeal has risen and an unexpected high level of inspector attrition were affecting performance. SW asked MS to look at how we improve performance, considering new assumptions around inspector intake, what does the trajectory look like and what do we need to do to bring performance back on track.

5.4 SG commented on the improvements to performance and that it had been heading in the right direction, but was concerned to see this improvement now trailing off. Whilst the new format is really helpful, SG would like to see a little bit more information around the variability of performance and to have a conversation about this. This also includes better

Local Plan KPIs. SW said information on individual outliers will help the Board to understand what is behind the variability in performance. MW explained this information does exist.

5.5 On financial reporting, SG said he would like information on budget performance, NR explained year to date variances will be include starting from next month. SG said this will help the Board to focus on what decisions need to be made, where any planned savings are reporting red.

5.6 It was agreed the increased levels of staff absence would be explored at the September People Committee meeting. DH asked for information around absence duration to be included. SW said it would also be helpful to understand why inspectors are underreporting absence.

Hearings and Inquiries deep dive

5.7 MS updated the Board on 1-2 day inquiry performance and customer behaviour affecting our 22 weeks target:

- Indication is that our change of approach since January 2017 to sourcing an inspector is having a positive impact on timeliness.
- 40% of customers (since January 2017) have requested event dates outside of the 22 week target; this is due appellant or LPA resource limitations amongst other things.
- 14% of appeals that were started as a 1-2 day inquiry were changed to the bespoke inquiry timetable.
- 30% of 1-2 day inquiries have been withdrawn or are in abeyance
- Only 2 cases (of 22) since 2017 were adversely impacted due to lack of specialist inspector availability.

5.8 The Board discussed the impact of withdrawing bespoke and non-bespoke inquiry appeals and the potential to charge a cancellation fee. TT and BL said inspectors could instigate an award of costs if necessary, but PINS would not receive any of the funds.

5.9 MS made the recommendation to the Board to stop using a separate process for 1-2 day inquiries. These should form part of the bespoke timetable process. This will allow our customers to offer event dates that work for them and the LPA. SW asked MS to consider, if you were to move one to two day inquiries into the bespoke process what would you need to put in place e.g. a strong complaints process, potential charging for dual tracking, understand which customers will be affected by this change and more active customer satisfaction tracking in this area.

5.10 The second recommendation MS made to the Board was to change how we measure bespoke inquiry performance. MS proposed we focus on the percentage where we meet the parties' preferred event date and the time from end of event to decision. This will be used as a measure of success and will help us to understand why some parties are not given their preferred

date.

5.11 Concern was raised around timetables drifting due to parties limited availability. MS said we are able to test and gather regular feedback where we cannot meet preferred dates. SG said it is important dates are agreed by the parties through fair conversations.

5.12 It was agreed MS should come back to the September Board with a proposed new approach to hearing and inquiry measures, what are the risks and provide assurance on how we mitigate the risks. RP suggested consideration should also be given to venue availability. This can be a constraint for LPAs.

5.13 TT referred to the changes to the inquiry process in Wales. The changes allow the inspector to deal with some matters via the written representations procedure which reduces inquiry time, BL confirmed he is looking into this. MS said we can also make more use of the statement of common ground.

5.14 TW highlighted hearing appeals have the same ministerial target as written representation appeals, yet there are practical and procedural differences which make the 14 week target difficult to meet.

5.15 Start to event performance varies for a number of reasons, such as the initial procedure requested and the time taken to identify the appropriate procedure, parties not always accepting the first event date offered and availability of inspectors. The procedural processes around identifying the procedure and offering dates is being reviewed.

5.16 Event to decision time is approximately 7-8 weeks, work is underway to understand why it takes this long. DH asked how are we using inspector time? This might have an impact on their ability to deliver decisions and making them less productive. TW is doing some work around additional information being presented at the event that will also have an impact, BL is also feeding into this work.

Agreed:

5a) MS to look at how we improve performance, considering new assumptions around inspector intake, what does the trajectory look like and what do we need to do to ring performance back on track.

5b) MS/ MW to provide more data on the variability of performance and show the individual outliers with an aim to narrow the variability.

5c) MS to produce better Local Plan KPIs.

5d) People Committee to explore the increase in staff absence at the September meeting.

5e) SW asked MS to consider, if you were to move one to two day inquiries into the bespoke process what would you need to put in place e.g. a strong complaints process, potential charging for dual tracking, understand which customers will be affected by this change and more active customer

	<p>satisfaction tracking in this area.</p> <p>5f) It was agreed MS should come back to the September Board with a proposed new approach to hearing and inquiry measures, what are the risks and provide assurance on how we mitigate the risks.</p>
6.0	<p>Transformation update</p> <p>6.1 The Board reviewed the “Transformation programme highlights” report which is currently reporting a delivery confidence assessment (DCA) of amber. TG has made this assessment based on the key programme controls and delivery milestones. The appropriate level of Governance for the programme is now in place and with the workstreams becoming active, TG explained the DCA level will improve.</p> <p>6.2 TG will provide an update to the Board in September on benefits management strategy and change assurance. Government Internal Audit Agency (GIAA) will be carrying out external assurance work.</p> <p>6.3 Further resource has been recruited to support the Transformation Directorate; one of the Programme Managers is a shared resource and will spend 50% of their time supporting the Heathrow project.</p> <p>6.4 The Transformation team have held 2 “all staff” transformation briefings. The team also continue to hold monthly “tea with transformation” sessions.</p> <p>6.5 The Inspector Workforce Scheduling Project (IWSP) received approval at the DCLG Investment Sub-Committee (ISC). The team will be taking an updated and more detailed business case back to the ISC in November, after completion of the discovery phase, for a further assessment on benefits and costs.</p> <p>6.6 There is significant risk around PINS’ capacity and capability to deliver the Transformation programme. TG drew the Board’s attention to the mitigating options and suggested the likely solution would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correctly balance Run v Change 2. Prioritise Change, based on benefits 6. Create a flexible resource pool 3. Upskill workstream staff (through training and development). <p>6.7 SJ suggested moving number 3 further up the list, anticipating that there may be hidden skillsets amongst staff. If we can develop scope for on the job training to help deliver change, this move could also improve productivity.</p> <p>6.8 DH said we need to look at which staff we have to help deliver the programme, and provide opportunities to staff to be part of the programme, with the knock-on benefits of offering opportunities to others by backfilling posts. However, DH emphasised the need for clear discussions and development paths that included a “return ticket”. JE asked if there is a leadership and development programme for those in lower grades and if we have offered any volunteering opportunities to join the TP. SR referred to the</p>

	<p>talent management grid which has been discussed by Management Team.</p> <p>6.9 SG said asked who owns the overall narrative for the TP and monitors the end goal and delivery.</p> <p>6.10 The Board highlighted that, as the TP team enter the discovery phase on the IWSP, we should seek to be clear about the two to three key benefits that we need to deliver and make sure these are suitably prioritised and resourced for successful delivery.</p> <p>6.11 DH asked for a chart to be developed which shows the delivery milestones of plans for the highest benefits we need to achieve.</p> <p>6.12 There was a discussion about the early stage of this work; SG said the Board should ensure it allows the Transformation team enough time to mobilise and define the key work modules and get a robust plan in place. SW agreed, and said it would be important for TG to keep the team and Board focussed on delivering the major benefits and actively manage towards the unit cost reductions to be achieved. Whilst we must stay focussed on delivering the milestones within the activity plan, the ultimate goal is that the outcomes must also be clear and delivered.</p> <p>6.13 It was agreed the charts presented were helpful and at the right level of detail for the Board. SW asked TG to come back to the November Board with a benefits tracker and an update on the primary benefits identified as part of the IWSP discovery phase, which would underpin the IWSP Business Case.</p> <p><u>Agreed:</u></p> <p>6a) TG to update the Board at the September meeting on the Transformation Programme and process for capturing benefits.</p> <p>6b) TG to update the Board at the November meeting on progress on benefits realisation and the more detailed business case following outputs of the IWSP discovery phase.</p>
7.0	<p>Medium Term Financial Plan & Productivity measures - OFFICIAL</p> <p>This section of the meeting is captured under part two official minutes.</p>
8.0	<p>Review of meeting & AOB:</p> <p>8.1 The Board agreed the following forward planner updates:</p> <p><u>September</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KPIs reporting – s78 Written Representations progress and the drivers of variability and better Local Plans reporting. • Hearings and Inquiries – new target proposals for bespoke timetable, addressing the mitigation of risks and highlight the pros and cons. • Remove the holding slot for a manifesto update. • Transformation Programme update and process for tracking and capturing benefits. • Add analysis of absence to the September People Committee forward

planner.

November

- Transformation Programme – benefits realisation progress and business case following outputs of the IWSP discovery phase.

Agreed:

8a) The updates to the PINS Board forward planner.

Next meeting: 14 September 2017, 12.30pm – 3.30pm