



# Minutes

<b>Title of meeting</b>	PINS Board Meeting
<b>Date</b>	14 January 2016 <b>Time</b> 12.30pm
<b>Venue</b>	PINS Boardroom, Temple Quay House
<b>Chair</b>	Sara Weller ( <b>SW</b> ) – Chairman
<b>Present</b>	Steve Quartermain ( <b>SQ</b> ) – Chief Executive Janet Goodland ( <b>JG</b> ) – Non Executive Director Jayne Erskine ( <b>JE</b> ) – Non Executive Director Susan Johnson ( <b>SJ</b> ) - Non Executive Director David Holt ( <b>DH</b> ) - Non Executive Director Mark Southgate ( <b>MS</b> ) – Chief Operating Officer Tony Thickett ( <b>TT</b> ) – Director, Wales Jon Banks ( <b>JB</b> ) – Acting Director, Corporate Services Tracy Hodgkiss ( <b>TH</b> ) – Director, People & Change Peter Schofield ( <b>PS</b> ) – Director General, DCLG (dialled in)
<b>In attendance</b>	Phil Hammond ( <b>PH</b> ) – Director of Casework (items 5) Tom Warth ( <b>TW</b> ) – Head of NI Operations (item 5) Rachael Pipkin ( <b>RP</b> ) – Head of Knowledge Centre (item 6) Debbie Moore ( <b>DM</b> ) – Head of Governance (item 6 & 7) Tracey Jones ( <b>TJ</b> ) – Programme Support Manager (item 7a) Peter Sloman ( <b>PSI</b> ) – Head of Finance & Commercial (item 7b) Jan Ryan ( <b>JR</b> ) – Head of ICT & Estates (item 7 c) Natasha Perrett ( <b>NP</b> ) – Board Secretary

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 14 October meeting

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
12.	Tony Thickett	The same data should be captured for Wales for benchmarking purposes.	10.7	<b>By 29 February</b> - data gathered on unit costs for England and Wales, appeals and other casework. The unit cost for Wales is higher. Next step is to analyse the data to understand why and what, if any, meaningful comparisons can be drawn with England.

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 11 November 2015

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
6.	Phil Hammond	Rethink the CTP project risks and understand what will stop us getting to the April Steady state.	6.8	<b>Complete</b> – risks considered at the January People Committee meeting.
11.	Jan Ryan	Present deliverables and measures of success at the January Board meeting.	8.9	<b>By 31 March</b> - Success factors will follow.

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 9 December 2015

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
4.	Debbie Moore	Bring Board effectiveness review proposals back to the next Board meeting.	3.6	<b>Complete</b> – DM and Jo Esson met with Internal Audit on 27 January. The audit will take place in April, Jo Esson will lead.
8.	Tony Thickett	Arrange for Susan Johnson to visit the team in PINS Wales in February.	4.7	<b>Complete</b> – SJ visiting PINS Wales on 9 February.
11.	Jon Banks & Peter Sloman	Give more detail on the delivery plans, plus provide a schedule of risks and opportunities on the saving to be delivered at the January Board meeting	5.21	<b>By 1 March</b> – to be included in the PINS Board pack for the March Board.

## Part One

### Schedule of Actions – 14 January meeting

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
1.	Natasha Perrett	Amend the deadline for action 12 of the October minutes.	2.3	<b>Complete</b>
2.	Natasha Perrett	Send the new NEDs the dates for stakeholder and inspector training events.	2.4	<b>Complete</b>
3.	Mark Southgate	Add the all live casework table to the scorecard. The number of appeals received and decisions issued should be added to table.	5.4 & 8.2	<b>Complete</b> – the live casework table will be attached as an annex to the scorecard for the February pack and a revised scorecard is to be presented to the March Board.
4.	<b>Phil Hammond/</b> Mark Southgate	A CTP forecast should be provided at the February Board to show the degree of progress	5.7 & 8.2	<b>By 2 March</b> – to be included in the MI pack for the

		being made. A trajectory should be added which shows where we thought we would be and if we have achieved it. A commentary should be included which explains the current position with a forward look.		March Board.
5.	<b>Steve Quartermain/</b> Peter Schofield	Discuss demand management of the appeal service and how we might encourage applicants to renegotiate their planning applications with the LPA.	5.11	<b>Complete</b>
6.	Phil Hammond/ Philip Oldfield	Provide an update on the move from classic to CTP at the February Board meeting.	5.12	<b>Complete –</b> session scheduled for 11 February after PINS Board. Papers included in the PINS Board pack.
7.	Phil Hammond	Prepare a briefing for new NEDs to explain the steps in the appeals process and relate this to the current backlog MI.	5(e)	<b>Complete –</b> session scheduled for 11 February after PINS Board.
8.	Rachael Pipkin	Plot the likelihood of the emerging risks (low, medium or high).	6.5	<b>By 2 March –</b> assessment of likelihood of risk being reviewed and will be incorporated into the next report to ARAC.
9.	Steve Quartermain	Discuss with Ruth Stanier the policy development for Local Plan implementation.	6.9	<b>Complete</b>
10.	David Holt	Give consideration to the reporting of emerging risks to the PINS Board or ARAC.	6.10	<b>By 17 March following March ARAC.</b>
11.	Steve Quartermain/ Natasha Perrett	Ensure Workforce Planning is brought back to the Board in Q1 2016.	6(d)	<b>Complete –</b> item added to the March PINS Board forward planner.
12.	Jon Banks	JB to share an early draft of the MI pack and to bring the draft MI pack to the March Board which covers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operations</li> <li>• Customer Quality</li> <li>• Finance</li> <li>• People</li> <li>• Risk</li> <li>• Programme delivery.</li> </ul>	7.6 & 7.7	<b>By 2 March –</b> Board pack issue date.
13.	Natasha Perrett	Send the core narrative to SJ and DH.	7.18	<b>Complete –</b> included in the

				induction pack issued on 28 January.
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------

## Minutes

1.0	<p><b>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed the newly appointed non-executive directors (NEDs) Susan Johnson (SJ) and David Holt (DH) to their first Board meeting.</p> <p>1.2 The Chair called for declarations of interest of which there were none.</p>
2.0	<p><b>Minutes of 14 December Board Meeting (Part One)</b></p> <p>2.1 JB updated the Board on action 4 of the December minutes (Board effectiveness review proposals). Internal Audit will be conducting the review in the new financial year. JB confirmed the audit will include all of the Committees.</p> <p>2.2 The Board discussed the style of the minutes, SQ suggested as part of the effectiveness review Internal Audit look at the style of the Board minutes.</p> <p>2.3 TT explained action 12 of the October minutes (data gathering for PINS Wales) will be complete by the end of January.</p> <p>2.4 The Board discussed the annual stakeholder and inspector training events. NP to send the dates to the new NEDs.</p> <p>2.5 JB updated the Board on action 12 of the September minutes (improvements to the online service are made quickly). JB explained this action has been taken forward and contact made with customers where possible.</p> <p><b><u>Agreed:</u></b></p> <p>2a) The minutes reflect an accurate record of the December Board meeting.</p> <p>2b) NP to amend the deadline for action 12 of the October minutes.</p> <p>2c) NP to send the new NEDs the dates for stakeholder and inspector training events.</p>
3.0	<p><b>Committee Chairs: updates</b></p> <p><b>(a) People Committee (meeting of 14 January)</b></p> <p>3.1 JE explained the Committee's main focus was on the People Strategy and People Survey results. The Committee also discussed and agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TH should arrange for a "pulse" survey to be undertaken to test the action against the people survey to date.</li> <li>• Further investigation should be undertaken of the people survey verbatim comments concerning IT, to get a better view of what "better IT" means.</li> <li>• The NEDs should be provided with a short list of questions to explore when they visit teams and then feedback findings to the Board. Continued focus on performance management</li> <li>• Specific need for improved Objective setting and follow up on training</li> </ul>

	<p>courses for the Senior Leadership Team (SLT).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper on pay policy was accepted. The Committee particularly liked the clarity of the objectives, options and proposals.</li> </ul> <p><b>(b) Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (minutes of 3 December meeting, verbally reported at the December Board)</b></p> <p>3.2 No further comments were received for the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee minutes.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>3a) To note the updates from the Committee Chairs.</p>
4.0	<p><b>Chief Executive's update</b></p> <p>4.1 Work is underway on the induction programme for Sarah Richard's arrival as PINS CEO. Sarah will be joining PINS on the 14 March.</p> <p>4.2 SQ referred to the December Board meeting where there was a discussion around returning to business as usual (BAU) in casework. SQ reminded the Board casework is not static, with the 10% increase in appeal numbers this is a volatile environment and BAU represents a moving target.</p> <p>4.3 The terms of reference and timetable for the follow up Internal Audit review on management information reporting, have been agreed and work will commence in January. Background papers will be provided by the end of January. The plan is to receive Internal Audit's report at the March Board meeting.</p> <p>4.4 Work is underway on the accommodation moves which forms part of the spending review. Natalie Coombs and JB are taking this forward with team champions. There has been a lot of engagement with staff; the programme of moves are due to start in February.</p> <p>4.5 JE referred to paragraph 3.1 and asked why the number of inspectors recruited was less than envisaged. SQ explained this was due to the quality of candidates and therefore the number of people we appointed. The target was to appoint 40 new inspectors; only 32 have been offered appointments.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>4a) To note the update from the CEO.</p>
5.0	<p><b>Monitoring performance</b></p> <p>5.1 Work is underway to review PINS management information (MI) with an aim to have a 'record once and use often' approach. SQ said we are in a much stronger position on understanding the backlog, and the governance structure for the Casework Transformation Project (CTP) will allow the new process to gain traction.</p> <p>5.2 SQ suggested disaggregating the measures for reporting against the backlog and CTP, to demonstrate and give assurance to the Board that delivery under the CTP model is better.</p>

5.3 The Board discussed the all live casework table (annex 1). MS explained by the end of March we expect to have all of the admin stages under control and operating as BAU. Cases will then pass into being inspector ready; cases in this category will grow as the admin backlog is reduced until Inspector resource reaches the required levels.

5.4 It was agreed the table in annex 1 should form a regular part of the KPIs to the Board. JG suggested the addition of appeals received figures at the top table and decisions issued figures at the bottom of the table. This will be incorporated into the next version of the table

5.5 PS expressed concern about the realism of the steady state figures in the table as we are still above the figures. SQ explained the rise in registry was due to the Christmas period. There was a surge in the number of appeals submitted before industry closed for the holidays. Before this period, figures were reducing to steady state. MS explained these figures are reviewed by the management on a weekly basis to ensure progress is being made.

5.6 The Board discussed the table on page 4 of the scorecard. PH explained this is a mix of all casework under the CTP and classic models. Under the CTP model cases are allocated to an inspector early on in the process. PH suggested splitting the classic figures and CTP figures to demonstrate the return to BAU through CTP.

5.7 SW said a CTP forecast to the Board to show the degree of progress being made would be helpful. DH said a trajectory should be added which shows where we thought we would be at this stage and if we have achieved it. A commentary should be included which explains the current position with a forward look. Trajectory charts at the end of the report already go some way towards fulfilling this requirement.

5.8 SJ said the forecast for the inspectors we expect to appoint should be reviewed and the forecast amended to understand what this will do to the backlog.

5.9 The Board discussed the rise in appeal submissions and how we monitor the pattern of demand. SJ asked if we carry out any analysis or have any visibility of upstream numbers from Local Planning Authorities (LPAs). MS said we do have the analysis on applications being submitted and refused by LPAs, but it is more difficult to track the propensity of applicants to appeal.

5.10 PH said there is more we can do to get better visibility on bigger cases so we have can have a proactive approach.

5.11 The Board discussed demand management of the appeal service and how we might encourage applicants to renegotiate their planning applications with the LPA eg through piloting communication accompanying letters refusing planning permission which direct appellants towards their best next steps. SQ and PS agreed to discuss this further.

5.12 MS explained that with the CTP project manager in place, we will be looking to use the disciplines and principles on our other projects. SW asked if we will be on track to deliver the CTP project and move to new processes in April. PH indicated that this was probably not the case.

5.13 PH said the new tranche of inspectors will be working in CTP, and all band 1 and band 2 inspectors will be working electronically on s78 written representations cases by the end of January. This is a significant move. All other casework is being processed under the classic model and we need to bring this down to 5000 cases. PH (or Phillip Oldfield (PO)) will provide an update on the move from classic to CTP at the February Board meeting.

5.14 The Board discussed the complexity of understanding the overall Appeals processing steps, and the potential confusion arising from the various descriptors used (eg start, registry etc). A briefing should be prepared for new NEDs (which existing NEDs were welcome to attend) to explain the core appeals process, and thought would be given to simplifying and standardising the terms used to create greater clarity.

**Agreed:**

5a) MS to add the all live casework table to the scorecard. The number of appeals received and decisions issued should be added to table.

5b) A CTP forecast should be provided at the February Board to show the degree of progress being made. A trajectory should be added which shows where we thought we would be and if we have achieved it. A commentary should be included which explains the current position with a forward look.

5c) SQ and PS to discuss demand management of the appeal service and how we might encourage applicants to renegotiate their planning applications with the LPA.

5d) PH/PO to provide an update on the move from classic to CTP at the February Board meeting.

5 e) PH to prepare a briefing for new NEDs to explain the steps in the appeals process and relate this to the current backlog MI.

6.0

**Strategic Risk Register (SRR), including emerging risks**

Emerging risks register

6.1 The emerging risks register was developed following concerns raised at the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee about proposals in the pipeline which may cause risks for PINS.

6.2 RP will make sure the register is visible at the Senior Leadership Team, Management Board and Group Manager meetings. Where emerging risks turn into real and close risks RP will transfer to the SRR.

6.3 DH said the paper was useful and thought it added a layer to the issues and risk around resource planning. DH was pleased to see the register at the Board and said normally he would expect it as an item at the ARAC with an annual review at the Board. SW suggested that the emerging risks register and top risk deep dive should continue to come to the Board, but that a decision should be made in due course by DH on where the various risk documents will report.

6.4 JE asked if we have modelled any of the risks into workforce plans. MS said he is currently discussing with DCLG colleagues.

6.5 RP was asked to plot the likelihood and impact of the emerging risks (low, medium or high). RP will discuss this with Heads of Service (HoS).

Strategic Risk Register (SRR)

6.6 The Board discussed S10. JB explained the CACI project brief will be discussed by Management Board on the 19 January. This will cover the replacement strategy for the Inspector Scheduling System (ISS). DH asked if the residual risk is correct. JB confirmed it is seen as low risk, high impact.

6.7 SW referred to risk S2 and said it was still unclear who is responsible for workforce planning, what we are doing to improve it, what the model is and what is in the model. We need to go back to the first principles and look at the inputs and outputs and the quality of the data and assumptions underpinning it. In the Business Plan, workforce planning needs to be flagged as a more substantive issue and at present the mitigations are not holistic enough. DM said the robustness of workforce planning has improved, however the Board confirmed it would like to revisit this in its forward agenda.

6.8 PS said there was a broader risk around changes in policy and initiatives that may impact on PINS and resourcing going forward. PS asked if the relationships with DCLG policy colleagues are good enough, to get a clear sense of emerging policy ideas which are being developed. SQ said these need to be improved further, Helen Adlard and Ben Linscott used to have conversations with policy colleagues and these need to return going forward. This action could be picked up by SQ when he returned to CLG as Chief Planner.

6.9 There was discussion about the scale and impact of requirements for PINS involvement in the requirement for Local Plans to be completed by 2017, DCLG will be developing the policy over the coming months. SQ will pick this up with Ruth Stanier and team.

**Agreed:**

6a) RP to plot the likelihood and impact of the emerging risks (low, medium or high).

6b) SQ to discuss with Ruth Stanier the policy development around Local Plan implementation.

6c) DH to give consideration to the reporting of emerging risks.

6d) SQ/NP to ensure Workforce Planning is brought back to the Board in Q1 2016.

7.0 **Business Plan**

Management Information (MI)

7.1 TJ explained we are currently looking at our MI, with a view to creating a 'record once and use many times' approach. This will include streamlining the



process and number of people involved. The MI will be used by Management Board and the Executive Groups which will then be linked to the PINS Board and Committees. The new approach will involve HoS in the day to day management of the organisation.

7.2 JB said 4 reports will be produced. The aim is to get the reporting right for the start of the new financial year.

7.3 Reputational risk was shown as reporting to the People Committee. JG said the MI for this risk should report to the CQPSC.

7.4 DH said it is important each report has an owner and only the owner creates and changes to the report. This helps with consistency and should be made clear across the organisation. Under the governance structure, DH said whilst the finance report is monitored at the ARAC, the CQPSC should review the year performance in line with the ToR.

7.5 The Board discussed customer quality. SW said this is missing at present as this is not reviewed by the Operations Group which is the Executive Group which reports to the CQPSC. SW asked where this is reported. SQ said there is now a 4<sup>th</sup> group, the Knowledge and Professional Standards group and consideration should be given to where this group also reports. SQ suggested this group is included as part of the review of effectiveness to see if this should merge with an existing group or if it should report to the CQPSC.

7.6 SW asked for the MI pack for the Board to cover:

- Operations
- Customer Quality
- Finance
- People
- Risk
- Programme delivery.

7.7 JB will bring a draft pack to the March Board for the new financial year. SW suggested that she might see an early draft for comment.

#### IT Strategy and Roadmap 2016-19

7.8 JR explained by the end of the financial year we will complete the 2012-15 IT strategy having moved to the Connect shared service desk and moved all casework to Horizon.

7.9 The 2016-19 IT strategy supports the Business Plan and is based on principles of digital first, cloud first and sharing services across the DCLG group. "One corporate service for IT" is moving quickly and work is underway with DCLG and HCA colleagues to understand what a more significantly shared service might look like. A plan will be in place by July 2016 with implementation starting in April 2017.

7.10 The deliverables for the strategy will include end to end digital transformation for our casework, comprising:

- improvements for our customers through the portal, with greater self-service and tracking of progress
- access to Horizon for inspectors
- increase use of electronic working.

7.11 In the next financial year we will be looking at cloud for apps to provide more flexibility, lower hosting costs and less disruption to service.

7.12 DH asked if we are clear, from a disaster recovery perspective, how long each area of the organisation can operate without services and how long it would take to recover if we came under cyber-attack. With the use of bring your own device (BYOD), disciplines need to be re-established and staff need to be aware of the impact that their actions can have. JR explained we are currently covered by the shared services with DCLG on recovery. Going forward we are covered by deploying accredited devices and the security officer has co-ordinated business continuity plans across the organisation.

7.13 SJ referred to the aspiration to move to “digital by default” for our customers and whether equality impact assessments have been carried out. JR confirmed she is working with Jo Esson on assisted digital working and this will include equality assessments when looking at changes to the Portal. SW said she would like, off-line, to understand more about the planned customer self-service offer, what our customers want and if/when we can deliver.

#### Business Plan (BP) and Strategic Plan (SP)

7.14 DM updated on progress to date. There have been 2 workshops held with HoS and their comments have been taken on board and built into the Plan. Following feedback, further work is underway on the SP to make it less wordy and to focus more on the outputs. A summary of the BP and SP will be produced to help HoS and managers to talk to their teams.

7.15 SJ agreed that she felt the SP was too wordy and too detailed in some places, She challenged whether there was sufficient evidence of the boldness and confidence the organisation has in itself and its future. SJ agreed to follow up to DM with a note of her specific comments.

7.16 There was some discussion around the value of highlighting PINS’ contribution to the economy of the country, and if this should be included in the SP. SW said our role is to implement the NPPF, to do it well and this is reflected in our NI casework and has played a key role in positive planning.

7.17 The Board sought clarification on the comment about maintaining the confidence of Ministers, vs retaining the confidence of customers. SQ said it was absolutely vital that the Ministers having confidence we do the job well.

7.18 SW said the onward communication of the SP and BP to our teams is key to support engagement in the delivery of the plan. A one page visual would help this communication to have more impact. DM agreed and said that Stuart Campbell (SC) is taking this forward. SW asked for the previously agreed core narrative, prepared by SC, to be shared with the new NEDs.

	<p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>7a) JB to share an early draft of the MI pack and to bring a draft MI pack to the March Board which covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operations</li> <li>• Customer Quality</li> <li>• Finance</li> <li>• People</li> <li>• Risk</li> <li>• Programme delivery.</li> </ul> <p>7b) NP to send the core narrative to SJ and DH.</p>
8.0	<p><b>Forward agenda &amp; AOB</b></p> <p>8.1 The Board agreed the following items for February Board agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve 2016-17 Budget (JB) Wales update (TT/ NH)</li> <li>• Final version of the Strategic Plan, Business Plan and delivery plans. (NB This is now going to be taken at the March Board to ensure all delivery plans are fully populated and embedded)</li> </ul> <p>8.2 The performance update at the February Board should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The updated "all live planning casework" table with addition of the "appeals received" and "decisions issued" figures.</li> <li>• A CTP forecast to show the degree of progress being made. A trajectory which shows where we thought we would be and if we have achieved it. A commentary which explains the current position with a forward look.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <p>8a) The February PINS Board agenda.</p>

**Next meeting:** 11 February, 12.30 – 3.30, CARDIFF