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Introduction

This is our ninth annual Planning Performance Framework (PPF9) for the National Park.

Published annually, this framework demonstrates the continuous improvement of our planning service and is a requirement for all planning authorities in Scotland. It represents a holistic view of our performance, giving substance to our statistics published bi-annually regarding how many applications we handled and the timescales for these.

This framework includes our National Headline Indicators (statistics on Local Development Plan age, effective land supply, project planning, approval rates and enforcement) which can be found at the end of the document at Part Five. Part One tells the story of how we have improved on last year’s performance and gives our annual update on headline development issues in the National Park, development plan scheme, legacy cases, and pre-application service. It also highlights new improvements, such as the way we handle complaints and record large volumes of representations. We have also recently started publishing a Local Development Plan newsletter to increase communication with a wider range of stakeholders, and highlight the work we are publishing and news stories on our blog.

Swift Training by RSPB for Development Management team (April 2019)
Our priorities as a Planning Service

The Government’s Programme for Scotland 2019-20, published in September 2019, sets out the next steps on Scotland’s journey to net zero emissions and raises the ambition on tackling the climate emergency. Last year the focus was on sustainable economy, city deals and empowering communities and we demonstrated how we were tailoring our work to these priorities. The focus this year is climate emergency and below we can demonstrate how our work in the planning service contributes towards this programme.

Climate and Economy

Scottish Government actions under this section include many urban investments but also includes investments that will affect the rural area such as £30 million for innovative low carbon heating projects, 12,000 hectares of woodland creation supported by £5 million investment, £2 million for Biodiversity Challenge Fund, and Active Travel work to make towns and cities friendlier and safer places for pedestrians and cyclist. To ensure a successful economy the Rural Tourism Infrastructure Fund (RTIF) was given a further £3 million for new projects in 2020-21. As part of NPF, the government will explore policy to enable development that supports dynamic rural economies and help re-populate rural areas.

Our Local Development Plan (LDP) policy monitoring shows that low and zero carbon technology was used for 100% of new buildings in 2019. Successful bids to the RTIF fund are delivering improved rural visitor infrastructure at Inveruglas and Tarbet. Joint working with the Strathard community is developing a co-designed framework to guide future development and land use.

See case study 3 about our new Rural Framework for Strathard tackling climate change and land use issues.

Empowering Communities

Scottish Government actions under this section include increase the number of affordable homes of all tenures in communities - £25 million available between 2016 and 2021 to the Rural Housing Fund, tackle the issue of short term lets, strengthening places – approach to encourage better collaboration and community involvement - £11 million in Investing in Community fund to help local areas respond to priority issues, invest a further £10 million in the Scottish Land Fund, supporting community ownership to boost local amenities and support local economies. Introduce a new community right to buy for sustainable development, ensure new renewable energy development on Scotland’s forest and land pay community benefits.

Our priority is to continue to use planning policy to support more affordable housing provision, as well as support capacity of community organisations and community led action on a range of issues including land use, climate change and social enterprise.

See case study 4 about piloting place plans with two further communities.
There are four overall measures against which our performance is assessed:

- Quality of outcomes;
- Quality of service and engagement;
- Governance; and
- Culture of continuous improvement.

There are a number of case studies highlighting broader activity and explaining how we have been focusing on high quality development on the ground (Case Studies 1 and 2). We evidence quality of service and engagement by (Case Study 3 and 4). In light of planning reforms we are working on place plans (Case Study 4). Finally, we have been developing a new procedures for handling large volumes of representations and to monitor major developments alongside an external Project Monitoring Officer (Case Study 5).

### Case Study Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Topics</th>
<th>Issues covered in PPF9</th>
<th>Case Study Topics</th>
<th>Issues covered in PPF9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Working</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Place Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charrettes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterplanning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDP &amp; Supplementary Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Process Improvement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Skills Sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Online Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management Processes</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Active Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASE STUDY 1**
New housing and village green for West Loch Lomondside

**CASE STUDY 2**
Cameron House – large scale expansion of 5 star resort

**CASE STUDY 3**
Strathard Land Use and Rural Development Framework

**CASE STUDY 4**
Community Local Place Plans

**CASE STUDY 5**
Cononish Gold Mine

**CASE STUDY 6**
Telling the Planning Story
Quality of Outcomes – demonstrating the added value delivered by planning

Monitoring Outcomes 2019

Last year we showcased our new annual monitoring report. The 2019 Monitoring Report demonstrates how we are delivering the vision set out in the Local Development Plan. This shows progress with low carbon development, active travel opportunities and infrastructure to support this, more affordable housing opportunities and provision of visitor accommodation.

Housing

There was been a spike in both housing approvals and completions in 2019. Completions were 63 new homes (calendar year) compared to previous year averages of around 30. This included 26 new affordable homes at Balloch on an exceptions site at the edge of the village. This demonstrates the added value and flexibility our policies provide, as these homes were delivered under our rural exception policy which allows affordable homes where there are no other sites available within the village boundary or on allocated sites. A high quality finish was achieved through close monitoring and approval of conditions – in relation to signing off tiles, render and approving the final planting scheme.

Tourism

New tourism accommodation was constructed, such as an innovative cabin design in Monachyle Mhor, Balquhidder and a more traditional chalet styled building at Nether Glenny Farm near Port of Menteith (see photos). Both of these small units are extremely high quality and evidence the creative design and innovation supported by our Design and Placemaking Guidance.

These are examples of ‘light’ touch developments with very low environmental impact responding to the location character. The chalet is off grid with electricity via a solar panel and wind turbine, heating is provided by a wood burning stove. At the cabin ‘in the trees’, heating is provided by the nearby hotel’s biomass system. Two small trees were removed however compensatory planting was achieved with four new oak and three new birch trees planted in accordance with the LDP natural heritage policies. This is an example of the added value that the planning system can deliver through achieving net gains to biodiversity and nature through non-monetary developer contributions.
Active and Sustainable Travel
There was 3km of new paths completed in 2019, most notably a new section of the Lochearnhead to St Fillans railway path that will become part of the strategic National Development 8 Long Distance Cycling and Walking Network.

This year, for the first time, we analysed the use of Transport Policy 2 (TP2) in relation to sustainable travel. There were a number of positive contributions with additional cycle storage, active travel packs for new householders and new path infrastructure. New holiday pods/lodges at Drymen and Balquidder have direct access to strategic routes such West Highland Way and NCN7, and include provision of bike racks. Other tourism lodge developments have collection services as part of their travel plan. A new brewery, café and bar was approved at Carrick Castle, near to the bus stop and on the core path.

Climate change
One of our main improvements has been the implementation of our climate design policy where this year all new buildings approved included low and zero carbon technology – these included air source heat pumps and solar PV. In a few cases a condition was used as the detail was not provided, however the commitment was made by the developer. This demonstrates the added value being provided via strong negotiation skills by our development management team to secure improved compliance with this policy.

Built Heritage
Our planning service has a key role in supporting the conservation and enhancement of the National Park’s built heritage. Last year, through negotiation, six listed building applications were withdrawn where they didn’t comply with LDP policy. Detailed advice was provided and amendments agreed, resulted in approvals and achieving positive outcomes for heritage and place.

Lochearnhead to St Fillans railway path – Before and After

Cononish House, Listed Building – Application was withdrawn as initial design did not comply with policy
CASE STUDY 1 – New Housing and Village Green for West Loch Lomondside Communities

Development of housing and community infrastructure in Luss and the surrounds is a step closer following approval of Luss Estates’ planning applications

Overview
In PPF6 the case study highlighted the West Loch Lomondside Rural Development Framework - an area based planning and development strategy that was tailored to the areas needs and opportunities, in order to help facilitate a viable programme of investment and development in Luss and the surrounding rural area.

The Framework provided confidence to the landowner, Luss Estates, to put forward an innovative package of development proposals including a mix of housing types and tenures, along with a new community village green in Luss. Overall this comprised eight separate planning applications at various locations as shown in the map, each uniquely designed and phased to allow for cross-funded delivery of the development mix.

The final application package including 26 open market homes and the financial equivalent of 23 affordable houses (comprising 5 social rented homes, 6 serviced and ready-to-build affordable housing plots and a village green) along with 2 hectares of native woodland planting was approved in November 2019. The drafting of the Section 75 legal agreement that accompanies and ties together the applications into a phased delivery package is now being progressed. This is a significant package of investment for a small rural area that has been experiencing population decline and loss of young people.

Goal
The goal was to deliver the development proposals that were identified in the West Loch Lomondside Rural Development Framework. Following initial submission, the proposals were collectively modified, including alterations to dwelling numbers and improvements made to design and site layouts. A number of technical issues also required more detailed surveys to resolve matters relating to drainage and flood risk, ecology and tree impacts. At each stage the proposals were re-negotiated, refined and viability-tested to ensure compliance with agreed strategy.
CASE STUDY 1 – New Housing and Village Green for West Loch Lomondside Communities

Outcome
Although taking place over a protracted period, the process to determine the planning applications demonstrated successful collaborative working with the landowner and the National Park. It also ensured that there were opportunities for the local community to engage with the process, through repeat consultation.

Clear policy advice and guidance to ensure the overall package would deliver the strategy set out in the Rural Development Framework was essential in demonstrating value for all stakeholders including the local community. Pragmatism and fostering a good working relationship with Luss Estates was also pivotal in to successfully negotiating a high quality and commercially viable development package overall which will contribute positively to the future social and economic sustainability of the Luss area.

This case study demonstrates how innovative planning policy approaches, developed in partnership with the private sector, can be successful in facilitating development delivery in rural areas and is a model that could be further developed for other areas of the National Park.

This case study contributes towards the Quality of Outcomes.
Key markers:
11 - regular and proportionate policy advice

Key Areas:
Affordable Housing, Planning Applications

Stakeholders:
Authority Planning Staff, Local Developers

Name of Key Officer:
Caroline Strugnall
CASE STUDY 2 – Cameron House, Large-scale Expansion of 5-star Resort
Extending the Park’s Tourism Economy and Season

Overview
Cameron House, is a 5-star established hotel and leisure resort located on the western shore of Loch Lomond, 2km from Balloch. Cameron House is a Category ‘B’ listed building, comprising a predominately early 19th century mansion house and late 20th century bedroom and leisure suite extensions, set within a designed landscape with mature trees. In last years’ PPF we reported on the applications for façade retention scheme and reinstatement of the historic building following a significant fire in December 2017.

An application was submitted in 2019 for a four story extension of the current hotel (a total of 140 bedrooms following reinstatement) up to 210 bedrooms, to meet market demand. The applicant stated that the hotel was previously running (pre-fire) at 97% occupancy at weekends and the proposal would increase occupancy throughout the week. On the ground floor, would be a new 350 person loch facing banqueting/conference hall to offer a new type of facility. The previously underutilised historic walled garden was to be retained and reinstated with a formal garden and car parking. The new extension would supplement existing direct employment by approximately 150 jobs.

Goal
To ensure that in handling the application that the historic and natural heritage value of the site and its lochside surroundings were enhanced and protected by the application to vastly extend and alter the building and the grounds. Therefore, alongside the historic and natural environment, the principle of development and design quality were key considerations.

It was also important to consider the long-term landscape and lighting management of the site and sustainability in terms of energy and transport. To work collaboratively with the applicant’s multi-disciplinary team and all the relevant consultees, in particular SEPA, Transport Scotland and the local authority, at pre-planning and application stages.
CASE STUDY 2 – Cameron House, Large-scale Expansion of 5-star Resort

Outcomes
Following the pre-application input we collaboratively worked with the applicant’s team so the application positively progressed beyond the original submission to one where the design quality and configuration of the extension has been enhanced, the impacts on woodland loss have been compensated for on-site and long-term management of this important site on the shore of Loch Lomond has been updated and secured in perpetuity via a legal agreement. The design quality, combined with new landscape planting and management proposals, complements the site to ensure that its historic setting qualities are protected. Furthermore, sustainability standards were satisfactorily incorporated, with incorporation of air source heat pumps, enhanced biodiversity, consideration of flood risk, sustainable drainage system, use of solar gain through aspect and design and the active travel plan. The plan supports the use of sustainable transport choices such as the adjacent regional cycle route. This new extension will enhance the range of facilities at this established resort to meet their market demands but will also contribute further to the National Park’s employment levels, visitor experience and year-round tourism economy.

This case study contributes towards the Quality of Outcomes but also Quality of Service and Engagement.  

Key markers:
3 – Early collaboration

Key Areas:
Design, Environment

Stakeholders:
Authority Planning Staff, Local Developers

Name of Key Officer:
Craig Jardine

Existing site, location of new Extension

Visualisation of 70 Bed/Conference Extension Courtesy of 3D Reid
Quality of Service and Engagement
This section provides evidence that our planning service is undertaking positive actions to support sustainable economic growth by providing clarity and certainty and a positive customer experience.

LIVEPark

Award Winning Processes and Plans
This year a highlight was being shortlisted at the Scottish Awards for Quality in Planning in 2019 for our LDP Action Programme and Lochgoil Community Action Plan. This work was originally showcased in our Planning Performance Framework 7 (2017-2018) and also highlighted in last year’s PPF (2018-2019). For the award submission we developed two videos which provides feedback from our Planning and Access Committee Members on the value of the document. Lochgoilhead Community Action Plan was a nomination in the People’s Choice award.

LIVEPark newsletter and blogs
In 2019, as well as keeping our blog up-to-date on our website, we started a new newsletter – called LIVEPark news. Its main aim is to give updates on the Local Development Plan action programme, development plan scheme and monitoring report which are now on six-monthly and annual cycles. It also highlights some of the big news regarding development activity across the National Park, acting as another conduit to share information and helping to raise the profile of planning and development.

In our first instalment we highlighted the work ongoing on major applications. The newsletter was issued to 521 contacts via mailchimp of which 185 contacts opened it. This is a 39.4% open rate. The action programme was the most followed link. The list included those who had originally signed up to be kept informed on planning matters when we were consulting on our Local Development Plan. We are now advertising the newsletter on our website and inviting people to join the list.
Development Plan Scheme
Last year we explained that our Development Plan Scheme had included a review of LDP timescales, being informed by an assessment of our evidence base, emerging new key issues and the current progression of the Planning Bill through Parliament. This resulted in the new LDP timescales moving from 2021 to 2023 in order to closely align with NPF4, Scottish Planning Policy and anticipated new planning regulations.

Our Development Plan Scheme for 2020, which followed the same timescales as above and set out in the 2019 Development Plan Scheme, was due to be published in April 2020 however this wasn’t possible due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic reducing staff time available. At officer level we have since reviewed our timescales for preparing our new plan in line with the emerging draft work programme shared by the Scottish Government, to which we consider we need to closely follow. We anticipate our LDP programme needs further review and we intend to issue an updated Development Plan Scheme in August 2020.

At present we are focussed on carefully project planning the delivery of the Local Development Plan and at end March 2020 we were fully on track to deliver the plan by 2023 but we do expect this to shift in the next review.

Action Programme
The action programme includes a summary of progress over last 3 years and is reviewed every 6 months.

At March 2020:

- **51%** of the LDP sites are being **progressed** or are completed (see graph showing the steady increase in completions):
- **56%** of the LDP sites have **no planning permission** but there is progress with around 20 sites of these sites being discussed in active pre-application discussions.

Given half the sites are progressing well then it is considered the plan is on track to deliver the majority of the sites over the plan period.

![Status of LDP site activity over time](image)
Trees and Woodland Strategy

The requirement for a statutory Forestry and Woodlands Strategy was brought in by the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019. A public consultation ran from May to June 2019; there were also two events held during the consultation period which were attended by land managers and forest managers/agents. Our Trees and Woodland strategy was approved at the board meeting on 24th October 2019.

This sets out our vision for how trees and woodlands in Loch Lomond & the Trossachs National Park are to be protected and enhanced over the next 20 years. The strategy will guide woodland enhancement and creation within the National Park to help meet important local and national targets that will deliver wider social and economic benefits, such as increasing the number of forestry sector jobs and encouraging community management or ownership of woodland. It will be used to support the existing policy within the Local Development Plan.

Being clear and proportionate - Developer contributions

As reported last year in PPF8, we have an adopted developer contributions policy within the Local Development Plan and housing supplementary guidance. The Developer’s contributions guidance, adopted in June 2018, is still current. Case Study 1 showcases how we have achieved developer contributions that are not always monetary, where a new public open space at Luss was part of a package to deliver housing. Also at Cameron House (case study 2, page 10) there were significant landscaping contributions and on page 6 one of the tourism cases demonstrated how additional planting was secured, over and above the compensation required to enhance biodiversity.
Delivering a positive customer experience

Last year we reported on the length of time it takes to acknowledge applications in line with our target of 3 days. In 2019/20 the average time for acknowledgement was **down to 1.6 days**, a reduction since last year, when it was 1.7 days average. The percentage acknowledged in the target of 3 days is met in 98% of cases, the same as last year.

In terms of validation there has been a drop of applications valid on first submission – from 43% down to 28%. This is due to an update in our validation procedures, and we are now promoting the Heads of Planning Scotland guidance on national standards. This has meant we are ensuring applications have all the relevant information before we make them valid.

Complaints – frontline complaint recording

Last year we made a commitment to logging frontline complaints (see service improvements) and this started in March 2019 and we logged 19 frontline complaints, of which 4 were regarding neighbour notification, 5 enforcement related and 5 related to the process and procedures of handling pre-apps and applications. There was also one noise complaint.

In order to ensure staff understood what the differences were between the frontline and formal complaints procedure training was held with all staff in June 2019. This explained to staff that frontline complaints are those that can be handled and resolved quickly as part of daily business.

This first year of stats has helped us understand where service improvements could be made such as upgrading the gazetteer (the GIS system to identify properties) so that more up-to-date information is available for notifying neighbours; ensure that comments made in representations are checked for any potential defamatory statements and implement interim updates to agents on delayed applications.

We also continue to monitor formal complaints (Stage 2 – Investigation) as shown on the graph below and this shows the number has increased by 1 from last year – 9 compared with 8 in 2018/19. The formal complaints are logged separately and handled by the National Park’s information officer following the corporate [Complaints Procedure](#).
CASE STUDY 3 – Strathard Framework
Using our planning role to develop a Strategic Framework for a rural area of the Park, that fully integrates community aspirations, development planning and land use.

Overview
Strathard is a large rural area located at the heart of the National Park. It includes the village of Aberfoyle together with several other small dispersed rural communities including Kinlochard, Inversnaid and Stronachlachar.

Over previous years there has been several pieces of work undertaken by various public sector agencies looking at ecosystems in the area, identification of land use options to support natural flood management in the catchment and also community led engagement and publication of two Community Life Plans which we were able provide some support towards. These community plans can be considered to be early versions of Local Place Plans.

There was an opportunity to build on all this momentum by preparing a new rural development framework, similar to earlier pilots for east and west Loch Lomondside, however this time evolving these further to include land use and planning guidance as an integrated area based strategy. This would provide more pro-active and holistic guidance for this rural area and allow us to progress our desire for a more responsive plan-led approach across the National Park.

Goal
The goal of the project is to produce a strategic framework that will guide future planning and land use decisions, seeking to establish stronger alignment between land management and development opportunities and giving greater certainty to developers, businesses, landowners and the community. At the heart of the framework is a shared desire and impetus amongst all stakeholders to respond directly to the climate emergency by exploring options for decarbonisation, supported by Architecture and Design Scotland. We were also keen to pilot a co-design approach, beyond National Park staff to an external steering group working with representatives from the Community Council, the Development Trust and Stirling Council, to prepare the framework, harnessing community empowerment and partnership working principles.
CASE STUDY 3 – Strathard Framework
Cont…

Outcome
The steering group is working really well, learning from one another and meeting on a monthly basis. It has an agreed set of project parameters and terms of reference which set out the remit for the group, including overseeing communication, geographic scope, community engagement and agreeing project outputs/outcomes and final structure of the framework.

The outcomes so far have been an extremely successful first workshop in March 2019, with around 45 attendees - agencies, landowners, businesses and the community - all coming together discussing planning and land use matters in Strathard. Architecture and Design Scotland piloted an activity that considered two possible futures from Strathard by 2050, one illustrated what would happen if there was no significant change/action and the other where there were interventions e.g. new housing partnership models, hydrogen visitor shuttle service, peatland restoration, increased woodland cover, electric charging from locally generated energy. This illustrated the appetite from all stakeholders to develop a robust response to the climate emergency and also built resilience within businesses and the community. The second workshop has been postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic however we are considering how to deliver this virtually and will be able to report back on this in next year’s PPF.

This case study contributes towards the Governance.
Key markers:
10 – Cross-section stakeholders engagement; 12 corporate working and 13 – sharing good practice
Key Areas:
Placemaking, Collaborative Working
Stakeholders:
Authority Other Staff, General Public
Name of Key Officer:
Kirsty Sweeney
CASE STUDY 4 – Community Place Plans
A new digital online mapping tool impresses the community and a zine is developed by the school children.

Overview
All communities within the National Park have been supported to help prepare and produce locally owned Community Action Plans (CAPs) over many years. These plans articulate the community’s vision for the future and identify priority actions. Over the last three years we have been reviewing, with the Community Partnership, the existing process of developing a CAP and testing new methods of engagement, including the use of mapping, to test and develop a suitable Local Place Plan process. We reported, in PPF7, on our first pilot using the Place Standard and mapping for the Lochgoilhead Community Action Plan. This year, we piloted further changes in Killin, where alongside the use of the Place Standard workshop and a village walk around, we also developed a new online digital consultation mapping tool (linked to a bespoke place standard) and undertook a workshop with secondary school pupils.

Goal
The main goal of the pilot was to further improve our new Local Place Plan approach and to enable the community to lead on the process. It was clear during early steering group meetings that to be successful it was important to hear and record the views of all members of the community, not just those that attend traditional workshops, with the views of young people highlighted by the community as a key priority. We agreed and during the pilot we tested if better use of digital technology could be utilised or if the resourcing and expertise that this requires would be too difficult for a community to undertake without support. This allowed us to explore and pilot new engagement techniques that could eventually be rolled out across all communities in the Park, and even Scotland wide.

Outcome
The work to date has successfully engaged a wide sector of the Killin community and helped bring a common consensus of the issues and opportunities in Killin. There has been excellent engagement with the local school pupils, through the joint work with Mclaren High School and Planning Aid Scotland, where an online electronic magazine, called a Zine, was produced based on the outputs of the pupils priorities.
One of the key outcomes is an online tool using a bespoke set of place standard questions and mapping, where the material generated from the walkabout and first workshop are summarised and presented in text or if spatial, mapped and views sought. There was a good response to this approach generating enthusiasm within the community steering group as an effective way to show where there is consensus and help develop the priorities. The momentum has gathered, as a result of the first workshop, where an early priority to improve the signage in the village has secured funding. This has helped the community steering group have confidence in the value of developing the plan.

For the planning service, we have digitised outputs which means that ideas and priorities can be easily picked up when the Local Development Plan is reviewed. It is intended that the end Local Place Plan will be published online using software such as a story map and will be adopted by the community as their Local Place Plan.

All this work is also feeding into an internal review around resources and support that can be offered to communities to develop their own place plans and how to best engage other key stakeholders in the process.

Digital Outputs from community workshops and online consultation

This case study contributes towards the Quality of Service and Engagement.

Key markers:
3: Early Collaboration

Key Areas:
Place Standard, Community Engagement

Stakeholders:
General Public and Hard to Reach Groups

Name of Key Officer:
Derek Manson
Governance – Ensuring that our structures and processes were proportionate, effective and fit for purpose

Major Applications 2019

As reported in PPF8 we continued to meet on a weekly basis to help project manage major and larger applications. As well as planners attending, there was input from specialists (including conservation, landscape and access), project management, legal, GIS, communications and governance (committee officer) depending on the stage of the application. This year the meetings ran from April 2019 to August 2019 when three major applications were under determination and works had commenced on site at Cononish Gold Mine.

The continued focus of the meetings this year was the large planning application at West Riverside, which involved three sites identified in the Local Development Plan and reached significant levels of representation. The Major Application Project internal meetings, alongside the processing agreement, ensured there were clear lines of communication regarding responsibilities and timescales (see Case Study 6 for further details).

We also handled two other major applications this year with a 50 unit housing proposal at Claish in Callander being submitted April 2019, determined August 2019 (only a few weeks after its target date of 4 months) and a 101 unit (reduced to 88 unit) proposal at Gartness Road, Drymen. Similar to West Riverside, dedicated webpages were set up to communicate the process to the general public.

Processing agreements were offered for all major applications. Although two processing agreements were drawn up one application was withdrawn prior to determination and the other is still awaiting completion of a legal agreement (delays outwith our control).
Major Applications 2019 cont.....

The Drymen housing site is for a mix of open market and affordable units and included both an allocated site and a long-term site. The allocated site had been in previous plans for more than 15 years and had been difficult to develop due to access being taken through a public car park. This application to open up the long term site realised a long term ambition of the developer to create a more suitable access, however it was a difficult balance given a long term site was be brought forward early and we needed to carefully consider if a small village like Drymen could accommodate this level of growth. Through the negotiations the numbers were reduced from 101 units down to 88 units but with the same number of affordable units which was a real success.

Continuing to develop the planning team

This year has been a busy year again with a continuing programme of training, both in-house and externally. In addition to in-house and external courses, we have an e-learning system (ELMS) which allows individuals to undertake additional training at a time that suits them. This includes personal development courses such as time management and customer service.

Internal Training

April 2019  Swift training (RSPB) at our offices
            Natural Heritage Training (in-house)
May 2019    Managers away day to Inchailloch
            Litter pick – both team and organisational wider
            Wild Park (Local Biodiversity Action Plan) Training
Aug 2019    Planning Act Scotland 2019 Training (Solicitors)
Feb 2020    Service Design (in-house)

External courses/conferences

- Environmental Impact Assessment Forum (May 2019)
- Development Viability (May 2019)
- Resilience and Stress (June 2019)
- Presentation and Effective Communication Skills (June 2019)
- Place and Design (September 2019)
- RTPI Scotland Annual Conference (October 2019)
- Association of Environmental & Ecological Clerks of Works (AEECoW) Annual Conference (November 2019)
- Forestry and Water Training (November 2019)
- Scottish Planning Enforcement Forum (SPEF) (December 2019)
- Planning Appeals (March 2020)
- Rural Enterprise Futures
- Active Travel at Edinburgh’s Low Carbon Centre
Member Training and Development
This year has been a busy year for our National Park Board and Planning committee. During this period we have ran 9 training and/or briefing sessions.

There was training and briefings relating to planning such as:
- June 2019 – Placemaking, Community Engagement, Volunteering and Education training
- August 2019 – Planning training
- Oct 2019 – Climate Emergency amongst other strategic issues
- Nov 2019 – Visit to Cononish Gold and Silver Mine
- Jan 2020 – Procedural training for Planning & Access Committee.

Shared Working Arrangements – Argyll and Bute Council
Built Heritage Advisor

As explained in Part 6 of the report on workforce information, the Built Heritage Advisor post has been vacant since the beginning of this year. Given the drive to ensure cost savings in our revenue budget, we have set up a shared working arrangement with Argyll and Bute Council.

This shared arrangement involves the built heritage advisor in the council’s planning team receiving consultations from National Park officers in relation to applications in conservation areas, those affecting listed buildings or where it is a conversion of a traditional building. Although most correspondence is desk based, the advisor has also joined case officers for site visits. The advisor was heavily involved in many cases including the case study (page 10) at Cameron House and Cononish House (page 7) which has helped ensure we continue to reach the right outcome for our important built heritage assets in the National Park. The Authority received 23 listed building applications and 19 applications in conservation areas in 2019 which is in line with the yearly average.
CASE STUDY 5 – Cononish Gold and Silver Mine
In January 2019 work started on the preparatory construction phase of the Cononish Gold and Silver Mine.

Overview
In last year’s PPF case study, landscape improvements as part of the Greater Cononish Glen Management Plan at Cononish Gold and Silver Mine were reported as an example of how the planning system can help deliver environmental gains. The construction phase of this development commenced in January 2019.

Works on site to date have included:
- widening of the mine adit,
- upgrade of the road junction onto the A82,
- erection of boundary fencing and signage, and new bridge and
- earthworks to create a bund and platform area for the erection of the processing building.

Once the processing plant building has been constructed with equipment installed then the operational phase can commence and gold will be produced.

In accordance with the terms of the s75 legal agreement a Planning Monitoring Officer (PMO) was appointed in December 2018 to monitor the development on behalf of the National Park, following the discharge of all suspensive conditions. A monitoring framework has been developed with the PMO, including a reporting system with monthly reports prepared following site visits, identifying current works and the key issues on site and reporting on condition compliance with the 57 planning conditions, the terms of the Greater Cononish Glen Management Plan and the s75.

Goal
The goal was to develop a monitoring framework to ensure proportionate and effective management of the development of the gold and silver mine which is in a highly sensitive location within the National Park. This type of development and the employment of the Planning Monitoring Officer – drawing on external specialist knowledge and expertise - are unique in the National Park and therefore new processes and structures have had to be developed to address the specific requirements of this project. Given the significance of the location and the development there are a large number of stakeholders involved in the development and the goal was to bring stakeholders together and collaborate.
CASE STUDY 5 – Cononish Gold and Silver Mine

Cont..

Outcomes

A robust monitoring framework has been developed to ensure continuous monitoring of development with the PMO.

The lifetime of the mine is expected to be 10 years, so it was important to establish good working practices from the outset. An early meeting was organised by the Planning Authority with key stakeholders, to introduce the PMO and establish good working relationships, with representatives from SEPA, Scottish Water, SNH and the developer in attendance. A number of review meetings have since been held to discuss overall project management and issues arising. During the initial construction phase of the development monthly site visits have been undertaken by the PMO and a representative of the Planning Authority. Site visits have been coordinated where possible with other key agencies such as SEPA and the project Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) and Landscape Clerk of Works (LCoW) to facilitate effective collaboration.

Corporate working across NP teams, using the Major Applications team until August 2019 (see page 20 for further details) then smaller meetings with only conservation team since then and with other key agencies has been facilitated with good working relationships established within the NP and between the NP, PMO and the developer. Given the huge volumes of correspondence associated with this significant development, working practices have been developed with the PMO and the developer to find the best ways to share documentation, information and correspondence.

The Planning Authority provided the PMO with remote access necessary IT systems and working with the NP IT team, developed a special database and email address for the PMO to use. Working with the developer a shared documentation system is used for access by the NP and PMO to key documents. The initial condition tracker established by the National Park’s Development Monitoring Officer has been developed further, working with the PMO to create a condition compliance checklist which is shared with the developer and used to work together to ensure condition compliance.

The development is of huge significance in the National Park and is demanding on resources, therefore efficiency was a priority in developing the monitoring framework. Co-ordination of the development by the National Park has provided a high-quality service to the developer and allowed for effective engagement with all stakeholders. The monitoring framework has been well established prior to the mine moving into the production phase.

This case study contributes towards the Governance but also Quality of Service and Engagement

Key markers:

12: Corporate Working Across Services

Key Areas:

Economic Development, Development Management Processes

Stakeholders:

Local Developers, Authority Planning Staff

Name of Key Officer:

Alison Williamson
CASE STUDY 6 – Telling the Planning Story
Championing the planning process of a major application through press and social media

Overview
This year was dominated by a major application at West Riverside, Balloch, which involved three sites identified in the Local Development Plan and reached significant levels of representation (also mentioned in Major Application Team Update page 20). The application was submitted in May 2018 and was for a £30 million holiday resort development, in principle. It had an indicative layout including 105 holiday lodges, an aparthotel, brewery, monorail and an indoor leisure and waterpark centre at the edge of Loch Lomond. There were over 55,000 people who formally objected following a campaign by the Scottish Green Party. In last year’s PPF we highlighted the bespoke database we used to manage this level of representation. This case study highlights the extensive project management and communications work to support the handling of the application (the application was withdrawn on 17th September, days before the planned hearing on 24th September 2019).

Goal
It became apparent given the high level of representation and media interest that the application had to be handled in a slightly different manner than usual. This case study focuses in on the goal to achieve good public awareness and understanding of what was a complex and significant application for the National Park Authority where there was regular media coverage with diverse views and was many people who weren’t familiar with the planning process seeking to gain an understanding. The goal was to ensure the correct and up to date information was in the public domain to ensure the role of the National Park Authority and planning was understood.

Conceptual Layout for Major Application for Planning Permission in Principle at Balloch – Courtesy of Anderson Bell & Christie
CASE STUDY 6 – Telling the Planning Story
Cont.

Outcome
Given the scale of the development, number of representations and high level of public/media interest a number of project management tools were utilised to facilitate the determination of the application. Throughout the whole process we demonstrated exemplar project management including use of a formal processing agreement (which was agreed with the applicant) and, internally, the use of project management spreadsheets, detailed schedule of casework meetings with the project team and progress reports to the Executive Team. Internal meetings were attended by representatives from planning, conservation, communications, legal, project management and GIS and ensured there were clear lines of communication regarding responsibilities and timescales.

Given the level of public interest our communications team played a key role and set up a dedicated web-page with blog updates posted at key stages of the application. There were a regularly updated FAQ (frequently asked questions) page also on the website. Here is an example of an update provided in July 2019:

“with all the main consultation responses now received, planning officers can finalise the assessment of these complex proposals against relevant planning policies, consultation responses and the large number of public comments received. Dates for the special Hearing and Board meeting are currently being identified and will be publicised to all interested parties when confirmed.”

There was also a timeline created (see image) to illustrate the stages and dates that the application had to go through before the Hearing and Meeting where the decision would be made.

Further examples of the media used can be can be found in the Supporting Evidence section of this report. Also, RTPI learn online courses illustrates this as a case study in a module that provides an overview of how to work with communications colleagues, the press and social media.

This case study contributes towards Quality of Service and Engagement
Key markers:
2: Processing Agreements
Key Areas:
Development Management Processes, Process Improvement
Stakeholders:
Public, Authority Planning Staff
Name of Key Officer:
Vivien Emery
Culture of Continuous Improvement

Performance Improvement Project

Determination times were above the Scottish Average in 2018-19 and showed an increase from 2017/18. We developed a Performance Improvement project and carried forward the Service Improvement on performance from PPF8:

“To target reduction in the determination times for householder and local planning applications through improved use of ICT applications to monitor performance, in order to align more closely to the Scottish Average determination times.”

This started with a review of the possible causes of increased determination times, including the high volume of major applications taking up the majority of time of 3 planners (in a team of 5) and the resulting impact on resourcing levels within the team.

Next we held a brainstorming session with staff from both DM teams to identify possible areas for improvement and efficiencies. These areas included a renewed focus on performance and increasing the capacity of the team through filling some vacancies in the wider team. We included a particular focus on householder cases, using a checklist for new planners and reducing the complexity of the caseload allocated to planning assistants where possible in order to help them to turn straightforward cases around more easily. We also implemented a change of focus with agents - from continually negotiating changes on unacceptable plans, to encourage proposals to be withdrawn, redesigned and resubmitted or to be refused more quickly.

The impact of these changes has been a reduction in overall caseload across the team (due to extra resourcing). Additional resource within the team was recruited in Q2 and other vacancies were filled in September 2019, however this dropped down again in Q4 when there was a further vacancy. Improved recording of stop-the-clock has been utilised where the delay is outwith our control. Faster turnover of householder applications and more applications withdrawn or refused has been achieved as a consequence of these changes.

The results for 2019/20 show an improvement from the previous year for householder and non-householder applications. The figure for householder applications is more closely aligned with the Scottish Average at 7.4 weeks compared with 7.3 weeks nationally. The non-householder applications determination times are within two weeks of the national average.

Focus on performance continues to be required and therefore a Service Improvement is included for 2020/21 to further develop ICT solutions to provide planners with more up to date information on their casework and performance.

The performance figures for 2020-21 will be impacted by Covid-19 restrictions as all National Park offices were closed, staff are working from home with limited access to systems and site visits were not possible for a 3.5 month period.

Improvements to procedures

Procedures are constantly under review and focus during the year has been on developing a Certificate of Lawfulness procedure and a procedure for reports of illegal tree felling. As part of the Performance Improvement project a Householder key task sheet was developed, particularly aimed at helping new starts within the team. Also work has been ongoing at improving the validation procedure and the use of pre-validation check sheets for planning officers.
Dealing with ‘legacy cases’

The recording of legacy cases (over 1 year old) remains a priority area for service improvement. A significant number of cases (12 in total) were cleared in this period, and this represents an improvement on last year when only 9 cases were cleared (see Part 4, National Headline Indicators). Nevertheless, we had 9 new cases added to the list that remain outstanding.

Our overall figure for ‘live’ legacy cases has therefore **dropped** from 25 to 22. We have also started tracking cases more closely, as the graph illustrates - and noting the reasons that cases have extended beyond the 1 year determination period. Most have had the ‘clock stopped’ for legitimate reasons outwith our control but this does not prevent them entering this category. In this PPF period we specifically targeted a small number of long standing stalled applications where a legal agreement had not progressed and the site had changed ownership in the interim. These applications were returned and removed from our system.

Of the 9 new cases, 3 were linked with corresponding applications for Listed Building Consent and overran due to requests for further information. In most of the longer running cases either the agent/applicant has not been forthcoming with the required information or, where further information has been received, re-consultation - essential to resolve complex matters - has proved time consuming.

As in the previous 2 years, the legacy cases are significantly affected by **8 linked applications at Luss** (see case study 1), which although determined at Committee in October 2019, await finalisation of the associated legal agreement - so unfortunately have not been determined within 2019/20 period. As explained in the case study, this complex case is a prime example of where our authority has sought to resolve issues and give applicants extended time to gather further information to secure the benefits of new development in the wider public interest. Once this legal work is finalised and the planning permissions are issued, our legacy balance will be significantly reduced and we continue to seek to minimise these cases. We hope that we can tackle other cases and get the figures below our previous average of 15 cases.
Best Companies

Following on from previous Best Companies staff engagement surveys, the National Park Authority took part again in 2019/2020 and was awarded a one-star accreditation, ranked 84 in the Best 100 not-for-profit organisations in the UK.

The results for the planning teams showed a significant improvement across most areas from the previous result in 2017, as well as identifying areas of improvement to be addressed through individual team plans.

Sharing Best Practice and Skills with others – examples from 2019

- Our Director of Rural Development & Planning spoke at the “Plan Making – Best Practice and Emerging Trends”. The event was held in Dublin in October 2019 and we presented our Local Development Plan process and learnt about the Irish planning system – he discovered more affordable housing, focus on delivery, clear national guidance and a need to tackle climate change.
- Our Director also spoke at the Wild Scotland conference in Autumn 2019.
- John McNairny, Chief Planner visited our offices in January 2020 to learn about stakeholder engagement and service design from our planning and wider organisational approaches to a variety of projects.
- Our Development Planning team presented at a Placemaking event to community representatives from around the Park and beyond, sharing the good practice in the work that is underway at Strathard and on Local Place Plans at Killin (see case studies 3 and 4).
- Our Planning Support team also visited Stirling Council Archives in December 2019 to learn about records management and get a demonstration of their microfiche scanner.
- The team visited Argyll and Bute Council planning department in February 2020 to share experiences of validation and planning support.
- We hosted the Scottish Planning Enforcement Forum (SPEF) in December 2019 and several staff members gave a presentation on their experiences as Monitoring Officers.
Sharing Good Practice amongst the team

This year we continued our successful model of running departmental team sessions; on development activity, strategy and community action. This year, on 30th October 2019, the team went to Aberfoyle and learnt about:

- Strathard Framework – which is new land use and planning guidance be prepared in a co-design approach with the community
- Callander Landscape Partnership – a National Heritage Lottery funded programme of projects delivering for natural and cultural heritage
- A business support programme that resulted in re-opening of many shops in Aberfoyle village centre – this involved a tour.
- We also learnt about the Dukes Weekender which has recently become an annual cycle event in Aberfoyle.
Part 2 Supporting Evidence

In order to compile Part 1 above we have drawn on the following documents:

**Website – Planning pages**
http://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/

**Live Park Facebook**
https://www.facebook.com/lomondtrossachs

**LIVE Park Twitter**
https://twitter.com/ourlivepark

**Adopted Local Development Plan, Supplementary and Planning Guidance**
http://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/planning-guidance/local-development-plan

**Adopted Action Programme**

**Developer Contributions Supplementary Guidance**

**Development Plan Scheme**

**Enforcement Charter**
October 2018 – Planning Committee – Enforcement Charter

**SAQP Awards - Shortlisted projects**
- Action Programme
- Lochgoil CAP

**Trees and Woodlands Strategy**
https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/park-authority/publications/treesandwoodlands/

**Best Companies**
https://www.b.co.uk/company-profile/?lochlomond-and-the-trossachs-national-park-56388
Part 2 Supporting Evidence for Case Studies

New Homes in Luss
Planning Committee Papers for approval of housing

Cameron House Extension
News reports on approval

Strathard Framework Blog
https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/blog/strathard-framework-workshops-kick-off/
https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/blog/strathard-framework-your-place-your-future/

Community Life Plans
https://www.ccstrathard.org/community-life-plans/

Killin Place Plan Blog/Articles/Mapping
Mapping for Killin
https://nationalparkscot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bbf2ac4740b44c50913ef36bf7581307
Killin app
https://survey123.arcgis.com/share/5c3107db10e441fa8c2dd97e67512055

Cononish Gold Mine
Dedicated Webpage with regular updates -
https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/planning-applications/major-planning-applications/gold-silver-mine-cononish-glen/

West Riverside Planning Application
Webpage - https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/planning-applications/major-planning-applications/west-riverside-woodbank-house/

Blogs:
5th Sept 2019 – release of Report
17th Sept 2019 – withdrawal of Application
The following are examples of positive feedback from our customers directly via email:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Pre-applications</th>
<th>Monitoring/discharge of conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Thank you very much for your help regarding my application, these type of works I find very stressful and would just like to express my appreciation and thanks.”</td>
<td>“Thank you for your extremely informative and helpful response to my enquiry. I am very grateful.”</td>
<td>“Thank you for your email on Friday 4th October. We are pleased that all the pre-start conditions have been discharged and we can proceed with our project. As you know we have waited a long time for this moment and are really excited to at long last get a start to building our new home. We really appreciate your help in getting us to this stage.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Thanks for your help with our projects this year and hope you have a great festive season and New Year.”</td>
<td>“Thank you all for your valued input.”</td>
<td>“Thank you for your email. I am pleased that the changes were satisfactory and have been included in the planning permission as a Non-Material Variation. Could you please pass on my thanks to the officer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hopefully this will conclude this whole matter, on a personal note my wife and I would like to personally thank yourself and everyone within the planning department as the inputs from yourself have been very helpful, prompt and professional which has helped a process I was quite concerned about.!!!!”</td>
<td>“Thank you very much for your email and helpful advice.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 3 Service Improvements

In the coming year we will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Planned Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Legacy Cases</td>
<td>Further develop mechanisms to target and reduce the number of legacy cases running at any one time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Planning Service Charter and Enforcement Charter</td>
<td>Review and update the Planning Service and Enforcement Charters, including how we can better engage with agents and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Delivering a planning service under COVID-19 restrictions</td>
<td>Continuing service delivery under exceptional circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic; implementing paper-free workflows, paper-free site visits etc. Reducing determination times following pandemic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Improved performance reporting</td>
<td>Further development of ICT software/databases to help manage current caseload better and reporting on current/past performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our delivery of service improvement actions from previous year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Further develop mechanisms to target and reduce the number of legacy cases running at any one time.</td>
<td>PARTIALLY COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See commentary under Legacy Cases – page 28. This is partially complete and will move to next year due to the 8 linked applications that are still to be determined but we recognise an issue still remains as 9 new cases were added to the list this year and the average of 15 cases a year remains unchanged excluding the linked cases. This will remain a service improvement area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review and update planning application procedures and templates with a Service Design approach from acknowledgement of applications through to decision and appeal/review, focusing on validation, handling representations and improved notifications for committee meetings.</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management procedures are constantly under review, looking for improvements in dealing with applications more efficiently. Through the year various procedures and templates have been amended, taking on board a Service Design approach – improving the clarity of correspondence with agents and members of the public. In addition, Service Design training sessions have been led by board member Sarah Drummond which have included planning staff. The outcome of this is a greater awareness of Service Design techniques which we will employ in further procedure development work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To target reduction in the determination times for householder and local planning applications through improved use of ICT applications to monitor performance, in order to align more closely to the Scottish Average determination times.</td>
<td>PARTIALLY COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See commentary in contextual statement and Performance Improvement Project (see page 27). A workshop/brainstorming session was held with both DM teams to identify improvements and a number of strategies have been implemented. Additional resource within the team was recruited in Q2 and other vacancies were filled in September 2019 but in Q4 there was one vacancy in the team and one member on maternity leave. Reducing determination times following pandemic impacts is included in the new service improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Set up a mechanism for improved communication and engagement with agents by the re-establishment of an agent’s forum</td>
<td>PARTIALLY COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This service improvement relates specifically to maintaining a feedback loop with the wide-ranging users of the planning service. A planning agent’s forum has been an effective method of two-way communication for many years. It is planned to revive this informal meeting with an event programmed for the end of March 2020 however this was cancelled due to COVID. All those agents who are regular users of the planning application system have been invited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 | Develop and trial more locally place based plans to inform the next Local Development Plan. This will involve working with two local communities to prepare Local Place Plans and work with the Strathard community and other stakeholders to prepare an integrated Rural Development and Land use Framework for Strathard.  
We have been working with Killin and Strathfillan communities to develop local place plans with the Community Partnership. The workshops were undertaken late 2019 and involved youth engagement with the primary and secondary school, use of the Place Standard tool and adaptation of this to facilitate further engagement and outreach using mapping and online digital engagement techniques. See Case Study 4 – Community Place Plans pg18.  
The work at Strathard has also been progressing well with the steering group meeting regularly, designing the process in a co-production approach. PAS was appointed as consultant working with Architecture and Design Scotland to research and facilitate the workshops. The research and baseline reporting has been completed and workshops are being undertaken in March and the framework is due to be drafted for consultation in June/July 2020. There is a good mix of stakeholders attending the events from all the different groups – the community, landowners, businesses, key agencies, the council and ourselves. See Case Study 3 – Strathard Framework pg16. |
|---|---|
| 6 | In order to enhance customer service we will develop a system for logging frontline complaints to help identify improvements to processes.  
A new system for recording frontline complaints has been developed (see pg15 for further information). This is in a spreadsheet format, stored centrally so that it can be viewed by all staff members. Recording of complaints has meant that recurring themes can be identified and measures put in place to avoid such complaints in future. |

**COMPLETE**
### Part 4 National Headline Indicators

#### Key Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PLANNING</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Age of local/strategic development plan(s) (years and months) at end of reporting period</td>
<td>3 years 3 months</td>
<td>2 year 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement: less than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the local/strategic development plan(s) be replaced by their 5th anniversary according to the current development plan scheme?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the expected date of submission of the plan to Scottish Ministers in the development plan scheme changed over the past year?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were development plan scheme engagement/consultation commitment met during the year?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Established housing land supply</td>
<td>592 units</td>
<td>601 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-year effective housing land supply programming</td>
<td>534 units</td>
<td>527 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-year effective land supply total capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-year housing supply target</td>
<td>375 units</td>
<td>375 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-year effective housing land supply (to one decimal place)</td>
<td>7.1 years¹</td>
<td>7.0 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing approvals (April 2018 to March 2019)</td>
<td>57 units</td>
<td>25 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing completions over the last 5 years</td>
<td>193 Units</td>
<td>139 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marketable employment land supply</td>
<td>14.95 ha</td>
<td>14.95 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment land take-up during reporting year</td>
<td>0 ha</td>
<td>0 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Effective housing land supply has increased due to changes in the programming and in particular due to approval a long term site in Drymen which has now become effective.
### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

#### Project Planning
- Percentage and number of applications subject to pre-application advice
- Percentage and number of major applications subject to processing agreement or other project plan
- Percentage planned timescales met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage and number</th>
<th>66 app, 28 %</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of applications</td>
<td>0 processing</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject to</td>
<td>agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-application</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage and number</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of major applications</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject to</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processing agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or other project plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timescales met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Decision-making
- Application approval rate
- Delegation rate
- Validation - % validated on first receipt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage and number</th>
<th>92.8%</th>
<th>98.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % validated on first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receipt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Decision-making timescales
Average Number of Weeks to Decision
- Major developments
- Local developments (non-householder)
- Householder developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Weeks to Decision</th>
<th>21.1 weeks</th>
<th>12.7 weeks</th>
<th>7.4 weeks</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local developments (non-householder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Legacy Cases:
- Number cleared during reporting period
- Number remaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number cleared during reporting period</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number remaining</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENFORCEMENT

- Time since enforcement charter reviewed (months)

  *Requirement: review every 2 years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time since enforcement charter reviewed (months)</th>
<th>17 months</th>
<th>5 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints lodged and investigated</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of breaches identified – no further</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions taken</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases closed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices Served</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports to Procurator Fiscal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Headline Indicators - Contextual Statement

This statement provides some headline commentary surrounding the notable trends in the National Headline Indicators. Our detailed statistics are in Part 5 (following on from this section) and this statement also provides comment on the stand out figures from that area.

Development Management

The time periods for determining planning applications have improved in 2019-20, compared with the previous year. Improving performance in terms of making faster decisions was identified as a key service improvement. The Continuous Improvement section (page 27) explains how a Performance Improvement Project was implemented. In Q1 2019-20 (April-June) performance was analysed and possible causes and solutions were considered by the DM Planning Managers. One of the key causes was the impact on the team of handling a major application (West Riverside submitted in Q1 2018-19 and withdrawn in Q2 2019-20 just before a hearing and Board meeting) and monitoring the development of another major application which had commenced development on site in Q4 2019-20 (Cononish gold mine). Also there were two further major applications brought to the Planning and Access Committee in Q2 2019-20. The impact of these major applications were that they took up much of the time of three planning officers and this had a resultant impact on the capacity of the remainder of the team. Whilst an experienced planning officer retired, additional resource was recruited in Q2 (July-Sept 2019) and other external vacancies (planning assistant and monitoring officer) were filled in September 2019. In Q4 (Jan-Mar 2020) there was one vacancy in the team and one member on maternity leave. Figures from the Scottish Government show a significant improvement in householder determination times down to 7.4 weeks from 9.1 weeks, however local non-householder determination times (12.7 weeks) remain above the Scottish Average. Considering some turnover in staffing and the high profile major applications, delivering an improvement in determination times is a significant achievement.

The number of recorded ‘legacy cases’ is 22 very similar to previous years (see Governance section page 28 above for commentary on legacy cases). This remains an improvement commitment.

Although two processing agreements were drawn up this year (for two major applications), one application was withdrawn and the other is still awaiting completion of a legal agreement (delays outwith our control). These are therefore not included in the statistics. Similar to last year we only had one decision on a Major application, Claish Farm housing site (see official statistics below), which was determined within 21.1 weeks but there was no processing agreement drawn up even though it was offered.

Our commitment to our pre-application service remains high with 28% of applications being subject to formal pre-application enquiries. This service remains a free service. As reported previously this figure conceals that the majority of our detailed local applications (as opposed to householder, advertisement, tree works or prior notification) are subject to pre-applications and also that there are a number of pre-applications that do not result in an application as they involve proposals that would not be supported by planning policy.
**Enforcement**

Our enforcement service is operated as a shared activity across the professional development management officers – rather than by means of a dedicated enforcement officer. The number of notices served is 6 which was four more than last year. In two instances Planning Contravention Notices were utilised in order to try and establish the facts of a suspected breach of planning control as an initial measure prior to following up with an Enforcement Notice. As reported in previous years the DM team includes a monitoring officer whose role is invaluable in providing an awareness of any unauthorised development early on – so that any potential harm can be avoided, guidance on due process can be provided and enforcement action avoided. The monitoring officer also provides the administrative support for the setting up of a case file for enforcement enquiries.

**Development Planning**

This year we are again reporting that we will not to meet our target for replacing the plan within 5 years. As explained last year, this was an informed decision, approved by Members of our Planning and Access Committee and based on an assessment of the risks associated with proceeding under the old timescales. We are currently considering the impact of COVID-19 on our local development plan timescales, in line with amendments being made to the programme of work being undertaken at national level by the Scottish Government.

This year the Housing Land Supply remains at a healthy 7.1 years. This has been tested via engagement and feedback from agents and landowners as part of the Housing Land Audit and Action Programme process. The approval rates have significantly increased this year given a 50 unit approval at Callander and a jump can be seen in completions due to more affordable housing sites being completed due to the government’s funding programme.
### A: Decision-making timescales (based on ‘all applications’ timescales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major developments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.1 weeks</td>
<td>n/a - no applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local developments (non-householder)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: less than 2 months</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>11.2 weeks</td>
<td>12.0 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: more than 2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Householder developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: less than 2 months</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.4 weeks</td>
<td>9.1 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: more than 2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.1 weeks</td>
<td>n/a - no applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local housing developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: less than 2 months</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.2 weeks</td>
<td>15.9 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: more than 2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business and Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a - no applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local business and industry developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: less than 2 months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.9 weeks</td>
<td>8.7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: more than 2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIA Developments</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a - no applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Consents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As listed in the guidance(right)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.9 weeks</td>
<td>8.3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/legal agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major: average time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a - no applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local: average time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.7 weeks</td>
<td>24.0 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B: Decision-making: local reviews and appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total number of decisions</th>
<th>Original decision upheld</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2018-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local reviews</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to Scottish Ministers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contextual Statement on Official Statistics

The commentary relating to determination times, processing agreements and enforcement is provided in the contextual statement above under National Headline Indicators.

In terms of legal agreements, there were 2 cases determined on average in 18.7 weeks, this was a drop from last year’s figure of 24 weeks.

In terms of Local Reviews, there is a notable increase from 3 to 8 due to the change made in Development Management to focus less on negotiation where proposals do not comply with policy. More commentary around this can be found on page 27.

2 This was reported as 8 in official statistics but this was an error. It has been amended to reflect the correct numbers of reviews determined between 01/04/2019 and 31/03/2020.
Part 6 Workforce Information

This is a snapshot of staffing at 31 March 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Planning Service</th>
<th>Tier 1 Chief Executive</th>
<th>Tier 2 Director</th>
<th>Tier 3 Head of Service</th>
<th>Tier 4 Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Age Profile</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and Over</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This does not include the Chief Executive but includes the Director of Planning and Rural Development. Total staff is 20 excluding maternity leave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTPI Charted Staff</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Staff</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Chief Executive, Director and 3 managers and have been counted within this table as they are all qualified RTPI planners. At 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 we had 2 vacant posts, full complement would be 12 FTE.

**Vacancies** - As of the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 the DM team was operating with 2 vacant posts – a Planning Assistant and a part-time planner who is on maternity leave and Development Planning team were also operating with 1 vacant post – Built Heritage Advisor. Built Heritage advice is being provided by arrangement with Argyll & Bute Council.

**Tree Works Applications and TPOs** – The Trees and Woodlands Advisor who sits in conservation team under a different Director handles Tree Works applications and Tree Preservation Orders. We are currently reviewing our Tree Preservation Orders and also the tree officer has prepared new Trees and Woodland Strategy which will form planning guidance to the Local Development Plan.
Receipt and acknowledgement of all applications, appeals, pre-applications, and NMVs. This includes scanning, redacting, data entry, neighbour notification, committee administration. Planning lists, records management. Validation of all applications. Small to medium applications, certificates and pre-applications including all householders and any reviews. Procedures. Training. Complaint handling. Website and social media.

Medium to large/complex applications inc EIA and Major applications, Pre-applications Reviews or appeals. Enforcement cases Condition discharging, NMV, Compliance monitoring of development under construction and post construction. Complaint handling.

Local Development Plan, Action Programme, Monitoring Reports, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Habitat Regulations Appraisal of the Plan, National Park Partnership Plan, Community Action Planning, Local Place Plans, Wind Farm Consultations, Liaison and consultation with partner agencies and organisations Partnership working Projects, Grant Schemes and funding Community Development and Support, Town Centre Enhancement, Masterplanning and Development Briefs. Website and social media.
## Part 7 Planning Committee Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees &amp; site visits</th>
<th>No. per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Council committees ¹</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Committees (where relevant)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee site visits ²</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRB ³</td>
<td>10 ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRB site visits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. References to committees also include National Park Boards.
2. Number of site visits are those cases where visits were carried out by committees/boards.
3. This related to the number of meetings of the LRB, application numbers going to LRB are reported elsewhere.
4. Two meetings were required for 1 LRB. Also, a further two meetings were due to take place on 23rd March 2020 although were postponed as a result of Covid-19 restrictions. These two meeting have not been included in the figure of 11 and will therefore be included in next year reporting figures as the meetings took place in May 2020.
## Part 8 Key Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance Marker</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2   | Processing agreements:  
- offer to all prospective applicants for major development planning applications; and  
- availability publicised on website | See Contextual Statement (page 39) and **Major Application update** in Governance section (page 20), where a processing agreement was used for the West Riverside application which was then subsequently withdrawn. Processing agreements were offered to all applicants for major development planning applications. The availability of processing agreements is mentioned on our website: [https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/planning-applications/make-an-application/helpful-resources/planning-processing-agreements/](https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/planning-applications/make-an-application/helpful-resources/planning-processing-agreements/).  
Also, an informal processing agreement was used for Cameron House (see Case Study 2 pg10). |
| 3   | Early collaboration with applicants and consultees  
- availability and promotion of pre-application discussions for all prospective applications; and  
- clear and proportionate requests for supporting information | **Case study 2 – Cameron house** (page 10) demonstrates early collaboration through pre-application and working with the consultees to be clear and proportionate about requests for supporting information.  
See **Major Application update** in Governance section (page 20) where early collaboration and pre-applications were held for both major housing applications at Callander and Drymen.  
A free pre-application advice service is offered (see Contextual Statement page 39). |
| 4   | Legal agreements: conclude (or reconsider) applications after resolving to grant permission reducing number of live applications more than 6 months after resolution to grant (from last reporting period) | This year we targeted legacy cases where there were long standing stalled legal agreements and these have been removed from the system.  
We had two applications determined this year involving legal agreements at **Case Study 2 - Cameron House** (see page 10). We have a robust internal procedure in place involving our own legal team and our external solicitors to ensure under 6 months. These 2 cases were determined in around 4 ½ months, well under the Scottish Government’s target. |
<p>| 6   | Continuous improvement: | We have reported successes this year with completing 4 of our 6 service improvements (see Part 3 – Service Improvements pages 34-36) including reviewing and updating planning application procedures (inc. Certificate of...|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• progress/improvement in relation to PPF National Headline Indicators; and • progress ambitious and relevant service improvement commitments identified through PPF report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawfulness and Illegal Tree Felling procedures) and templates (see page 27 for details) such as a new pre-validation check sheet, improving determination times for householder and local (see page 27 and headline indicators), and trialling locally place based plans (see case study 3 and 4). We also have partially completed our aim to re-establish the agent’s forum (albeit it was cancelled due to COVID in late March). We also have made headway into reducing legacy cases, but recognise there is more improvements to be made and this improvement has been carried forward. We have developed new ambitious and relevant service improvement commitments for the forthcoming year, reflecting on current performance – see page 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Local development plan less than 5 years since adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Local Development Plan remains current 2017-2021 and is now 3 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Development plan scheme – next LDP: • on course for adoption within 5 years of current plan(s) adoption; and • project planned and expected to be delivered to planned timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our Development Plan Scheme (see page 13) explains why we are not on course for adoption of the next LDP within 5 years of the current plan given we undertook a review of the plan’s strategy (which remains robust) and we are awaiting the new regulations to enable us to produce a 10 year plan under the new Planning Act. We consider that due to COVID-19 pandemic the next plan may delayed further. A revised Development Plan Scheme will be published in August 2020 in light of COVID and announcements by Scottish Government regarding progress of NPF4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elected members engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – if plan has been at pre-MIR stage during reporting year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In 2019/20 we did not undertake any early development plan preparation. However, we have a rolling programme (6 monthly) of updating our Action Programme and yearly Monitoring Report which are presented to Committee then we keep elected members engaged in the development plan delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cross sector stakeholders* engaged early (pre-MIR) in development plan preparation – if plan has been at pre-MIR stage during reporting year *including industry, agencies and Scottish Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regular and proportionate policy advice produced on information required to support applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have continued with our successful Development Planning Clinic (reported in PPF8) where Development Management officers are able to bring cases and get early policy advice that is then passed on to the applicant or the person who made the pre-application enquiry. This is also highlighted in our case studies – Case study 1 and 2 – but also in the smaller cases highlighted in Quality of Outcomes section (pages 6 and 7) which gives a summary of our outcomes from our Monitoring report 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Corporate working across services to improve outputs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We continue to work closely with all four local authorities, but in particular Argyll and Bute Council and Stirling Council. We continue to regularly attend Housing Forum meetings, and protocols in relation to affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Sharing good practice, skills and knowledge between authorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Stalled sites / legacy cases:</strong> conclusion or withdrawal of old planning applications and reducing number of live applications more than one year old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15 | **Developer contributions:** clear and proportionate expectations  
   - set out in development plan (and/or emerging plan); and  
   - in pre-application discussions | As explained in the Quality of Service and Engagement section (page 14), we have an update to date Developer Contributions guidance and Housing guidance with clear expectations for both monetary and non-monetary contributions. **Case Study 1 – Cameron House** (page 10) explains how we work to achieve non-monetary contributions and also a case study in Quality of Outcomes section regarding gains at a tourism development. Clear and proportionate expectations of Developer Contributions are set out in pre-application discussions. |

services for customer benefit (for example: protocols; joined-up services; single contact arrangements; joint pre-application advice) contributions remain in place and have been used in relation to **Case study 1 – Luss Housing Applications** (page 9) where we are now negotiating a legal agreement. The same also applies for the large Drymen housing site where we are working closely with Stirling Council on the legal agreement (see Major Applications update) and there will be more on this in next year's PPF. As explained in Governance section (page 21), we have a set up a new arrangement with Argyll and Bute Council to provide Built Heritage advice. Furthermore **Case Study 5 – Cononish Gold Mine** (page 23) demonstrates corporate working with IT to provide the PMO access to our systems, and with other services such as legal, conservation team. This is linked to the update on Major Applications team which demonstrates this regular cross-cutting meeting. **Further Case Study 5 – Cononish Gold Mine** (page 23) demonstrates corporate working with IT to provide the PMO access to our systems, and with other services such as legal, conservation team. This is linked to the update on Major Applications team which demonstrates this regular cross-cutting meeting.