



Minutes

Title of meeting	PINS Board Meeting
Date	10 November Time 12:30
Venue	Conference Room 5, Cathays Park, Cardiff
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 of Inspectors Simon Gallagher (SG) – Director of Planning, DCLG
In attendance	Neil Hemington (NH) – Chief Planner, Welsh Government Peter Sloman (PS) – Head of Finance & Commercial Mark Southgate (MS) – Director, Major Casework (item 5-10) Phil Hammond (PH) – Director, Casework (item 5-10) Phil Oldfield (PO) – Project Manager, Transformation Project (item 5) Isabel Nethell (IN) – Head of Service, Wales (item 6) Ifan Gwilym (IG) – Planning Officer, Wales (item 6) Simone Wilding (SWi) – Head of Major Casework Management (item 6 & 7) Pauleen Lane (PL) – GM, National Infrastructure (item 6 & 7)
Observers	Natasha Perrett (NP) – Board Secretary Tim Guy (TG), Director of Transformation

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 2 June 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
10.	Ben Linscott	Explore training opportunities with the MoJ.	10.7	11 January – briefing note to be included in the January PINS Board pack.

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 15 September 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
8.	Tom Warth transferred to Simone Wilding	Engage stakeholders most likely to use the inquiry procedure to set expectations and explore options to allocate inquiry dates differently.	6.7	Ongoing – update note attached as Annex 2 to the November PINS Board minutes.

9.	Tom Warth	Draw out the choices and consequences around processing inquiry planning appeals differently.	6.8	11 January – for 19 January PINS Board. To be linked to workforce planning paper.
----	-----------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 13 October 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
2.	Simon Gallagher	Update the Board on progress on the White Paper in November.	4b	Complete – SG gave an update at the November PINS Board meeting.
3.	Mark Southgate	Bring an impact assessment to the December PINS Board on the outcomes of the White Paper and its implications for PINS.	4.3	The White Paper has not yet been published. PINS continue to liaise with DCLG on developing policy. A paper will be presented to Board after publication.
5.	Peter Sloman & Richard Addison	Review the MI pack and consider which sets of data are critical for the Board to see.	5.2	8 February 2017 – for the 16 February Board meeting. MI pack to be aligned with Business Plan approval.
7.	Peter Sloman and Simon Gallagher	Discuss spending options and to bring propositions back to MB.	5.7	Complete – PS has set out proposals and is working with the DCLG sponsorship team.
10.	Peter Sloman	Look at profit and loss segmentation reporting.	6.4	8 February 2017 – for the 16 February Board meeting. Action is being undertaken and will be reported as part of the final Budget report in February.
11.	Peter Sloman	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. The document should demonstrate the importance of delivering the right service at an affordable cost.	6.5	8 February 2017 – for the 16 February Board meeting.
12.	Peter Sloman	Explore with staff the vision statement “Independent	7.8	Complete

		experts, inspiring confidence and shaping exceptional communities, now and for future generations” and feedback responses to the November Board.		
13.	Peter Sloman	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	Ongoing - being developed and identified in line with bid for transformation and change resource.
15.	Mark Southgate	Lead a deep dive item at the CQPSC meeting on the customer journey and technology.	9.11	8 February – for 16 February CQPSC.

Part One

Schedule of Actions – 10 November 2016

	Owner	Action	Minutes	Timeframe
1.	Rachael Pipkin	White Paper update to be included as part of the Strategic Plan item at the December PINS Board.	4.3 & 4b	The White Paper has not yet been published. PINS continue to liaise with DCLG on developing policy.
2.	Phil Hammond	Present to PINS Board recovery options and choices to clear the backlog. To include what the consequences might be on other areas of the organisation, trajectories and targets.	5.2, 5.5 & 5.7	11 January – for 19 January PINS Board.
3.	Phil Hammond	To close the CTP project and provide assurance to the Board that all outstanding actions have clear accountabilities.	5.14	Complete – Update note attached as Annex 1 to the November PINS Board minutes.
4.	Natasha Perrett	Check the implications of the Welsh Language measure have been added to the strategic risk register.	6.3	Complete – Jo Esson confirmed this risk is on the SRR allocated as risk S11.
5.	Simone Wilding	Bring a deep dive on band 3 work across the organisation	7.11	8 February – for 16 February

		including an overlay of the third runway and organisation capacity of inspectors and support teams.		PINS Board.
6.	Mark Southgate	Come back to the Board with a paper focusing on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the options to close the resource gap, such as using planning officers, processing casework elsewhere, negotiating targets. • How can we open up the work and offer internships and bursaries • Gain a view of how much time and how many people it takes to process low level appeals. 		11 January – for 19 January PINS Board.
7.	Natasha Perrett	Amend and issue a revised schedule of meetings.	9.6	Complete
8.	Sara Weller, David Holt, Susan Johnson, Jayne Erskine	Provide Natasha with their availability for meetings in 2017 against the proposed date changes.	9.6	Complete

Minutes

1.0	<p>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed Tim Guy, Director of Transformation and Neil Hemington to the November PINS 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 13 October Board Meeting</p> <p>2.1 No further comments were received on the October PINS Board minutes.</p> <p>2.2 BL gave an update on action 10 from the June Board meeting “Explore training opportunities with the MoJ”. There are a number of other bodies to be included. BL is working with the new Director of Government Legal Services.</p> <p>2.3 PS gave an update on action 7 from the October Board meeting “Develop a proposition for using the underspend for investment in service improvement and discussion with the sponsorship team.” PS has written to the DCLG sponsorship team with proposals to bring flexibility into the current and</p>

	<p>future budgets. SW asked PS to think about where we might use funds to make improvements in the current financial year.</p> <p>Agreed: 2a) The minutes reflect a true and accurate record of the October meeting.</p>
3.0	<p>Committee Chair updates, meetings of 10 November</p> <p>a) Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee (CQPSC)</p> <p>3.1 SJ reported, the CQPSC discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee Terms of Reference (ToR) - in relation to inspector code of conduct, the Committee has asked to be sighted on, and to receive assurance, that any complaints about inspector conduct is acted upon. • The first pilot customer group has been set up to explore, and discuss what the issues are they are facing when dealing with PINS. There is also an opportunity to work with the group to improve the quality of information and data submitted for inspectors. • A draft Customer Strategy will be coming to the Committee in February. • The consistency in decision making which was raised in the customer survey. PL is addressing this through the Professional Standards Group. • Committee MI and understanding the messages in complaints that are not upheld, with an aim to understand the themes and reduce the overall number of complaints. • Call handling, understanding how we deal with the queries falling into the other category through online guidance and advice. • Specialist casework and the diverse range of cases processed by the team. <p>b) People Committee minutes (meeting of 13 October)</p> <p>3.2 No further comments were received on the People Committee minutes.</p> <p>Agreed: 3a) To note the update from the Committee Chair.</p>
4.0	<p>CEO update</p> <p>4.1 Progress on reducing the backlog of volume casework has levelled off this month, SR advised the Board would see this in next month's MI pack. Resources have been allocated to help move the issues out of the system.</p> <p>4.2 SR has been working with SG on the preparations for the White Paper. BL has weekly contact with Steve Quartermain and team to understand the impact on Local Plans. SG said we need to understand both the individual and cumulative issues and impact.</p>

	<p>4.3 SW said implications of the White Paper should come back to the December PINS Board, we need to understand the implications on workforce planning.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>4a) To note the update from the CEO.</p> <p>4b) White Paper update to be included as part of the Strategic Plan item at the December PINS Board.</p>
5.0	<p>Monitoring performance</p> <p><u>MI pack</u></p> <p>5.1 PS circulated a draft of the PINS dashboard, which contains key information from the MI pack and asked the Board for views. SW agreed this would be helpful for the Non-Executive Directors (NEDs) as we move towards bi-monthly PINS Board meetings.</p> <p>5.2 The Board discussed OKPI1 – number of appeals in the system at baseline data. This is the first time the Board has seen performance move away from the amber trajectory. There is a risk we will not reach the 5040 cases baseline in quarter 4. SW said we need to understand the recovery options and what choices there are to make. The data being provided is giving the Board less confidence the target will be met.</p> <p>5.3 PH explained the calculations used for the trajectory do not account for the drop off in performance over the summer and the Christmas period. PH said we now need to unpack the 5040 baseline figure into case types to match Planning Casework Operations (PCO) processing. The original 5040 number was based on cases processed through the ‘classic’ model.</p> <p>5.4 There are options available to improve performance such as maximising our Non-Salaried Inspector (NSI) resource, adding more casework staff to build inspector programmes, change priorities to release inspectors and offer more appeals to inspectors through the Additional Casework Scheme (ACS).</p> <p>5.5 DH asked what do we need to do to hit the 5040 number and what might the consequences be on other areas of the organisation. We need to understand the consequences on other trajectories and targets. SG agreed and said a conversation is needed to look at our options to understand what it will take to get back on track by the year end.</p> <p>5.6 Analysis is already underway to understand the impact of moving inspector resource. The relevance of the 5040 baseline figure needs to be tested and understood. The customer experience is improving as we start appeals quicker, even though we are still above the 5040 baseline figure.</p> <p>5.7 SW said we have been clear about removing the backlog by the end of the financial year. The Board needs to understand the choices available to</p>

move us out of the backlog, and agreed there was no further interest in a conversation about moving targets. The Board want to see the broad spectrum of options and actions to be considered.

5.8 SR explained we need to change our modelling to understand the flow through the new system, as we have moved away from 'classic' appeal processing. We need to know what is going on in the new flow in PCO.

5.9 The Board discussed Householder, Commercial and s78 written representation planning appeal performance, which is improving with average times to decide coming down.

5.10 SW said the goal for the end of the year is not the baseline number that counts, what does matter is the promise we have made to our customers and the Minister to remove the backlog in year. We need to start the new financial year stable and hitting targets. The Board needs confidence that we will start the new financial year in a stable business as usual position.

CTP update

5.11 The Board discussed closing the CTP project, as there is £185K of benefits not yet delivered. The Board asked if it is the right time to close the project.

5.12 PO explained the new operating model is now in place, there is nothing left for the project to deliver. The IT changes required to the system will be managed through Horizon, and CAT V recovery is already taking place. The plan is for Heads of Service (HoS) in PCO to take ownership of the programmes.

5.13 SW said the Board needs confidence the actions would not be lost if the project is closed and asked TG for views. TG explained it would be unusual to close a project that is amber as business case benefits should be achieved. As the project is amber due to performance in CAT V, TG suggested a deep dive takes place to understand business as usual in the project and the controls around it.

5.14 The Board agreed to close the project, subject to assurance being given that all outstanding actions will have clear accountabilities.

Agreed:

MI pack – improving casework performance

5a) PINS Board agreed Management Team should focus on removing the backlog by the end of the year, to get PINS to a stable business as usual position.

5b) PH to present to PINS Board recovery options and choices to clear the backlog. To include what the consequences might be on other areas of the organisation, trajectories and targets.

CTP update

	<p>5c) The Board agreed to close the project and asked for assurance to be given that all outstanding actions will have clear accountabilities.</p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Developments of National Significance, Wales</p> <p>6.1 The Board discussed Welsh language standards and keeping a record of either individual or a bodies language preference and the translation of decisions and reports. TT discussed the requirements with the Welsh Language Commissioner around our National Infrastructure work. There are 2 schemes due to be submitted in 2017 which will require a bilingual approach. This will have both cost and time implications.</p> <p>6.2 NH explained the Ministers in Wales have a similar focus to Ministers in England around housing delivery. The tracking of development plans and housing delivery has been taking place. Findings have shown, whilst there are development plans in place, housing is not being built. Welsh Government is thinking about what can be done to ensure more housing is built. This will have an impact on PINS in the future and how we examine plans.</p> <p>6.3 SJ asked if the implications of the Welsh Language measure have been added to the strategic risk register.</p> <p>6.4 The Board also discussed 4.4 of the paper (proposals in the Wales Bill to devolve decision making powers on energy schemes up to 350Mw to Welsh Government). TT explained he is working closely with NH to plan how this will affect PINS Wales and how the process would work.</p> <p>6.5 DH said there are themes emerging around resources and skill sets in dealing with the changes in PINS Wales. On dual translation, DH said we need to make sure we are prepared and are sighted on the associated risks and lead times to make sure performance is not affected.</p> <p>6.6 There was discussion around the risk to translating documents, particularly reports and decisions. TT explained Trosol carries indemnity insurance.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>6a) To note the PINS Wales update.</p> <p>6b) NP to check the implications of the Welsh Language measure have been added to the strategic risk register.</p>
<p>7.0</p>	<p>National Infrastructure (NI) update</p> <p>7.1 Focus has been on forecasting the NI workload ranges. Due to pre-application engagement with future applicants, a profile for 2016-17 has emerged. Modelling work is also underway to understand the impact on resources against the likelihood of projects being submitted (annex 1).</p>

7.2 Skill matching inspectors to projects is taking place with a focus on resourcing to deliver the programme that is coming. More people need to be trained in quarter 4 so they are deployable as applications are submitted.

7.3 PL explained a training aspect for 2017 is knowledge of aviation, PL is following policy context closely.

7.4 JE said we need to work resource requirements in the NI update paper and encompass with the workforce planning paper. We need to know the total extent of the resource demand.

7.5 DH said it would be useful to see the granularity of skill sets needed and stress test against the red line (100% of notified cases annex 1).

7.6 The Board discussed 4.22 of the paper (fee increase), SJ said on Local Plans we need to map what is in and out of our control. With the efficiencies on Local Plans in the White Paper, we will hit a point where we no longer share the resource. There is a cumulative risk; we need to understand the worst case scenario.

7.7 SG said this work is low volume, high visibility and has reputational risk for each of the organisations involved. Careful programme management and discipline is required. SG is working with the Management Team to keep them updated on progress.

7.8 On recruiting inspectors, SW said we need to define the level of skill required and how we will attract people, thought should be given to this with and without the third runway to produce a base case and programme of management should the third runway emerge. A deep dive session on the third runway should come back to the Board.

7.9 MS explained work now underway to find inspectors with the skills required to handle events and have the right support team in place. Specialist skills are being considered such as environment, air quality and legal support, all of these things form part of project planning. A strategy is being drawn up to give NSIP experience to inspectors now.

7.10 On 4-5 panel member cases for next year, charts are being produced to identify which skills are required and where the gaps are, so training can take place.

7.11 SW said the Board needs a view across the organisation of work that is at band 3, including an overlay of the third runway and organisation capacity of inspectors and support teams.

7.12 Work is already underway to spot those inspectors that have the potential and skills to manage NI cases, BL explained this is being done through a skills audit and mid-year review discussions. PL and BL are also reviewing the training programme for NI casework.

7.13 On the NSIP fee increase (paragraph 4.22), SG explained he has a meeting with transport officials to discuss further. PL and SWi explained if approval is received by December, the 1st of April commencement date is achievable.

7.14 SWi raised concerns around 2 large schemes which will need to be treated as bilingual cases. Should extensions to the timetable be required, requests will need to be made to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Agreed:

7a) MS & SWi to bring a deep dive session to the Board on band 3 work across the organisation, including an overlay of the third runway and organisation capacity of inspectors and support teams.

8.0

Workforce Planning

8.1 The Board discussed the modelling around workforce planning and difficulties encountered recruiting inspectors. SW said the Board has seen papers which have consistently said we need to recruit more inspectors, and this would resolve the shortage. Following numerous recruitment rounds, we still have not managed to recruit the number of inspectors required.

8.2 The Board was sceptical that further detailed analysis or demand planning would get us to an appropriate level of inspector resource. SW said if the problem is recruiting the inspectors we need, we need to address this and look at more radical options, such as utilising planning officers, handing work elsewhere, negotiating targets and pay.

8.3 DH said he would like to see more of the actions and options available to us. Look forward on a broader basis to encompass everything coming to us on a 2 year basis.

8.4 SG said we need to make sure we retain people, how can we make sure they stay. JE said we should be looking at 3-5 year resource and making sure we have internships and bursaries available. BL explained he has been working Civil Service Learning to design the recruitment campaign.

8.5 DH suggested carrying out analysis on our low level appeals to form a view of how much time and people these cases take up. SW said we need to be honest about closing the gap. If we can't close the gap through recruitment, we need to think about this problem in a different way. We cannot keep under recruiting and underspending the budget.

8.6 The Board agreed focus should move from detailed analysis, to understanding the resource gap, how we close the gap and what the pipeline needs to look like to make this achievable. MS to come back to the Board with radical options for the Board to consider that will increase inspector

	<p>resource.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>8a) MS to come back to the Board with a paper focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the radical options for the Board to consider that will close the resource gap, such as using planning officers, processing casework elsewhere, negotiating targets and pay • how we open up the work and offer internships and bursaries • a view of how much time and how many people it takes to process low level appeals.
9.0	<p>PINS Board and Committee proposals</p> <p>9.1 The proposals set out in the paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • move the Board meetings to bi-monthly sessions and moves the intervening month to 2 Committee meetings • enables PS to provide monthly performance reporting to the Board by moving the scheduled meeting dates. <p>9.2 Some of the Non-Executive Directors (NEDs) were not able to attend meetings on the proposed dates.</p> <p>9.3 SW asked the Board if there is support for the move to bi-monthly meetings and Committees on the intervening months to take place from March 2017.</p> <p>9.4 The NEDs agreed the change, SG raised concern about his loss of engagement with the move to bi-monthly meetings, as he does not attend the Committee meetings. The Board agreed SG would be invited to attend the Committees as an observer.</p> <p>9.5 SR said a review point has been built into the forward planner for June 2017 to review the changes to make sure the frequency is suitable and working for the Board.</p> <p>9.6 SW asked NP to amend and issue a revised schedule of meetings and for the NEDs to feedback availability.</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <p>9a) The Board agreed to continue to hold monthly meetings until February 2017. From March 2017 the Board will move to a bi-monthly meeting schedule.</p> <p>9b) NP to amend and issue a revised schedule of meetings.</p> <p>9c) NEDs to provide NP with their availability for meetings in 2017 against the proposed date changes.</p>

10.0	<p>Forward agenda & AOB</p> <p>10.1 The Board agreed the December items as set out in the PINS Board forward planner.</p> <p>Agreed: 10a) The December PINS Board agenda.</p>
------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Next meeting: 8 December 2016, 12.30pm – 3.30pm