



Minutes

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Title of meeting | PINS Board Meeting |
| Date | 19 January Time 12:30 |
| Venue | Brunel, Temple Quay House, Bristol |
| Chair | Sara Weller (SW) – Chairman |
| Present | Sarah Richards (SR) – Chief Executive Jayne Erskine (JE) – Non Executive Director David Holt (DH) – Non Executive Director Susan Johnson (SJ) – Non Executive Director Tony Thickett (TT) – Director, Wales Ben Linscott (BL) – Head Inspectors Navees Rahman (NR) – Director of Corporate Services Simon Gallagher (SG) – Director of Planning, DCLG |
| In attendance | Peter Sloman (PS) – Head of Finance & Commercial (item 5) Mark Southgate (MS) – Director, Major Casework (items 5-9) Phil Hammond (PH) – Director, Volume Casework (items 5-9) Tim Guy (TG), Director of Transformation (item 9) Natasha Perrett (NP) – Board Secretary |

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 13 October 2016

| | Owner | Action | Minutes | Timeframe |
|-----|--|--|---------|--|
| 3. | Mark Southgate – Ben Linscott | Bring an impact assessment to the December PINS Board on the outcomes of the White Paper and its implications for PINS. | 4.3 | Closed – superseded by action 2 19 January. |
| 5. | Peter Sloman & Richard Addison | Review the MI pack and consider which sets of data are critical for the Board to see. | 5.2 | Complete – covered by the dashboard. |
| 10. | Peter Sloman Navees Rahman | Look at profit and loss segmentation reporting. | 6.4 | Complete – included as part of item 8 on the February agenda. |
| 11. | Peter Sloman Navees Rahman | Review the MTFP to consider the audience of the document and ensure it is not seen simply as a “cost-cutting” exercise. It needs to reflect a focus on the end-goal of inspectors and decisions. | 6.5 | 10 May – for 18 May PINS Board |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---|-----|---------------------------------------|
| | | The document should demonstrate the importance of delivering the right service at an affordable cost. | | |
| 13. | Peter Sloman Navees Rahman | Take forward next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to look at how big the productivity phase 1 "BAU" cost reduction might be • consider, in phases 2 and 3, what else might get us to a sustainable footing (changes to the service proposition, fees) • identify the metric that shows we are becoming more productive • identify what needs to be in the budget. | 8.6 | 10 May – for 18 May PINS Board |

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 10 November 2016

| | Owner | Action | Minutes | Timeframe |
|----|----------------|--|---------|---|
| 5. | Simone Wilding | Bring a deep dive on band 3 work across the organisation including an overlay of the third runway and organisation capacity of inspectors and support teams. | 7.11 | 8 March – for 16 March PINS Board. |

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 8 December 2016

| | Owner | Action | Minutes | Timeframe |
|----|------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|
| 1. | Phil Hammond | Submit a further briefing note to the Board which sets out who owns the 6 key outstanding issues from the CTP project, what they are delivering and by when. | 2.2 | 8 March – for 16 March PINS Board. |
| 5. | Jo Esson and Management Team | Reassess the Strategic Risk Register to capture s62a work and align with the Business Plan. | 4.1 | 8 March – for 16 March PINS Board. |
| 6. | Rich Addison & Pete Sloman | The dashboard to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the target and trajectory to the casework performance graphs. | 5.3, 5.4, 5.7 & 5.8 | In progress – to be reviewed and included in the new reporting year. |

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 19 January 2017

| | Owner | Action | Minutes | Timeframe |
|----|---------------------------|--|------------|---|
| 1. | NEDs and Management Teams | NEDs and Management Team to consider how NEDs can help teams and Directorates in the organisation. | 2.2 | 8 March – for 16 March PINS Board. |
| 2. | Ben Linscott | Give an update to the February Board on the impact of the White Paper on PINS and to include the communications plan to the organisation. | 2.4 | Simon Gallagher will lead this discussion at the February Board. |
| 3. | Ben Linscott | Review the ATE agenda and let the NEDs know if there is space from them to hold a surgery with inspectors. | 3.2 | Complete – BL has advised a 45 minute slot will be available for the NEDs at the ATE. |
| 4. | Tony Thickett | Bring findings of research into difficult customers to the February or April CQPSC meeting. TT to confirm to NP. | 4.2 | By 12 April - for 20 April CQPSC. |
| 5. | Simon Gallagher | Check spending delegations with the sponsorship team in respect of the transformation spend (£850k). | 5.2 | Complete – SG Confirmed delegations allow PINS to spend resources within revenue budgets within certain parameters (e.g. Departmental delegation limits and Cabinet Office Spending Controls). |
| 6. | Navees Rahman | Circulate the Ministerial budget delegation letter to the PINS Board. | 5.2 | Complete |
| 7. | Mark Southgate | Include the outcomes of the White Paper and impact on Band 3 work in the Workforce Planning review for March Board. As part of the Workforce Planning and Band 3 update to include what demand looks like over the next 12-24 months (e.g. Local Plans, South East Runway etc) and our ability to react. | 6.4 & 7.6 | 8 March – for 16 March PINS Board. |
| 8. | Management Team | Management Team to bring a proposal on targets to replace the current “80% in 14 weeks” to the next Board meeting, | 6.8 & 6.11 | Complete – item 6 on the February agenda. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--|----------------------|---|
| | | <p>setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the pros and cons of each option • what would be the most suitable target for our customers • intended and unintended consequences of each option • confidence on our ability to consistently deliver in target eg across the year. | | |
| 9. | Tim Guy | <p>Review the SP to reflect Board comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • add the core function of the organisation which is to support the inspectors to make decisions to the front of the SP. • focus on clear priorities and measures of success. • consider the range of stakeholder groups and consider how best to align SP to meet needs of each group • ensure sufficient emphasis is put on financial sustainability earlier in the document • weave Wales into the SP, starting earlier in the narrative. | 9.6, 9.8, 9.9 & 9.11 | Complete |
| 10. | Tim Guy | Send the redrafted SP to NEDS for final confirmation. | 9.9 | Complete – issued 10 February. |
| 11. | Tim Guy & Navees Rahman | Bring the budget and priorities to the February PINS Board meeting. | 9.10 | Complete – item 8 on the February agenda. |
| 12. | Natasha Perrett | Send Navees the Productivity papers submitted to previous PINS Board meetings. | 10.2 | Complete |
| 13. | Natasha Perrett | <p>Update the forward planner:</p> <p>February</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of the White Paper on PINS <p>March</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South East runway, as part of the discussion on Band 3 inspector work and to alert Simone Wilding. <p>May</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign off of the Customer Strategy • Productivity Project update | 5.7, 8.1 & 10.1 | Complete |

Minutes

| | |
|-----|---|
| 1.0 | <p>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed Ben Linscott (BL) as a formal member to the Board meeting.</p> <p>1.2 The Chair called for Declarations of Interest (DoI) of which there were none.</p> |
| 2.0 | <p>Minutes of 8 December Board Meeting</p> <p>2.1 No further comments were received on the December PINS Board minutes.</p> <p>2.2 The Board discussed action 8 of the December minutes around how the Non-Executives (NEDs) could share their knowledge and experience to support staff through change. SW asked the NEDs and the Management Team to consider the areas the NEDs can help with and bring ideas back to the next meeting to weave into the bi-monthly Board timetable.</p> <p>2.3 The Board agreed to close action 8 of the September minutes as work is ongoing and is reported in the MI pack.</p> <p>2.4 The Board agreed to roll the item on the impact of the White Paper on PINS to the February Board meeting. The White Paper is due to be published shortly. SG said he was grateful for the support received from BL and MS and their teams. SG explained assurance is need around how PINS will communicate key messages with Inspectors. BL assured the Board there will be clear messaging to Inspectors. Clarity will be needed around what the messages are. SW asked BL to include the communication plan for the organisation into the White Paper update item.</p> <p><u>Agreed:</u></p> <p>2a) The minutes reflect a true and accurate record of the December meeting.</p> <p>2b) NEDs and Management Team to consider how NEDs can help teams and Directorates across the organisation.</p> <p>2c) To close action 8 from the September minutes.</p> <p>2d) BL to give an update to the February Board on the impact of the White Paper on PINS and to include the communications plan to the organisation.</p> |
| 3.0 | <p>Committee Chair updates, meetings of 19 January</p> <p>a) People Committee</p> <p>3.1 JE reported the key messages from the People Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Committee agreed the People Strategy and Strategic Plan need to be aligned and presented back to the April Committee meeting.• In relation to performance, Katie Hartwright (newly appointed Head of HR) updated the Committee on Government changes to the rules |

| | |
|------------|--|
| | <p>around the appraisal process. KH is taking this work forward to look at how this will affect PINS. KH will bring back to the Committee in April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The People Group and Staff Engagement Panel continue with lots of activity taking place with great enthusiasm. • A pay and reward strategy will be developed taking into consideration the outcomes of the equal pay audit, and work taking place on workforce planning. The strategy will come back to the Committee in April including a revised delivery plan. <p>3.2 The Committee discussed the breakdown of the staff engagement scores for the Volume and Major Casework areas. The NEDs were encouraged by the passion demonstrated to make a difference to these areas. All of the NEDs agreed to support the delivery plans. SW agreed and suggested BL consider a similar session at the next People Committee focussed on the staff survey findings and actions for inspectors. In respect of their engagement with the broader organisation, NEDs asked if there is any opportunity to have a surgery at the Annual Training Event (ATE). BL agreed to consider.</p> <p>b) Audit and Risk Assurance Committee minutes (meeting of 8 December)</p> <p>3.3 No further comments were received.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>3a) To note the update from the Committee Chair. 3b) BL to review the ATE agenda and let the NEDs know if there is space from them to hold a surgery with inspectors.</p> |
| <p>4.0</p> | <p>CEO update</p> <p>4.1 The Board discussed the progress of fee recovery for NSIP work. NR explained PINS are working with DCLG to put a case forward. SW asked why we needed to put a case forward when we already have the remit. SR explained we have the statutory provision in place for full recovery, but require agreement as to when we can put this in place.</p> <p>4.2 The Board discussed paragraph 2.3 of the update, with particular focus on customers who have been difficult for a particular group of inspectors. SR explained there have been incidences where a group of people have been aggressive towards inspectors at inquiries. TT explained he is working with the inspector group and is carrying out research to learn more about this issue. SJ asked for this to come to the next Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee (CQPSC) as part of the item on the Customer Strategy and Customer Charter. TT will confirm when he will be ready to bring his findings to the Committee.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>4a) To note the update from the CEO. 4b) TT to bring findings of his research into difficult customers to the</p> |

February or April CQPSC meeting. TT to confirm to NP.

5.0

Monitoring performance

5.1 PS updated the Board on the headlines from the dashboard:

- Performance against the majority of planning casework (s78 written representations and householder appeals (HAS)) has improved significantly. HAS cases are currently 92% in target.
- The number of absence working days lost has reduced for non-inspector staff, partly as a result of individuals who left under the VES. Whilst this is positive, there is still work to do around attendance management.
- The underspend has reduced to just under £1m following agreement to return £900k to DCLG and reprioritisation of £850k of work for the transformation and change programme.

5.2 The Board discussed the allocation of £850K to the transformation work taking place. SW asked what will the £850k be spent on and what is the process for accessing the spending. Does this need to be approved by anyone at CLG or the PINS Board? NR explained PINS has a general annual delegation letter from the Minister and the spending is covered in the letter. SG said he would check with the sponsorship team, to ensure the spending does not need approval elsewhere. NR agreed to circulate the delegation letter to the Board.

5.3 NR explained the funds will be spent on our immediate change priorities which are Strategic Workforce Planning, Planning Casework Operations sustainability which includes improvements to Horizon and purchasing redaction software and Programme and Portfolio Management. Spending in these areas is already happening. SJ asked if Management Team are tracking the outcomes from the spend. NR assured the Board Management Team are tracking the outcomes and benefits of the spending.

5.4 As some of the work involves the use of consultants for specialist expertise, SG asked if the Central Government Controls have been applied. NR confirmed the Procurement Team have been involved in the process and the framework has been applied.

5.5 DH said he was encouraged to see the underspend reduce, but said the Board should have early sight of such intentions to redeploy funds in a substantive way should this happen again in the incoming financial year.

5.6 SW said an update should be included as part of the Budget item at the February Board on what is in the transformation and change spend and how these areas were selected. NR agreed to include this information and to also provide an update on progress. DH said going forward as part of budget planning it would be helpful to have a reserve list of projects which can be brought forward should an underspend occur.

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>5.7 The Board discussed the key items outlined in the dashboard and agreed planning for the South East runway should come to the March Board as part of the discussion on Band 3 inspector work.</p> <p>5.8 SR explained work is underway to reprioritise our list of projects for the forthcoming year. The current top 3 projects reported in the dashboard are likely to change following the review.</p> <p>5.9 JE said in reviewing the projects we need to make sure we are not taking on too much. SR agreed and said this is part of the work being led by TG and team to look at the total impact on the organisation and to align the projects that will help us deliver the Strategic Plan.</p> <p><u>Agreed:</u></p> <p>5a) SG to check spending delegations with the sponsorship team in respect of the transformation spend (£850k).</p> <p>5b) NR to circulate the Ministerial budget delegation letter to the PINS Board.</p> <p>5c) NP to add the South East runway to the March Board as part of the discussion on Band 3 inspector work and to alert Simone Wilding.</p> |
| 6.0 | <p>Planning appeals performance update</p> <p>6.1 PH explained planning appeal performance has improved. In the next financial year, new appeal performance will be approximately 15-16 weeks from receipt to decision. This is a better performance than has been achieved in recent years.</p> <p>6.2 There is greater clarity and confidence in our band 1 forecasting and with more inspectors joining Planning Casework Operation (PCO) this enables reallocation of band 2 and band 3 inspectors to other work. Further work is underway to understand band 2 and band 3 demand.</p> <p>6.3 SW congratulated the team on the progress that had been made, which has been a substantial effort over the past 2 years. With performance improving SW suggested we could now consider establishing different targets with the minister. The Board agreed the current target of 80% of appeals to be decided in 14 weeks was not a good target for our customers.</p> <p>6.4 The Board agreed that attention now needs to turn to the performance gaps in our high level work. The Board agreed to focus on workforce planning, band 3 work and the outcomes of the White Paper and what that will require of us.</p> <p>6.5 MS explained workforce planning is focussing on band 3 work and how we allocate inspectors to bespoke casework, along with resourcing Local Plans, National Infrastructure work and the South East Runway.</p> <p>6.6 SG supported the move to focus on band 3 casework, whilst cautioning</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>that we need to make sure PCO performance continues to improve before we have a conversation with Gavin Barwell about our targets. SG said the proposition to the Minister should focus on customer service, be measurable and include a number of alternatives for consideration.</p> <p>6.7 The Board agreed any new targets need to be a target that customers can recognise (ie receipt to decision). DH said it is important we do not consider targets in isolation of each other. Revised targets need to look at the breadth of work in the organisation. Conversely, we may not wish to wait until we are ready to change all targets before we change the “volume casework” target.</p> <p>6.8 SW asked Management Team to bring a proposal on targets to the next Board meeting, setting out the pros and cons and what is a suitable target that we could publish for our customers. JE said this work should also include intended and unintended consequences of making the changes.</p> <p>6.9 SG said it is important to demonstrate we have improved performance and to take time to work up the targets. We need to consistently deliver in target for the next 2-3 months.</p> <p>6.10 On Inquiry performance, MS explained we have offered earlier dates but parties are sticking with original dates which are out of target. SW said we need to look at where we want to be at the higher level and how we are going to get there.</p> <p>6.11 The Board discussed seasonal availability of inspectors which will cause targets to move slightly. It was agreed the work on targets should also include the options considered to consistency deliver in target.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>6a) MS to include the outcomes of the White Paper and impact on Band 3 work in the Workforce Planning review for March Board.</p> <p>6b) Management Team to bring a proposal on targets to replace the current “80% in 14 weeks” to the next Board meeting, setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the pros and cons of each option • what would be the most is a suitable target for our customers • intended and unintended consequences of each option • confidence on our ability to consistently deliver in target eg across the year. |
| 7.0 | <p>Workforce Planning</p> <p>7.1 A workforce planning project has been initiated with advice, support and challenge coming from workforce planning experts. Tom Fitzherbert (TF) has been procured to support this work. TF has challenged the findings so far and has suggested we look at the way we build our inspectors’ work programmes. His work also covers our IT systems, as well supply and demand forecasting.</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>7.2 Comparison of working practices is also taking place around the way we allocate inquiry casework and NSIP inquiries.</p> <p>7.3 A recent recruitment of inspectors has resulted in 17 acceptances out of 22 offers, of the 5 remaining we received 3 withdrawals. There is further work underway to plan resources for next year.</p> <p>7.4 The Board discussed aligning resource requirements with the budget. DH raised concern about signing off the budget whilst all requirements are not yet known. How will we be able to cope when new work emerges? MS explained we know what we need at band 1. At band 3 we know we have fewer permanent Inspectors at this grade and will rely on NSIs to fill any gaps.</p> <p>7.5 SG said the Workforce Plan needs to be aligned with the Strategic Plan and Business Plan process. DCLG need to agree what we are signing up to and where the uncertainties are. MS and SR should put a proposition to the Board and DCLG. BL explained he is working with finance around the NSI fund, funding for promotions and working above grade.</p> <p>7.6 DH said we need to understand the ability and agility to be able to react to inspector resource demand, the Board needs to understand the pace and shortfall in band 3. This will be picked up in the Board discussion in March.</p> <p>Agreed: 7a) MS as part of the Workforce Planning and Band 3 update to include what demand looks like over the next 12-24 months (e.g. Local Plans, South East Runway etc) and our ability to react.</p> |
| 8.0 | <p>Impact of the White Paper on PINS</p> <p>8.1 BL receives regular updates on progress from the DCLG team. As the White Paper is due to be published shortly, the Board agreed to roll the item to the February PINS Board meeting.</p> <p>Agreed: 8a) NP to add the Impact of the White Paper on PINS item to the February Board meeting.</p> |
| 9.0 | <p>Strategic Plan</p> <p>9.1 TG has taken on feedback from the Board and the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) and has revised the Strategic Plan (SP). The latest draft version has been published on the intranet to engage with the organisation and gather feedback and views. SJ congratulated the team on the work of SP so far.</p> <p>9.2 SJ observed that the vision has positioned PINS in the space that talks about our contribution to ensure communities thrive. SJ could not, however, see the link from the vision statement to the role we play articulated in the SP. SJ commented that the commentary was very detailed in certain areas of</p> |

the SP and questioned who the audience was felt to be. SJ also cautioned around making specialist teams 'silos' and referred to page 6 of the SP, where Corporate Services had a separate section. NR agreed to review this section to better integrate it into the overall SP.

9.3 The Board agreed the objectives as currently worded were too generic and limited engagement and the priorities required more clarity. SG asked when the SP would be ready for Minister sign off.

9.4 DH suggested we should ensure that we know what good looks like for each of the priority areas and how we will be able to judge success eg how will we know that we have got to the right efficiency. There needs to be a clear link from the vision through to the priorities and into measures.

9.5 JE reinforced the request for more clarity around the objectives and said we need to be clear about the intent, by when, what the outcome will be and the activities linked to the intended benefit. JE said talent management programme and succession planning are missing from the list on page 17 of the SP.

9.6 SW asked if more needs to be added to the plan about SR's core vision for the organisation which is to support the inspectors to make decisions. This could be done in the front of the plan. SW agreed with others that we need to be really clear about the most important activities and measures of success.

9.7 TG said the customer for the SP is the organisation; feedback received so far has been positive as there are parts individuals can connect too. TG said more thought needs to be given on the wider audience of the document.

9.8 The Board discussed connecting strategic stakeholders (eg ministers) to the SP and asked TG to think about the delivery tools which could be used to align against each stakeholder. SW said we also need to think about financial sustainability which was very important to those stakeholders but currently had quite a low profile in the SP.

9.9 SW summarised the Board's feedback to suggest that we start with the material we have, provide more clarity around the objectives, priorities and measures, and review stakeholder groups and what they need from the organisation. TG agreed to about the audience and to re-craft and send the revised SP to the NEDs for comment.

9.10 The Board discussed the Budget and Business Plan and how they fit with the delivery plans. SW said the budget is effectively the financial part of the Business Plan and comes from the first year of the strategic plan. DH said we also need to include in the Business Plan things we will do in year 1 which will help us deliver in years 2 and 3. NR suggested we draw the SP and the Medium Term Financial Plan together.

| | |
|------|--|
| | <p>9.11 The Board agreed more work needs to be done to weave Wales into the SP earlier in the narrative. TT and TG will work on this.</p> <p>9.12 SW noted that the Business Plan and budget are scheduled to come back to the February PINS Board meeting.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>9a) TG to Review the SP to reflect Board comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • add the core function of the organisation which is to support the inspectors to make decisions to the front of the SP • focus on clear priorities and measures of success • consider the range of stakeholder groups and consider how best to align SP to meet needs of each group • ensure sufficient emphasis is put on financial sustainability earlier in the document • weave Wales into the SP, starting earlier in the narrative. <p>9b) TG to send the redrafted SP to NEDs for final confirmation.</p> <p>9c) TG and NR to bring the budget and priorities to the February PINS Board meeting.</p> |
| 10.0 | <p>Forward Planner</p> <p>10.1 The Board agreed the following forward planner updates:</p> <p><u>February</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of the White Paper on PINS. <p><u>March</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Band 3 deep dive to include preparations for the South East Runway. <p><u>May</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productivity project - could potentially be a workshop in May. • Customer Strategy – sign off <p>10.2 SW asked NP to send the productivity project papers to NR.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>10a) The February PINS Board agenda.</p> <p>10b) NP to send NR the Productivity project papers.</p> <p>Next meeting: 16 February 2017, 12.30pm – 3.30pm</p> |