



# Minutes

<b>Title of meeting</b>	Planning Inspectorate Board Meeting		
<b>Date</b>	26 July 2018	<b>Time</b>	11.00 – 14.00
<b>Venue</b>	Temple Quay House, Bristol		
<b>Chair</b>	Trudi Elliott ( <b>TE</b> ) – Chair		
<b>Present</b>	David Holt ( <b>DH</b> ) – Non-Executive Director Susan Johnson ( <b>SJ</b> ) – Non-Executive Director Jayne Erskine ( <b>JE</b> ) – Non-Executive Director Sarah Richards ( <b>SR</b> ) – Chief Executive Simon Gallagher ( <b>SG</b> ) – Director of Planning, MHCLG		
<b>In attendance</b>	Caroline Bee ( <b>CB</b> ) – Head of Finance, Commercial & Performance Pauleen Lane ( <b>PL</b> ) – Group Manager National Infrastructure Tim Guy ( <b>TG</b> ) – Director, Transformation (item 5-6) Martin O’Brian ( <b>MOB</b> ) – Head of Digital Services (item 7) Phil Hammond ( <b>PH</b> ) – Director, Volume Casework (item 9)		
<b>Note taker</b>	Kate Dixon ( <b>KD</b> )		
<b>Apologies</b>	Tony Thickett ( <b>TT</b> ), Steve Hudson ( <b>SH</b> ), Natasha Perrett ( <b>NP</b> )		
<b>Observer</b>			

## Part One: Schedule of Actions – 25 January 2018

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
2	Simon Gallagher	Identify suitable MHCLG representatives to attend CQPSC and People Committees.	2.5 & 2.7	<b>People - outstanding</b>
5	Jo Esson	Update, circulate and publish the final Terms of Reference.	2.8	<b>Linked to action 2</b>
15	Sarah Richards	Circulate draft targets submission to Board members for comment.	6.8	<b>On hold pending SR19 submission</b>

## Part One: Schedule of Actions – 24 May 2018

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
4.	Steve Hudson/ Martin Long	Provide a GDPR update at the September ARAC.	3.1	<b>Complete</b> – item 4d on September ARAC agenda
12.	Tony Thickett	Report back on the learning from the most recent cohort including those from a non-planning background	8.2	<b>January Board</b> – early indication of progress

## Part One: Schedule of Actions – 26 July 2018

	Owner	Action	Para	Timeframe
1.	Natasha Perrett	To update the ARAC and CQPSC minutes.	3.2 & 3.5	<b>Complete</b>
2.	Caroline Bee	Reinstate the previous format of the strategic risk register.	5.4	<b>Complete</b>

	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Para</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
3.	Mark Southgate	Provide dates of planned external stakeholder meetings	5.7	<b>Complete</b> – circulated by MS on 27 <sup>th</sup> July 2018.
4.	Mark Southgate	Provide feedback from meetings with targeted stakeholders	5.7	<b>November CQPSC</b> - action to be transferred to new owner.
5.	Tim Guy	Report on PINS targets at next Board meeting	5.12	<b>Item 4b on September Board agenda.</b>
6.	Tim Guy	Future PRB reports to include additional reporting as requested.	5.14	<b>Item 4b on September Board agenda.</b>
7.	Caroline Bee	Spending Review/Strategic Plan update	6.2	<b>Item 6 on the September Board agenda.</b>
8.	Sarah Richards/ Peter Rickett	Send stakeholder survey information to the NEDs	6.4	<b>Will be circulated when available.</b>
9.	Natasha Perrett	Add a Strategic Plan item to the September Board forward plan.	8.1	<b>Complete</b>
10.	Natasha Perrett	Add a GDPR item to the September ARAC forward plan.	10.3	<b>Complete</b>

## Minutes

1.0	<p><b>Welcome and Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>1.1 The Chair welcomed the Board. Apologies were received from Tony Thickett, Steve Hudson and Natasha Perrett.</p> <p>1.2 The Chair called for declarations of interest of which there were none.</p>
2.0	<p><b>Minutes of 14 June Board meeting</b></p> <p>2.1 The Board noted Lucy Hargreaves (MHCLG) was going to provide an update on MHCLG’s position on kiosks (4.6); SG advised that there had been no change. PL explained the Inspectorate had been correct in its initial judgement, there is a right to reject in relation to the failure to consult.</p> <p>2.2 There were no further comments on the June Board minutes.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> 2a) The June minutes are an accurate record of the meeting.</p>
3.0	<p><b>Committee minutes for information:</b></p> <p><b>a) Audit and Risk Assurance Committee</b></p> <p>3.1 JE asked for clarification on the timing of the deep dive escalation process (5.8). DH confirmed this was scheduled for the December ARAC meeting. He also welcomed feedback from SG on MHCLG’s risk appetite.</p> <p>3.2 The Board requested clarification of the wording of minute 6.15.</p>

3.3 There were no further comments on the ARAC minutes.

**b) Customer, Quality and Professional Standards Committee**

3.4 SJ noted that MOB's update had been circulated electronically per the actions.

3.5 SJ noted an error of wording in minute 3.3.

3.6 There were no further comments on the CQPSC minutes.

**Agreed:**

3a) To note the updates from the Committee Chairs.

3b) To update the draft minutes as requested.

4.0

**Organisation update**

4.1 SR updated the Board on events having taken place since the June meeting:

- Approximately 500 employees attended the onePINS event on 12 July. Feedback has been positive, with 90% approval ratings in some survey responses. It has been agreed that a subsequent event will be held as part of the next Inspector Annual Training event. The Board noted that the event had been wholly organised by staff.
- The re-stack move to situate all staff on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor in TQH is now complete, with minimal disruption to operations on the day of the move. SG will update MHCLG that the move is complete.
- The first 7 of 42 new inspectors began work in July, with the remainder to be phased in from September.

4.2 The Board noted that a new Planning Minister has been appointed.

4.3 The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published. PL explained this will impact around 2,000 cases. The impact had already been built into performance projections.

4.4 There have been 4 GDPR breaches, 2 of which have been reported to the ICO. The Data Protection Officer has since visited TQH to discuss the breaches with senior management.

4.5 DH asked for a reminder of the escalation process; PL advised that this was not yet signed off.

4.6 DH noted that the Annual Report and Accounts have now been published.

4.7 The Board noted the inquiries review, Chaired by Bridget Rosewell, has now started.

4.8 MHCLG has published its People Plan, with the intention of creating "one MHCLG" and further joining up across the Department. SR explained the

	<p>Inspectorate’s plan was likely to be very similar, as there is a degree of crossover between the two HR teams. SG asked when the Board will discuss the Gender Pay Gap; SR suggested at either the September or November Board meetings.</p> <p>4.9 SG confirmed the proposed Green Paper on social housing is due for publication shortly.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> 4a) To note the update.</p>
5.0	<p><b>Monitoring performance</b></p> <p><b>a) June Dashboard</b></p> <p>5.1 TG joined the meeting.</p> <p>5.2 CB presented the dashboard, noting the additional funding requests to cover recruitment of Non-Salaried Inspectors (NSIs) and HR training.</p> <p>5.3 Case volatility continues. A National Infrastructure (NI) case expected in January has been published this month. This brings income forward, but increases demand on resources and the associated costs of that demand. PL advised the NI caseload is currently higher than the highest forecasts.</p> <p>5.4 DH was concerned that the format of the strategic risk table had changed, specifically that graphics showing target risk had been removed, as had commentary and risk appetite. It was felt that the additions provide clarity on the ET approach to risk, which the NEDs find very useful. It was agreed that the format as agreed at ARAC would be reinstated.</p> <p>5.5 The Board discussed deploying inspectors on multiple plans, and asked how the impact is being managed. SR explained the Inspectorate has a commitment to assign an inspector within two weeks, duplicate running is the best way to meet that. The Inspectorate continues to work closely with local planning authorities (LPAs).</p> <p>5.6 TE noted not all LPAs hit their timetabled targets, and asked if this was taken into account when managing the Inspectorate’s timetable. PL advised deadlines could be missed for a number of reasons, and not always because the LPA was at fault. The overriding aim is to use resources as efficiently as possible, including using more experienced inspectors to provide pre-application advice. This is causing short-term pressure, but is generating positive feedback and should lead to better applications in the medium and long term.</p> <p>5.7 SJ asked about stakeholder engagement. SR advised the Inspectorate meets with the Planning Officers Society (POS) regularly. The Board asked for the dates of planned wider stakeholder meetings, and also requested feedback from meetings with targeted stakeholders such as POS.</p>

**b) Performance recovery update, including inspector recruitment**

5.8 TG updated the Board on developments since the Performance recovery Board (PRB) paper had been written. He also noted that two further meetings of the PRB have been held.

5.9 The PRB have made a number of decisions, including promoting 21 FTE inspectors from Band 1 to Band 2, and authorising the promotion of 12 more as demand requires. A direct Band 2 recruitment drive has also been agreed for the autumn.

5.10 The PRB has revisited the interventions of performance. TG will report formally at the next Board meeting on targets.

5.11 TG advised that workforce planning data is currently held in one spreadsheet and owned by one person, a RAG risk flagged as Amber. This is also currently the biggest pinch point with buy-in and support from staff.

5.12 The Board asked that key actions and dependencies for the next 3-6 months be included in future reports. TE noted the quality of papers provided to the Board and their helpfulness to the NEDs.

5.13 TG left the meeting.

**Agreed:**

5a) CB to reinstatement of the previous format of the strategic risk register.

5b) Mark Southgate to provide dates of planned external stakeholder meetings.

5c) Mark Southgate to provide feedback from meetings with targeted stakeholders.

5d) TG to report on PINS targets at next Board meeting.

5e) TG to make sure future PRB reports include additional reporting as requested.

**6. Spending Review and Strategic Plan**

6.1 It was agreed that a formal update meeting will be held in September. The Board acknowledged that final options would not be available at that stage, but felt an update was important.

6.2. SG explained the current approach of layering a spending review over a mid-term strategy review was the correct one.

6.3 PL noted that strategy needs to be communicated internally to staff and externally to stakeholders as well as upwards to MHCLG.

6.4 JE asked for details of the qualitative feedback sought from external stakeholders; SR will provide this.

**Agreed:**

6a) To hold an update meeting in September.

	6b) SR to send stakeholder survey information to the NEDs.
7.	<p><b>Artificial Intelligence (AI)</b></p> <p>7.1 MOB joined the meeting.</p> <p>7.2 MOB advised that Milton Keynes council is using AI in relation to planning applications, specifically to tag applications and using chat bots to answer customer queries.</p> <p>7.2 It was noted that this usage could be directly applied to the Inspectorate, particularly in the tagging of applications, which would speed up the appeals process. SG advised that MHCLG has a digital planning team in place, considering both the application of AI and its joining up across all local authorities.</p> <p>7.3 TE asked whether the facility for customers to track their appeal was included in the applications of AI under consideration. PL advised this is already a baseline requirement of the ODT project.</p> <p>7.4 DH felt that AI strategy should be driven by pinch points and outputs, rather than layering IT over existing projects. He noted the prioritisation of applications in the presentation.</p> <p>7.6 SG explained that it was felt in MHCLG that the digital team should not be distracted by new developments but instead ensure the basics were right first. The Board were in agreement with this approach.</p> <p>7.7 MOB then left the meeting.</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> 7a) To note the update.</p>
8.	<p><b>Forward planner</b></p> <p>8.1 The Board agreed the following addition: <b>September</b> – Strategic Plan</p> <p><b>Agreed:</b> 8a) The update to the Board forward planner.</p>
9.	<p><b>ODT – Show and Tell</b></p> <p>9.1 The Board received PH’s presentation.</p>
10.	<p><b>GDPR update for information</b></p> <p>10.1 DH stated that the paper was helpful to the Board, but questioned why it raised issues that he felt he should have been aware of prior to go live.</p> <p>10.2 The need to revisit training was not identified as part of future work. SR advised that training would be updated, and agreed that this should be made explicit in the report.</p>

10.3 DH noted that the issues raised in the self-assessment were different to the four headline points in the audit report. He asked that this be considered whilst the audit report was still in draft, as he will raise this at ARAC.

10.4 A question was raised on redaction and if this was being covered. PL explained that redaction is process failure and as such can be avoided by ensuring that the new system is GDPR compliant.

10.5 DH asked how a valid subject access request was determined. It was agreed that there was detailed work on this.

**Agreed:**

10a) To discuss GDPR at ARAC.

Next meeting: 1.00pm – 4.00pm, 27 September 2018, Brunel, Temple Quay House, Bristol