

**Report of: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee**

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> June 2010**

**Item No: 4**

**Title of Report : Scrutiny Review of Planning Enforcement**

**Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To report the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee's review of Planning Enforcement

**Key decision:** No

**Board Member:**

**Scrutiny Responsibility:** Value and Performance

**Ward(s) affected:** All

**Report Approved by:**

**Cllr. Darke – Review Group Lead Member**

**Cllr. Goddard – Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee Chair**

James Pownall – Law and Governance

Emma Burson – Finance

**Recommendation(s):**

**CEB is asked to consider the recommendations contained within the report and say if it:**

- Agree
- Disagrees and why
- If any extra information is required to make a decision what the timescale is for this

**The recommendations are contained within the body of the report but are repeated below for clarity**

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1**

**To consider in detail the data required to support transparency, service scope, demand and the sound and robust management of performance. To ensure that systems are available to deliver on these requirements and the service uses them diligently**

**Recommendation 2**

**To set and publish performance targets for the service as a matter of urgency to include at least:**

- **Criteria for immediate acknowledgement of complaints regardless of priority or source**
- **Timescales within which first inspection/contact should be made**
- **Criteria for communicating to all the result of first inspection/contact and the likely path to follow including target timescales**
- **Targets for case completion or case closure**
- **Minimum communication periods/points as cases progress to completion/closure**
- **Criteria for case closure**
- **Protocol for the information and communication of a closed case**

### **Recommendation 3**

**That the priorities set within the Planning Enforcement Policy be reconsidered to give clear high priority to issues of:**

- **Substantial public or community concern**

**Medium priority to issues:**

- **Affecting local amenities or facilities (as opposed to the serious harm category already listed)**
- **Causing environmental damage**
- **Affecting the street scene**

### **Recommendation 4**

**Managers to ensure that access to and responses from the service are consistently good and transparently reported. With this in mind to provide a quarterly report to each planning committee showing performance against complaints received in their wards alongside performance across the Council as a whole**

### **Recommendation 5**

**To consider now information giving and management by at least:**

- **Producing clear and good quality leaflets giving advice on the extent and limitations of the service along with how to complain and the service that will be received. For these to be widely available**
- **Considering the information given to developers and those applying for planning consent to ensure that enforcement criteria are clear**
- **Appraising the service area web pages to provide the same information as above and to allow on line access to the service**
- **Providing training for staff at customer contact points (including call centres) on the service and customer expectations**
- **Including in the compulsory planning training for members a section on planning enforcement, the service extent and limitations and what they and their constituents can expect**

## **Recommendation 6**

**To give priority, within the reframing of the service, to clear and timely communication with service users using the most efficient means. To be able to demonstrate this through the quarterly reporting mentioned at recommendation 4**

## **Recommendation 7**

**To give more detailed and systematic consideration to the benefits and difficulties of partnership working and form a judgement on the possibilities of net gains to the Council or communities. To report on this by July 2010**

## **Recommendation 8**

**Decision makers to consider with officers the possibilities of increasing outcomes either through efficiencies or increased investment to allow the service to consider an element of proactive enforcement and/or to respond to the steadily growing demands for service.**

## **Recommendation 9**

**To ensure continued senior management focus on this service with the aim of keeping standards and quality high and providing timely solutions if service demands begin to outgrow resources**

## **Introduction and Methodology**

1. The Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee agreed to set a Review Group (RG) to consider the performance and outcomes from the Planning Enforcement Service. The catalyst for this was outcomes from conversations with councillors about which services they thought would benefit most from scrutiny review. The members nominated to undertake this work were Cllrs. Darke, Gotch, Khan and McCready with Cllr. Darke nominated as the lead member.

The RG wishes to pass on its thanks to all councillors and officers who have supported this review and would commend their positive and open attitude.

2. Members agreed that they would like to influence developments in areas where their experience and interaction with residents allowed them to add value. The following lines of inquiry were agreed by the RG:
  - To give a local representative view of the public perception of the service and its effectiveness
  - To give a view on the priorities for the service and where targets and timescales should be applied to best effect
  - How communication with individuals, members, decision makers and partners more widely is handled and within what timescales
  - The availability and quality of information that is generally available to all
  - The possibilities for the service to become more proactive and how this can be used to best effect.

- Can the service cope with the growing demand? How can this be addressed. What are the consequences of not addressing it
3. The opening of the RG's work coincided with the start of a Business Process Improvement (BPI) review commissioned by the service. This allowed a better understanding to be gained by the RG and for their emerging findings to be considered by officers in "real time". It is hoped that all benefited from this.
  4. The work undertaken by the RG consisted of
    - A detailed consultation with members on their experience of the service (outcomes are attached at Appendix 1)
    - Data collection from systems used by the service to determine current levels of performance and the management of this (information collected and analysed appears at Appendix 2)
    - Consideration of the Planning Advisory Service guidance on good practice within a national review called "A stitch in time"
    - The emerging action plan from the BPI (current BPI action plan appears at Appendix 3)

## Findings

### 5. Data Management

To give some factual context to the performance of the service and measure the extent of current and previous service demands, the RG asked the service for basic service data detailed below:

#### *The backlog and ongoing work*

- For the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup>. March 2009 and 1<sup>st</sup>. April 2009 to date:
  - The number of complaints received each month and for these complaints their priority type, source, geographical area and when they were settled
  - The backlog of complaints at 1<sup>st</sup>. April 2008, 30<sup>th</sup>. June 2008, 30<sup>th</sup>. September 2008, 31<sup>st</sup>. December 2008, 31<sup>st</sup>. March 2009, 30<sup>th</sup>. June 2009 and 30<sup>th</sup>. September 2009 and the make up of these by type, source and geographical area

#### *Priorities*

For the same periods above new complaints totalled by priorities and geographical area.

#### *Resolving Complaints*

For the same period as above:

- The average time it takes from complaint to the first visit by complaint type
- The average time it takes to resolve a complaint by complaint type.

6. Information was presented by the service from its data management system “Uniform” and analysed by the RG. The results of this can be found at Appendix 2
  
6. It was clear to the RG at first and subsequent further analysis that the service recorded data was flawed and therefore inaccurate to an unknown degree. The data base available for use is sound but the process of recording data is not systematic. Some of the flaws in the data are contained within the introductions to the tables at Appendix 2 and so are not repeated here but essentially not all basic information was available within the system for each case therefore any sort process asked for had limited value
  
7. It is hard to imagine how a service of this nature has been or can be managed effectively and credibly without good quality information. The action plan from the BPI review mentions the production of a system for managing work loads and monitoring performance against target. It is not clear to the RG if this action is clear and high profile enough to ensure the production of data to underpin the service that is robust and credible. The RG feel this is a fundamental point for both improvement and raising the profile of the service through broader information sharing on performance.

### **Recommendation 1**

**To consider in detail the data required to support transparency, service scope, demand and the sound and robust management of performance. To ensure that systems are available to deliver on these requirements and the service uses them diligently**

8. **Service Management and Performance**
  
9. In framing any service consideration is given to reasonable performance expectations matched against demand and the available resources. In particular for a service whose access is via complaint the management of response, handling times and clear decision paths is critical in forming a good or bad reputation amongst service users. The RG found that the only performance measure detailed for the service is that listed in the Planning Enforcement Strategy (Appendix 4). This sets a time within which first contact should be made ranked by category of importance. There is no evidence that this is monitored
  
10. This is not to say that staff are not working to achieve what they may consider to be good results but without any objective setting of performance expectations and the production of subsequent data to measure these it has been impossible for the RG to judge if service results are what is required within a good quality service.
  
11. It was clear from the response from members that the service standards they receive are patchy. The RG did not consult other service users so cannot offer a view on their experience. Nevertheless the RG wished to

be sure that the service had an ethos of fairness and delivered at a consistently good level regardless of the source of the complaint

12. Issues around performance have been recognised by the service within the BPI and there is an action point to produce performance levels and targets which is welcomed. In the interests of improving reputation the RG wishes to be sure that as a minimum targets are set at least within a number of areas. These are detailed at recommendation 2
13. Members expressed a desire to see the expansion of priorities mentioned in Para 9 and to include clearly 1 issue that they saw as a high priority for action and 3 that they see as medium priorities. These are detailed at recommendation 3

### **Recommendation 2**

**To set and publish performance targets for the service as a matter of urgency to include at least:**

- **Criteria for immediate acknowledgement of complaints regardless of priority or source**
- **Timescales within which first inspection/contact should be made**
- **Criteria for communicating to all the result of first inspection/contact and the likely path to follow including target timescales**
- **Targets for case completion or case closure**
- **Minimum communication periods/points as cases progress to completion/closure**
- **Criteria for case closure**
- **Protocol for the information and communication of a closed case**

### **Recommendation 3**

**That the priorities set within the Planning Enforcement Policy be reconsidered to give clear high priority to issues of:**

- **Substantial public or community concern**

**Medium priority to issues:**

- **Affecting local amenities or facilities (as opposed to the serious harm category already listed)**
- **Causing environmental damage**
- **Affecting the street scene**

### **Recommendation 4**

**Managers to ensure that access to and responses from the service are consistently good and transparently reported. With this in mind to provide a quarterly report to each planning committee showing performance against complaints received in their wards alongside performance across the Council as a whole**

## 14. Information and Communication

15. Within a service that is often limited in function and resolution by regulation and bureaucracy the management of user expectation is important. It should be clear at as many points of contact and access as possible what can and cannot be done and what likely outcomes are. Much can be done with clear leaflets, advice on the web, at customer contact points, at the point of planning application and in advice and training given to councillors. The RG found it surprising that no such leaflets or advice exist. Conversely leaflets and information are a good encouragement to “civic action” which is of benefit to the well being of the area.
16. Outside of the performance management points discussed above, on-going communication with complainants is not consistently or efficiently handled and the performance of the service overall is not communicated at any level. It is not clear from the BPI action plan that this has been recognised as a priority area for improvement and the RG would wish to highlight this

### Recommendation 5

**To consider now information giving and management by at least:**

- **Producing clear and good quality leaflets giving advice on the extent and limitations of the service along with how to complain and the service that will be received. For these to be widely available**
- **Considering the information given to developers and those applying for planning consent to ensure that enforcement criteria are clear**
- **Appraising the service area web pages to provide the same information as above and to allow on line access to the service**
- **Providing training for staff at customer contact points (including call centres) on the service and customer expectations**
- **Including in the compulsory planning training for members a section on planning enforcement, the service extent and limitations and what they and their constituents can expect**

### Recommendation 6

**To give priority, within the reframing of the service, to clear and timely communication with service users using the most efficient means. To be able to demonstrate this through the quarterly reporting mentioned at recommendation 4**

## 17. A Reactive vs. A Proactive Service

18. The survey response from members showed a large majority (83%) wishing the service to undertake proactive Planning Enforcement work and 70% of respondents saying that the Council should consider spending more money in this area to achieve this aim. Given this result the RG explored with officers the benefits of proactive enforcement work matched against the potential cost of providing it
19. The data to make judgements in this area is not clear as discussed earlier but a reasonable judgement could be made that the majority of planning applications are complied with well and of the complaints where the development has no planning consent a good number on application would be granted. The RG could therefore see no valid case/benefit to be had from the delivery of a service where every consent granted would be “signed off” as Building Control consent is
20. The RG then moved on to consider if selective monitoring of planning consent could provide some real benefit. The lack of data meant that the discussion was mainly illustrative but the RG felt that a case could be made in looking at about 5% of applications where the difference between acceptable and unacceptable delivery of the consent would make a real or significant difference to communities, the spatial environment or the Councils aims values and policies. The RG agreed that for any consideration of this to be successful the judgement should be made by planners either individually or in advising committees at the time of consent
21. The other avenue explored for the delivery of proactive action was through partnership working with other areas of the council whose outputs engaged them in the same, similar or connected issues. In this the RG considered the following:
- Building Control
  - Environmental Enforcement
  - Planning Control
22. It was clear from the data that the majority of complaints come from neighbours and other members of the public but the next largest categories are referrals from the partners above. So whilst there are no formal partnerships in terms of process some joined up working does happen. The RG heard that the commercial environment within which Building Control operated would be undermined if they formally served 2 “clients”
23. The BPI did not consider the benefits to the process and outcomes through partnership working and the RG felt that this should be given more consideration. There was however a recognition that that this could have the outcome of increasing service demands that ultimately cannot be satisfied

## **Recommendation 7**



**To give more detailed and systematic consideration to the benefits and difficulties of partnership working and form a judgement on the possibilities of net gains to the Council or communities. To report on this by July 2010**

#### **Recommendation 8**

**Decision makers to consider with officers the possibilities of increasing outcomes either through efficiencies or increased investment to allow the service to consider an element of proactive enforcement and/or to respond to the steadily growing demands for service.**

#### **Conclusion**

24. The Planning Enforcement Service has clearly been undermanaged and produced patchy performance for some time. Service demands (complaints) have risen over a period of time and backlogs have developed causing poor focus, frustration and wasted time. All this has produced underachievement. This situation has gone unchecked for too long
25. The BPI process is a very positive step and the outcomes around skills, processes, performance and information, if carried forward to good resolution, will produce a much more successful service.
26. Service managers have made some inroads into the backlog which has developed using a consultant planner brought in for a short period of time. The clearing of this backlog is important not only to the complainants but also to ensure that any new process can be given a good start unencumbered by distraction. It was disappointing to hear that this work will not be completed before new processes begin because of lack of resources
27. The BPI process has produced some efficiencies but managers report that this extra "time" will be more than taken up with the extra effort in case management and improved communication. This is not a high profile service but nevertheless an important one to both the public and members. With this in mind the RG would wish to see continued senior management focus with the aim of keeping standards and quality high and providing timely solutions if service demands begin to outgrow resources

#### **Recommendation 9**

**To ensure continued senior management focus on this service with the aim of keeping standards and quality high and providing timely solutions if service demands begin to outgrow resources**

<p><b>Report Author:</b> <b>Pat Jones on behalf of the Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee</b> <b>Email: <a href="mailto:phjones@oxford.gov.uk">phjones@oxford.gov.uk</a></b> <b>Tel: 01865 252191</b></p>
---



## **Review of Planning Enforcement – Response to Councillor Questionnaire**

The response rate was 40% i.e. 19 out of 48 councillors

### **Q1: How would you rate your knowledge of the Planning Enforcement Service?**

Good overall knowledge of the service amongst councillors

- 55% responded – Good or Excellent
- Only 11% responded – Poor

### **Q2: When talking to your constituents or making complaints on Planning Enforcement issues, are you clear about: how to complain; who to contact; what service they/you should expect to receive?**

Most councillors know how to complain and who to contact but less knew what to expect from the service

### **Q3: How often do Planning Enforcement issues appear in your casework?**

Most councillors deal with these issues occasionally but a significant minority of respondents dealt with Planning Enforcement issues often

- 67% occasionally
- 33% often

### **Q4: What are your key expectations of the Planning Enforcement Service?**

This was a free hand question. I list the different responses rather than all of them

- Issues addressed in a timely manner
- To be prompt
- Timely response at all stages
- Be problem solvers
- Provide good control
- Redirect or deal with issues not wholly in their domain
- Action that is effective in bringing about a solution
- Satisfactory conclusion to investigations – current process seems to stall and falter before the end
- Clear explanation of the process and timings
- To keep me informed of progress and possible actions to be taken
- Make sure conditions attached to approvals are adhered to
- Make sure the agreed permission is adhered to
- Impartiality
- Integrity
- Neutrality
- Look afresh
- To act firmly

- Don't wait for complaint
- Clear explanations of procedure and guidance to those using the service
- Clear explanations
- Clear path of action
- Quick site visit and report back on what is to be done
- Regular follow up
- Efficiency

**Q5: From your experience are there any key omissions in the service?**

This was a free hand question. I list the different responses rather than all of them

- None
- Being proactive
- Don't wait for complaints from the public
- Need particularly to be proactive in conservation areas
- Ensuring conditions are met
- Clarity about priorities
- What happen about older issues
- The service is slow and pusillanimous
- Overload
- Timescales are unpredictable
- Difficult to get them off their chairs
- I have to dig for feedback – this should be automatic
- Under resourced so often unable to commit resource to pursue offenders
- Seem to go for easy pickings rather than those who will put up a battle
- Timely response
- They take too much legal advice which causes frustration
- Communication generally is poor
- Communication with building control is poor
- Lack of clear information at the beginning of the process
- Acknowledgement and explanation of the process and timing is not good

**Q6: How would you rate the Planning Enforcement service in the following areas?**

Not all respondents answered each question so I give the majority rating

The range was: Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, No experience

- Convenience or ease of access to the service - **Good**
- How complaints are acknowledged – **Average**
- Clarity and timeliness of ongoing communication – **Slightly below average**
- The way in which final outcomes are communicated and explained – **Slightly below average**
- The availability of information in leaflets – **Poor**
- The availability of information on the web – **Poor**
- The availability of information at customer contact points – **Poor**
- The availability of advice from officers working in the service – **Good**

- Time taken to actively pursue complaints – **Average**
- Time taken to resolve complaints – **Slightly below average**
- Information provided on outcomes across the whole service – **Poor**
- Service overall – **Average**

**Q6a: Which areas would you priorities for improvement?**

This used the same service elements as question 6 above but very few respondents answered this entire question so results are not representative. We could correlate the responses from Q5 to make judgements about priorities and omissions

**Q7: Do you agree with the current priorities of the service?**

This related to the timescales set within the current policy document for a first visit on receipt of a complaint. The majority of respondents mostly agreed

**Q8: Please state your priorities**

This asked respondent to rate their priorities and respond to others suggested or add their own. Only 63% of respondents completed this question so conclusions should be drawn with caution.

No one added their own suggestions. For those suggested by the Panel I give the priority suggested by the majority of those that responded and the percentage of the respondents that this represented

- Public or community concern – **High (58%)**
- Effects on local amenities (as opposed to serious harm) – **Medium (50%)**
- Environmental damage – **Medium (50%)**
- Effects on the street scene – **Medium (63%)**

**Q9: The current service only responds to complaints it receives. Do you think it should be proactive?**

- 83% thought the service should be proactive

**Q10: To what extent do you think the service should be proactive?**

Not all but most (80%) of respondents answered this question:

- Only as far as current budgets allow – **20%**
- With some minimal extra investment – **33%**
- So that we can operate efficiently to the level of the best performing – **47%**

**Q11: Thinking about this service overall and in relation to other service, what priority would you give it?**

- High – **44%**
- Medium – **56%**
- Low – **0**

**Q12: Is there anything else you would like to add?**

These are all the comments

- Proactive enforcement should be undertaken at a lower level in the organisation e.g. street wardens and then escalated to planning if necessary hence focusing enforcement officer skills
- Paul Townsend is consistently one of the best and most helpful officers I have engaged with on casework
- Action on better engagement and communication would do much to improve the image of the service
- Checking dangerous structures is an excellent service
- The calibre of enforcement officers is not in question
- Service is important to the public when they have an issue and so is a yardstick for we care for those we serve. Members of the public deserve to understand how we operate and what to expect from the service – this is currently opaque on procedures and speed. The proactive issue is trickier because of discretion and resources. Can we be more efficient within current resources and provide some temporary help to get the service into good order
- The big fish get away and the minnows get caught
- Better partnership
- Better communication is needed between planning, licensing and building control to give better and more joined up outcomes
- We should provide enough information to manage the expectations of individuals and communities
- We should give final approval in planning terms as well as building control terms

Pat Jones

[phjones@oxord.gov.uk](mailto:phjones@oxord.gov.uk)

01865 252191

The tables below show the data collected in response to the Review Groups request for information.

Information as been presented to me in lists extracted from the management information system used by the service. Rather than present you with these lists I have analysed then into the tables below. You will see from the introduction to each table that in most cases the data is incomplete and the extent of the incompleteness is not quantified. Given this you should make judgements with caution

To remind you the information requested was:

**To take a view on the backlog matched against incoming work.** I imagine backlog can be defined in a number of ways and I'm not sure how you define it but could we agree on complaints not resolved?

For the period 1.4.08 to 31.3.09 and 1.4.09 to date can we have:

- The number of complaints received each month and for these complaints their type, source, geographical area, how and when they were settled
- The backlog of complaints at 1.4.08, 30.6.08, 30.9.08, 31.12.08, 31.3.09, 30.06.09 and 30.09.09 and the make up of these by type, source and geographical area

**Priorities** - For the same periods above new complaints totalled by priorities and geographical area.

**Resolving Complaints** – For the same period as above - The average time it takes from complaint to the first visit (or however else you actively work on a complaint) by complaint type and the average time it takes to resolve a complaint by complaint type.

**Information giving** – Copies of all leaflets or information you currently use.

It is confirmed that the service currently has not leaflets or information giving sheets

**Data Tables**

**Conversion**

Decimal	Number of days	Decimal	Number of days
0.01	22 mins	0.1	½ day
0.02	44 mins	0.2	1 day
0.03	1hr. 6mins	0.3	1 ½ days
0.04	1hr. 28mins	0.4	2 days
0.05	1hr. 50mins	0.5	2 ½ days
0.06	2hrs. 12mins	0.6	3 days
0.07	2hrs 34mins	0.7	3 ½ days
0.08	2hrs 56mins	0.8	4 days
0.09	3hrs 18mins	0.9	4 ½ days
		1.00	5 days

**Table 1**

**Average time taken to resolve complaints by category**

Period – 1<sup>st</sup>. April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup>. March 2009

**Note:** This data is compromised because the category of complaints is not always recorded. I don't know what proportion this unrecorded element represents. The numbers are also reduced because a complaint that is recorded and resolved or removed within 24hours produces a minus number. Once again I don't know the total of the negative effect

<b>Complaint Category</b>	<b>Average time taken in weeks</b>
Flyposting <b>(F)</b>	6.26
Other breaches of control <b>(E)</b>	5.60
Public safety, listed buildings, trees, ads in the conservation area <b>(A)</b>	9.00
Support action by other Business Units <b>(B)</b>	2.94
Unauthorised development and breaches – serious harm <b>(C)</b>	12.23
Unauthorised use and ads not in the conservation area <b>(D)</b>	12.06



**Table 2****Average time taken to resolve complaints by category and ward**Period – 1<sup>st</sup>. April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup>. March 2009

**Note:** This is the same data as Table 1 but further sorted by ward consequently it is compromised for the same reasons. I would also have expected the “average for category” figure to be about the same as that appearing in table 1 (allowing for rounding within different average calculations). Some are so different to suggest further compromises in the data than those identified

Ward	Flyposting ( Average Wks)	Other breaches of control (Average Wks)	Public safety, listed buildings, trees, ads in the conservation area (Average Wks)	Support action by other Business Units (Average Wks)	Unauthorised development and breaches – serious harm (Average Wks)	Unauthorised use and ads not in the conservation area (Average Wks)
Barton and Sandhills	-	0.35	-	-	-	0.72
Blackbird Leys	-	13.90	-	-	13.36	15.20
Carfax	8.50	0.45	5.28	6.12	8.17	11.99
Churchill	-	5.36	1.53	0.16	-	2.30
Cowley Marsh	-	3.30	1.97	-0.05	21.43	10.60
Cowley	-	16.99	-	-	16.80	11.45
Headington Hill and Northway	-	7.26	-	2.36	26.08	15.29
Headington	-	3.27	-0.06	1.03	-	3.53
Hinksey Park	-	7.92	-	11.25	14.40	16.06
Holywell	-	9.38	4.52	-	13.78	-
Iffley Fields	-	4.86	19.14	2.26	20.26	12.95

Ward	Flyposting ( Average Wks)	Other breaches of control (Average Wks)	Public safety, listed buildings, trees, ads in the conservation area (Average Wks)	Support action by other Business Units (Average Wks)	Unauthorised development and breaches – serious harm (Average Wks)	Unauthorised use and ads not in the conservation area (Average Wks)
Jericho and Osney	1.78	2.17	26.11	-0.08	9.40	14.26
Littlemore	-	18.44	1.20	-	23.69	15.89
Lye Valley	10.86	15.24	-	-	3.39	7.54
Marston	-	5.07	-0.07	2.63	0.93	10.08
North	-	6.68	33.91	-0.08	10.53	0.94
Northfield Brook	-	-	-	-	-	6.48
Quarry and Risinghurst	-	5.23	4.06	4.10	-	9.05
Rose Hill and Iffley	-	4.71	4.76	0.48	5.53	11.65
St. Clements	0.71	6.68	20.07	-0.07	15.31	13.09
St. Margrets	-	5.25	12.21	-0.09	1.09	6.44
St. Marys	8.63	30.33	13.34	5.82	12.05	16.75
Summertown	0.79	4.85	-0.08	0.04	4.91	12.10
Wolvercote	5.50	2.54	-0.05	-	9.00	4.27
<b>Average for Category</b>	5.25	7.84	8.70	2.25	12.11	9.94

**Table 3**

**Time taken between complaint and first action by complaint type**

Period – 1<sup>st</sup>. April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup>. March 2009

**Note:** This is the same data as in Table 1 and so is compromised for the same reasons plus it has only captured complaints where the “first action” has been noted and captured. This statement suggests that it therefore represents fewer complaints than in Table 1

<b>Complaint Category</b>	<b>Average time taken in weeks</b>	<b>Policy response time</b>
Flyposting <b>(F)</b>	0.04	No response time set in policy
Other breaches of control <b>(E)</b>	0.95	Chronological order
Public safety, listed buildings, trees, ads in the conservation area <b>(A)</b>	0.37	0.2
Support action by other Business Units <b>(B)</b>	0.26	0.2
Unauthorised development and breaches – serious harm <b>(C)</b>	-0.15	1.00
Unauthorised use and ads not in the conservation area <b>(D)</b>	1.62	2.00

**Table 4****Number of complaints by source and ward**Period – 1<sup>st</sup>. April 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup>. March 2009

**Note:** This is the same data as in Table 1 and so is compromised for the same reasons plus it has only captured complaints where a source has been recorded. This statement suggests that it therefore represents fewer complaints than in Table 1

Ward	Agency e.g. fire service	Member of the public	Neighbour	Occup.	Landlord or Agent	Building Control	Planning Control	Environ. Health	OBS	Another council dept.	Cllr.	Member Of Parl	Area Comm.
Barton and Sandhills	1	1	4	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Blackbird Leys	2	2	1	-	-	1	7	1	-	1	3	1	1
Carfax	-	3	11	1	2	4	22	6	-	1	3	-	-
Churchill		8	13			1	3	8			3		
Cowley Marsh		8	18	1		4	19	4		2	1		
Cowley	1	4	18			1	19	5	1	1	2		
Headington Hill and Northway	1	13	17	1		3	4	1		1	3	1	

Ward	Agency e.g. fire service	Member of the public	Neighbour	Occup.	Landlord or Agent	Building Control	Planning Control	Environ. Health	OBS	Another council dept.	Cllr.	Member Of Parl	Area Comm.
Headington		5	7			6	2	6		1	2	1	
Hinksey Park	1		20			3	4	4			2	1	
Holywell			1				1			1			
Iffley Fields		5	19	1		4	11	7		1	2		
Jericho and Osney		5	29	1	1	2	17	6			10		
Littlemore		6	17				9	1	1		7	1	
Lye Valley		3	17				8			1	7	2	
Marston		9	21	1		4	5	1			4		
North			22	1		2	9	1		1	4		
Northfield Brook			1		1		2	2					
Quarry and Risinghurst	1	9	17	1		3	5	3		3	13		
Rose Hill and Iffley		6	17	2		2	11	2	2	7	1		
St. Clements		21	11	1		3	15	10		2	1		

Ward	Agency e.g. fire service	Member of the public	Neighbour	Occup.	Landlord or Agent	Building Control	Planning Control	Environ. Health	OBS	Another council dept.	Cllr.	Member Of Parl	Area Comm.
St. Margrets			13		2	2	7	2			4		
St. Marys		6	15		1	1	28	31		3	2		
Summertown	2	1	32	1		10	9	3		1	6		
Wolvercote		2	15			3	12			2	2		
<b>Total</b>	9	117	356	12	7	60	229	105	5	29	82	7	1

**Table 5**

**Total complaints received by category – Resolved and outstanding**

Period as shown in the table

**Note:** This analysis is taken from information in answer to the questions about new and outstanding complaints. These questions were posed for various periods. It is not clear from the data if the outstanding figures should be seen as cumulative but that would seem to be the only thing that would make sense i.e. those resolved are not necessarily those received within the period but may have been carried forward from a different period

I also received data in response to the question “How many cases are outstanding sorted by ward, type and source”. This question was asked for various periods. Analysis of this data (not included here) shows different (smaller) outstanding figures than those in the Table 5 below. My assumption is that this has occurred because when criteria is added to the sort process complaints are excluded because the criteria has not been input

My view would therefore be that the less refined data produces the more accurate but still flawed result

<b>Period of time</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>	<b>Cat.</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>% Resolved</b>
1/1/08 - 1/4/08	240				32		
<b>Total</b>	<b>240</b>					<b>208</b>	<b>86.67</b>
2/4/08 - 30/4/08	79						
1/5/08 -31/05/08	64						
1/6/08 -30/06/08	91				34		
		A	19	8.12			
		B	9	3.85			
		C	39	16.67			
		D	85	36.32			
		E	76	32.48			
		F	6	2.56			
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>		<b>234</b>			<b>200</b>	<b>85.47</b>

<b>Period of time</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>% Resolved</b>
1/7/08 - 31/7/08	92						
1/8/08 - 31/8/08	77						
1/9/08 - 30/9/08	73				71		
		A	24	9.92			
		B	42	17.36			
		C	23	9.50			
		D	103	42.56			
		E	46	19.01			
		F	4	1.65			
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>242</b>			<b>171</b>	<b>70.66</b>
<b>Period of time</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>% Resolved</b>
1/10/08-31/10/08	113						
1/11/08 - 30/11/08	69						
1/12/08 - 31/12/08	60				60		
		A	19	7.85			
		B	19	7.85			
		C	39	16.12			
		D	82	33.88			
		E	77	31.82			
		F	6	2.48			
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>242</b>			<b>182</b>	<b>75.21</b>



<b>Period of time</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>% Resolved</b>
1/1/09 - 31/1/09	92						
1/12/09 - 28/2/09	80						
1/3/09 - 31/3/09	106				84		
		A	18	6.47			
		B	22	7.91			
		C	48	17.27			
		D	86	30.94			
		E	92	33.09			
		F	11	3.96			
<b>Total</b>	<b>278</b>		<b>277</b>			<b>194</b>	<b>69.78</b>
<b>Period of time</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>% Resolved</b>
1/4/09 - 30/04/09	52						
1/5/09 - 31/5/09	70						
1/6/09 - 30/6/09	125				79		
		A	20	8.10			
		B	13	5.26			
		C	41	16.60			
		D	75	30.36			
		E	91	36.84			
		F	7	2.83			
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>		<b>247</b>			<b>168</b>	<b>68.02</b>

<b>Period of time</b>	<b>Complaints Received</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Outstanding</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>% Resolved</b>
1/7/09 - 31/7/09	87						
1/8/09 - 31/8/09	63						
1/9/09 - 30/9/09	70				67		
		A	23	10.45			
		B	13	5.91			
		C	24	10.91			
		D	88	40.00			
		E	71	32.27			
		F	1	0.45			
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>		<b>220</b>			<b>136</b>	<b>61.82</b>

Pat Jones  
[phjones@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:phjones@oxford.gov.uk)  
01865 252191

