

Appendix i - Additional information requested by Corporate Policy and Resources Committee in relation to enforcement timescales.

	Table 1: Planning Enforcement Information	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Avg. to date	17/18 Avg.
1	No. of open cases	135	132	123	115	126	127	123	125	129
2	No of High Impact	18	18	18	17	18	19	20	18	16
3	No of Medium Impact	85	90	89	83	85	77	73	83	35
4	No of Low Impact	32	24	16	15	23	31	30	24	77
5	No of cases received	16	26	23	22	26	25	25	23	231 total
6	No of cases closed	50	29	32	30	15	24	29	30	210 total
7	% where initial response provided within 20 working days		56	77	75	59	54	60	64	n/a
8	% closed where WLDC action resulted in compliance	50	38	44	27	46	17	32	36	33
9	Av. No of days to determine case (in calendar month)	354	138	249	180	158	147	192	n/a	184
10	Av. No of days to determine case in year to date	354	246	247	230	215	204	202	n/a	185

Notes on table 1:

- a) The number of cases closed to date in 18/19 is 209. There were a total of 210 cases closed across the whole of 18/18.
- b) In April of 2018 50 cases were closed in month, which resulted in the increased figure for average number of days taken.
- c) A concerted effort has been made to close cases, however the number of reports is consistent and continual.
- d) The trend across the average number of days is reducing, however given that it includes ongoing complex cases it is difficult to predict or work towards a target.

Challenges Moving Forward – Planning Enforcement

1. Commitment has been made to undertake a review of the performance measures as it is not felt that they reflect the actual provision of service within the work area.
2. The investigation of high impact or complex cases is resource intensive and these are recorded within the overall measure. For example, in September 2018 24 cases were closed. 10 of these were long standing and had been open since 2016. If these cases were not included within the measures, the remaining 14 cases were closed in average of 86 days.

3. Complex and high impact cases are the focus of officers. We are investigating on average 16 of these cases per month, alongside the other 100 or so cases that are being opened, closed or investigated. As the current policy requires us to investigate all reports officers balance work demands based on priority, which inevitable will result in longer timescales for lower priority cases.
4. Advice would be appreciated as to how long standing cases, where time periods are often out of the hands of investigating officers (for example, when an enforcement notice is appealed at the planning inspectorate).

Table 2: Housing Enforcement Information		Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Avg. to date	17/18 Avg.
1	No of open housing enforcement cases	84	89	80	77	85	83	93	84	94
2	No of housing enforcement requests received	3	14	15	17	9	14	21	93 total	210 total
3	No of cases closed	23	13	8	13	9	23	10	14	15
4	Av. No of days to determine case (in calendar month)	251	167	67	111	104	217	192	n/a	145
5	Av. No of days to determine case in year to date	251	172	145	137	133	154	158	n/a	164
6	No of properties in PRS where conditions have been improved	14	11	2	7	3	7	5	49 total	68

Notes on table 2:

- a) The number of requests received for housing enforcement has reduced generally. There has been a 50% decrease within the South West Ward compared to this time last year.
- b) The average number of days to determine cases is not expected to be greater than that of 17/18, however is unlikely to fall under the 90 day target.
- c) A concerted effort has been made to close any long standing cases.

Challenges Moving Forward – Housing Enforcement

1. Attaching a performance measure or target timescale to a case, whilst providing information, is not necessarily meaningful. Sometimes, cases take a long time for various reasons and officers work towards achieving the right outcome rather than achieving the timescale.
2. The type of case that officers are dealing with are often high risk and have multiple factors. Our ability to resolve these quickly is determined by many things, some of which are outside of our control.
3. Measures such as point 6 in table 6 show an actual outcome. This is a measure not seen within the progress and delivery report.