

<b>COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>12 DECEMBER 2001</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>BEST VALUE REVIEW OF BUILDING CONTROL</b>
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	<b>BUILDING CONTROL BEST VALUE REVIEW TEAM</b>
<b>Ward(s):</b>	ALL
<b>Purpose:</b>	To advise Scrutiny Committee members of the outcomes of the Best Value Review of Building Control
<b>Contact:</b>	Philip Tipler, Building Control Manager, Telephone 01323 415223 or internally on extension 5223.

<b>1.0</b>	<b><u>Summary</u></b>
<b>1.1</b>	The Building Control Best Value Review has been a concise review that has been carried out with no impact on the day to day service experienced by the customer. The review team has concentrated on improving the level of service experienced by customers, reducing the net cost to the Council of the Building Control Service and raising public awareness of the service and the benefits it provides.
<b>1.2</b>	As part of the review, the principal users of the service (Architects and Builders) were consulted to identify priority areas for improvement and current satisfaction levels. Staff were consulted to draw on their experience of current working practices and how they could be improved. Comparisons were drawn with other authorities to assess the cost and competitiveness of the service and to draw on their experience.
<b>1.3</b>	The review team are recommending retaining the service in house and making significant improvements including the adoption of a risk assessment protocol and a revised Service Level agreement with the Engineering section of Amenities to achieve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A reduction in the overall cost to the Council of approximately £19,000. from 2004 – 5</li> <li>· A reduction in the cost of the Building Control</li> </ul>

2.0	<p><b><u>Introduction</u></b></p> <p>The Building Control service is within the Planning Division, part of the Planning, Regeneration and Amenities Department.</p>
2.1	<p>The Building Control service was highly commended by the Cabinet Office in 1999 who assess for charter mark status.</p>
2.2	<p>The function of Building Control is to advise on and enforce the building regulations and allied legislation including means of escape and access. There is a statutory requirement for a Local Authority to provide this service and also to recover the costs incurred through the vetting of plans, the inspection of works and issuing of approval notices and other compliance certification. The plan vetting and inspection service is already open to competition and customers are free to have this work carried out by the private sector, currently the private sector (Approved Inspectors) is mainly working with large National Housebuilders through negotiated national agreements (e.g. Wimpey, Costains). On a national basis, Approved Inspectors are increasing their market share of commercial developments.</p>
2.3	<p>The obligation to recover costs and the existence of an alternative to Local Government means that Building Control is possibly more advanced in operating within a competitive environment than some other Local Authority services. This has had the disadvantage of there being limited human resources to carry out this review.</p>
2.4	<p>The % of total costs covered by fee income (fee level broadly set by the Local Govt. Building Control Association) decreased from 67% to 52% from 1999 to 2000 (Source Chartered Institute of Public Financial Accounting) this figure is comparatively low. The reduction of the proportion of costs covered by fee income coincided with the introduction of the Best Value Accounting Code of Practice. It is clear from Benchmarking undertaken that there should be capacity for additional fee earning work to be undertaken within existing resources. It should be acknowledged that there is a significant degree of flexibility in how figures are calculated and reported.</p>

2.5	Building Control plays an important role in the house buying process through confirming to purchasers' solicitors that alterations, building works, cavity wall insulation etc. have been carried out to an approved standard.
2.6	The Building Control service also advises on "Means of Escape" and Access issues in line with legislation.
2.7	Applicants have the option to use an Approved Inspector for vetting plans and carrying out inspections, there has been little market penetration by the approved inspectors (1998-9 - 2.3%, 1999-0 - 3.5%, 2000-1 – 3.4%) of work they are able to undertake.
2.8	There are close links within the Planning Division particularly Development Control as obtaining planning permission and building regulation approval are often concurrent or contiguous activities. The Means of Escape and Access Officer works closely with property services in advising on physical access issues as well as liaising with the Fire Service and others on Means of Escape. There are further links with the emergency services in the Council's duty around reported and actual dangerous structures. In line with other Local Authority Building Control units Eastbourne has formed a partnership with Church Property Limited in order that they are able to deal with their Building's Regulation plan vetting on behalf of other authorities.
2.9	The objectives of the service as well as being in the large part statutory are supportive of the Council's aims for promoting a healthy place, a safe place and a place for the future.
2.9.1.	<p>The process of Building Regulations approval ensures that works carried out are fit for purpose and help to ensure the safety of those who live in and visit recently constructed buildings. This helps to achieve the Council's objectives:</p> <p><b><u>A healthy place</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“ Protect public health through intervention and education;</li> <li>“ Help prevent accidents at home, work, in public and on the roads.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>A place for everyone</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“ Help everyone to have a decent home.</li> <li>“ Promote social inclusion and community participation through addressing access issues</li> </ul>

3.0	<p><b><u>Scope</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Building Control Service has been included within the review The review team has also considered significant elements of the Structural Engineering service that provides a key role in the building control function. The means of escape and access functions have not been reviewed because:</li> <li>· The resources involved in delivering the service equate to less than one FTE;</li> <li>· The Council delivers the minimum level of service regarding Means of Escape that it is able to within the statutory framework, this has been agreed by committee;</li> <li>· The Access role is utilised as a corporate resource working closely with the property section to improve access to Council buildings as well as service providers and members of the public.</li> </ul>
3.1	<p>As well as the challenges agreed by Cabinet the review team has focussed on issues that were identified through consultation and comparison and agreed by the team to be significant in terms of the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the service.</p>
4.0	<p><b><u>Resources</u></b></p>
4.1	<p><b><u>Financial Resources</u></b></p>

4.1.1	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Budgeted Expenditure 2001-2</b></p> <p>Employee Expenses £207,000</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Transport £ 17,000</p> <p>Supplies and Services £ 12,000</p> <p>Office Accommodation £ 41,000</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Service Management £ 8,000</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">Group Support - £ 52,000</p> <p>Information Technology - £ 15,000</p> <p>Central Support Services - £ 9,000</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Gross Cost - £361,000</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Fee Income - £197,000</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Net Cost - £164,000</b></p>																				
4.1.2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Expenditure and Income Comparison 1999-2001</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Year</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Expenditure</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Income</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Net</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>99-00</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;">£331,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£156,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£175,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>00-01</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;">£356,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£190,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£166,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Budgeted <b>01-02</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;">£361,000</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£197,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">£164,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Expenditure	Income	Net	<b>99-00</b>	£331,000	£156,000	£175,000	<b>00-01</b>	£356,000	£190,000	£166,000	Budgeted <b>01-02</b>	£361,000	£197,000			£164,000		
Year	Expenditure	Income	Net																		
<b>99-00</b>	£331,000	£156,000	£175,000																		
<b>00-01</b>	£356,000	£190,000	£166,000																		
Budgeted <b>01-02</b>	£361,000	£197,000																			
	£164,000																				
4.2	<p><b><u>Human Resources</u></b></p> <p>Building Control employs 7.8 Full Time Equivalent Staff the functions are as below.</p> <p>§ Building Control Manager - management of the section</p> <p>§ Senior Building Control Officer - site inspection, plan examination, 'training' of assistant, servicing Partner Authority Scheme</p> <p>§ Building Control Officer - site inspection</p> <p>§ Building Control Officer - plan examination</p> <p>§ Building Control Officer - site inspection</p> <p>§ Assistant Building Control Officer – assistance with site inspection / plan examination</p>																				

4.3	<b><u>Capital Resources</u></b>
4.3.1	<b>No significant capital need in the short term has been identified.</b>
4.3.2	It is important that close links with reception and Development Control are maintained and enhanced in order to improve the ease of use of customers by providing a “one stop shop” service for a planning service the review will enable this. The allocation of ground floor office accommodation at 68 Grove Road is currently being reviewed There is a likely reduction in office space being utilised by Building Control and this should be reflected in the overheads identified in 3.1
4.3.3	The consultation carried out by the Review Team did not identify that there was a demand for submitting plans electronically; this would necessarily incur major investment in IT. Comparison has identified that Local Authorities who have developed the capacity to receive plans electronically have done so in response to major developments where the condition of undertaking the work is the ability to receive plans electronically and the predicted fee income will cover the cost of equipment and training.
4.3.4	It is proposed that the demand for electronic plan submission be reviewed annually to ascertain demand and potential cost benefit.  Similarly, the storage of archive records and the use of Geographical Information Systems (computer software) are undoubtedly issues for the medium term future. It is at an initial stage of corporate consideration and will be considered more fully in three years during the proposed Best Value review of the planning service thereby ensuring a uniform approach and contemporaneous timetabling.
5.0	<b><u>Consultation</u></b>
5.1.	<b><u>Stakeholder</u></b>

<p><b>5.1.1</b></p>	<p>The vast majority of the users of Building Control Services are builders and architects. The section also play a role in “Searches” and are often approached either directly by house purchasers or their agents concerning possible irregularities uncovered when selling / buying a house.</p>
<p><b>5.1.2</b></p>	<p>Two regular users (Architectural consultants / agents) of the Building Control service attended review meetings; a leading firm of builders in Eastbourne were interviewed; and all applicants receiving a decision notice during a two month period were sent a questionnaire to identify their satisfaction levels and to identify desired improvements to the service. Consultees identified the following issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The time taken for issuing approval notices was of less importance than the promptness of inspections.</li> <li>2. It would be desirable to have the ability to download application forms and fee levels on line</li> <li>3. Email communication and requests for inspection in advance of formal letters would be appreciated</li> <li>4. It would be desirable to receive a pre-printed “snag list”</li> <li>5. There is a high level of satisfaction with the service.</li> </ol> <p>All of the above will be addressed (see action plan) and all respondents were sent a copy of the proposals to address the highlighted issues with an invitation to comment further.</p>

5.2	<p><b><u>Community</u></b></p> <p>There has been no consultation with the public; it was felt that there is little interest or understanding of the service by the public and that the distinction between planning permission and building regulations was not widely understood. A proposed outcome of the review is to increase public awareness of the service and the benefits that it can bring.</p>
5.3	<p><b><u>Internal</u></b></p> <p>All staff were briefed at the beginning of the review a member of staff has been on the review team and regular briefings have been given on the progress of the review. Suggestions have been sought from staff and changes to working practices identified by staff and designed to improve the turnaround time have been undertaken.</p>
5.3.1	<p>Formal consultation has been carried out with the Head of Amenities and the engineering staff within the division, regarding a possible transfer of the structural engineers to Building Control. Other options for reducing the cost of structural calculation checking were discussed and the recommendations resulting from this consultation form part of confidential appendix 4</p>
6.0	<p><b><u>Performance</u></b></p>
6.1	<p>There are no statutory Performance Indicators for the Building Control service; the DTLR are consulting on recommending a set of model local Pis which would include a quality and performance matrix as well as a balanced suite of indicators focussed on key aspects of service delivery. These indicators are being developed with others including the District Surveyors Association. The Building Control Service will consider adopting these for reporting internally and publicly through the Best Value Performance Plan.</p>
6.2	<p><b>In order to assess the current level of performance the review team have carried out benchmarking using the Chartered Institute of Public Financial Accounting data and data from a basic benchmarking exercise co-ordinated by EBC. Although this data is unaudited and as such of</b></p>



6.2.1	<p><b>An issue that was highlighted by this benchmarking was the expenditure on structural checking that is considerably higher in Eastbourne than elsewhere. Discussions with other Local authorities and process benchmarking were undertaken to identify means of reducing this expenditure.</b></p>
6.2.2	<p><b>Further comparisons were sought by, including the Building Control Manager from Hastings Borough Council in the review team; through the Sussex Chief Building Control Officers Group; attending a site visit with staff to Lewes District Council, who are operating some of the measures proposed within this review; and attending a meeting with Hastings Borough Council' Officers and Thanet District Council as representatives of the Kent Building Control Officers' Group. The lead officer also participated in the Best Value Review of Building Control in Hastings Borough Council.</b></p>

6.3

**Through the above comparison the following performance issues were identified:**

1. The total cost of the Building Control Service per head of population is average (median of 9 authorities)

2. The low level of professionally qualified staff (lowest of 9 authorities compared)

3. Relatively low numbers of applications deal with by EBC officers

(lowest in the group)

4. The low level of administrative support (2<sup>nd</sup> lowest out of 9)

5. Extremely high expenditure on structural calculation checking (also identified through comparison of support costs). – Costs were identified where members of BC staff did not carry out calculation checking: Eastbourne pays £44,000 the next highest in the benchmark group is Wychavon who pay £7500. Subsequent investigations have identified Arun who as Eastbourne do submit all their calculations for checking and spend £20,000 on calculation checking. A detailed analysis of this matter is included within appendix 4.

6. The 2<sup>nd</sup> lowest proportion of total costs are allocated to the charge earning account

7. The turnaround times for applications although within the District Surveyors Association Guidelines are the lowest of the 5 authorities that provided a return.

**It is believed that issues 2,3, 4 & 7 are interrelated**



6.4	Measures to improve the level of performance are contained within the improvement plan.
6.5	<p><b>It is proposed that the following performance measures are adopted for regular reporting to the Council's Scrutiny Committee, further measures may be incorporated when the DTLR proposals referred to in 5.1 are finalised:</b></p> <p><b>§ Net cost of Building Control service per head of population</b></p> <p><b>§ The turnaround time for applications</b></p> <p><b>§ The number of applications received</b></p>

7.0	<p><b><u>Procurement : Challenging the Means of Delivery</u></b></p>
7.1	<p><b><u>Cessation of the service</u></b></p> <p>There is a statutory obligation under the Building Act 1984 to maintain responsibility for this service</p>
7.2	<p><b><u>Public Private partnership</u></b></p> <p>Given the lack of investment need and the relatively low cost of this service it is difficult to see what benefits would accrue for the Council, the Customer or any potential Private Sector Partner.</p>
7.3	<p><b><u>Externalisation with no in house bid</u></b></p> <p>There is a statutory obligation for a Local Authority to carry out a large proportion of the work currently undertaken. The Private sector approved inspectors have not made significant inroads into the market and there is a doubt over whether they could or would want to take on the full range of the work Council's undertake. The service is not large enough in terms of staff employed and resource requirements to make a client contractor split feasible.</p>
7.4	<p><b><u>Externalisation of all or part of the service with in house bid</u></b></p> <p>The proportion of work that could be externalised would roughly equate to the majority of the fee earning service this work provides a scale of economy that allows for a wider service. Also see (7.3)</p>

7.5	<p><b><u>Improving the In House Service</u></b></p> <p>This is the recommended option; the review team are confident that the measures identified in the report and more specifically the action plan can bring about the necessary improvements to reach the standard of the top 25%.</p>
7.6	<p><b><u>Renegotiation of existing arrangements</u></b></p> <p>It is clear that the expenditure on structural calculations must be reduced. This is being proposed through measures identified in confidential appendix 4 to this report.</p>
7.7	<p><b><u>Joint Commissioning</u></b></p> <p>The Building Control Review Team has considered this option closely. Good communication and working links with neighbouring authorities exist, an exchange of work, when high demand affects one authority, have been discussed, and agreement has been reached. As yet, this facility has not been used. It is however difficult to see any benefit in an inspection function being anything other than local and the objective of national government seems to be to achieve a one stop shop for planning; a remote building control service, for example Sussex wide, does not appear to give any benefit.</p>
7.8	<p><b><u>Transfer</u></b></p> <p>This is not a viable option given the statutory nature of much of the service and the lack of existing, alternative service providers.</p>
7.9	<p><b><u>Hybrid</u></b></p> <p>No hybrid of the above options appears to be appropriate.</p>

<p><b>8.0</b></p>	<p><b><u>Deferred Improvements</u></b></p> <p>There are a number of improvements that should be considered in the medium term; it is proposed to review these at the time of the cross service review of planning and economic development in 2003-4. Matters that will be investigated further are:</p> <p>§                   The use of Geographical Information Systems</p> <p>§                   The ability to receive plans electronically</p> <p>§                   The proactive monitoring of planning conditions</p> <p>§                   The electronic archiving of planning and building control records</p>
	<p>Appendix 1 – Best Value Improvement Plan</p> <p>Appendix 2 - Consultation</p> <p>Appendix 3 - Performance Comparisons</p> <p>Confidential Appendix 4 – Report on options for the future of structural calculation checking</p>
	<p>Background Papers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Results of Consultation</li> <li>2. Results of User Survey (Builders &amp; Architects / Agents)</li> <li>3. Benchmarking Analysis</li> <li>4. Guide to Quality Schemes and Best Value (DETR publication)</li> <li>5. Circular 10/99 (Local Government Act 1999 Part 1)</li> <li>6. Council Budget Book 2001-2</li> </ol>
<p><b>8.BEST VALUE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</b></p>	
<p><b>To Reduce The Cost of The Building Control Service</b></p>	

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Measure or Significant Milestones</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Implementation Timetable</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	
To reduce expenditure on the checking of structural calculation checking	1. To introduce a risk assessment protocol for the checking of structural calculations	1. Risk assessment; consulted with insurers; agreed by committee; in place.	1. April 2002 risk assessment in place,	1. Risk assessment to be carried out by structural engineers from 2002 subject to cabinet approval.	1. Building Control Manager,	
	2. To put in place a rigorous service level agreement between the engineering section and the building control section	2. Proportion of applications requiring full checking of calculations by structural engineers.	2. 20% by 2006	2. Increased risk assessment and minor calculation checking to be carried out by Building Control Officers subsequent to having additional staff qualified	2. Building Control Manager	
		3. Expenditure on structural calculation checking	3. Reduction target to be agreed by March	3. Immediate implementation	3. Building Control Manager & Engineering Manager	
To increase the number of fee earning applications received	1. All responses to applicants for planning permission to include advice on building regulation approval	1. % of planning applicants receiving basic advice on building regulations	1. 100% by April 2002	1. Immediate implementation	1. Head of Planning	



	2. Promotion in partnership with the Crime Reduction Partnership the benefit of obtaining building regulation approval for small works through increased publicity, and advertising / marketing targeted at trade and public.	2. Promotional literature agreed and in place; increased number of enquiries baseline to be set	2. January 2003	2. May 2002	2. Building Control Manager / Crime Reduction Partnership	
	3. Contacting potential development partners	3. Number of partners	3. Additional Partner	3. June 2002	3. Senior Building Control Officer	
To review fee charges and allocation of time to ensure accurate and appropriate levels are set for all services provided	1. Ongoing review of fee levels where covered by the District Surveyors Association	Review carried out		Reviews in addition to ongoing ones to be carried out and where appropriate consulted on before September 2000	Building Control Manager/ Trainee Accountant	
	2. Review of methodology of time and cost allocation to charge account.	% of gross cost of building control service covered by fee income	The mean level of CIPFA Family authorities and neighbours for the preceding year (2000 Mean 62% Eastbourne 52%)	Immediate Implementation	Financial management representative, Engineering Manager, Building Control Manager	

	3. Investigate the introduction of a variable (dependent on response time) fee scale for services such as Solicitor enquiries.	Review carried out			Head of Planning, Financial Management Representative Building Control Manager	
<b>To increase the quality of the Building Control Service</b>						
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Measure or Significant Milestones</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Implementation Timetable</b>	<b>Responsible Officer</b>	
To increase the proportion of staff who are members of the Association of British Engineers or Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors	1. Support and fund professional training for staff.	1. Number of staff who are ABE or RICS	1. Two additional staff qualified by 2004	1. Immediate implementation	Building Control Manager and Building Control Staff	
To increase the ability to recruit and retain high quality staff.	2. Carry out review of staffing structure to reflect increased level of qualifications and subsequent reassigning of responsibilities to qualified staff	2. Review carried out revised structure in place	2. 2004	2. Subsequent to 1.	Director of Planning Regeneration and Amenities	

To achieve independent accreditation of the Building Control Service	Comply with all necessary criteria	Carry out review and audit of all existing procedures, forms consultation mechanisms etc. to identify any weaknesses.	ISO 9002 obtained by 01/01/2005	Immediate implementation of audit	Building Control Section	
		Identified weaknesses addressed		Dry run 2004	Building Control Section	
				Application June 2004	Building Control Section	
To offer a more customer focussed service	1. Trial early morning & out of hours inspections by arrangement	1. Out of hours inspections offered	1. April 2002	1.- 5. Immediate implementation	Responsibilities for implementing initiatives to be set during staff appraisal	
	2. Promote use of eastbourne.gov.uk, and email and www.labc.co.uk/eastbourne.	2. Number of electronic transactions per annum	2. Increase from base number of 0,BVMC to agree new target April 2003			
	3. Adjust staff allocation (plan checking & site inspection)	3. Revised structure in place	3. Before January 2002			
	4. Provide "snag lists" for professional applicants	4. % of responses where a snag sheet was issued when appropriate	4. 100% by June 2002			

	5. Hold user group meetings to update users on service developments; technical developments and to receive feedback	5. Number of meetings held	5. Three per annum		
		All: Qualitative user satisfaction survey and % of applications turned around in 10 working days	All: Increase in satisfaction level. 95% within 10 working days by 2005. Processing time to be improved year on year as a result of other measures contained within this action plan.	Processing time to be improved year on year as a result of other measures contained within this action plan.	

<b>Appendix 2</b>				<b>CONSULTATION &amp; INVOLVEMENT</b>	
				<b>DIRECT INVOLVEMENT</b>	
<b>Who was involved in the review?</b>	<b>In what capacity were they involved?</b>	<b>Were they invited to all meetings or selected ones?</b>			
Cllr Mark Neeham	Chairman of Review Team	All			
Cllr Norman Marsh	Liberal Democrat Councillor on Review Team	All			
Mr Philip Tipler	Lead officer of Review and Building Control Manager	All			
Mr Martin Ray	Corporate Management Team Review Team Member	All			

Ms Ruth Cannell	Financial Management Review Team Member	All	
Mr Nick Ritson	Strategic Development Review Team Member	All	
Mr Tim Cookson	Review Team Member and Head of Planning	All	
Mr John Hartland	Review Member and Building Control Officer	All	
Brian Bristow	Review Member Hastings Borough Council Chief Building Control Manager (Acting)	Excluded from meetings where specific staffing issues were being discussed	
Mr Chris Keet of C Keet Associates	Architect	Excluded from meetings where specific staffing issues were being discussed	
Mr Antony Stevens of Stevens Associates	Architect	Excluded from meetings where specific staffing issues were being discussed	
<b>INDIRECT INVOLVEMENT</b>			
<b>Who was consulted?</b>	<b>How were they consulted?</b>	<b>What were the results of the consultation?</b>	<b>How were results fed back to respondents?</b>
All applicants during June & July	Questionnaire	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High Level of Satisfaction</li> <li>2. Lack of market penetration of Approved Inspectors</li> <li>3. Desire for greater e capability</li> <li>4. Desire for “snag sheet”</li> </ol> <p>Improvements incorporated within improvement plan</p>	Sent copy of proposed improvements resulting from consultation

Colbran and Wingrove (Local Builders and users of Building Control Service)	Meeting with Lead Officer and member of staff	High Level of Satisfaction  Lack of ideas for service improvement.	Sent copy of proposed improvements resulting from consultation	
Kent Building Control Officers Group	Meeting with representative (Thanet DC) Hastings Borough Council Head of Planning and Building Control Manager and EBC. Building Control Manager, and Strategic Development Officer	The led to an increased understanding and awareness of issues around Building Control & Best Value.  The results of the meeting informed the review	Copy of Best Value Review	
Head of Amenities, Engineering Manager, Structural Engineers, Director of Planning Regeneration and Amenities, UNISON	Letter advising of possible transfer with invitation to discuss with lead officer	Attendance of Engineering manager at Best Value Review Team Meeting. Arrived at mutually beneficial solution.	Invitation to Best Value Review Team Meeting to explain proposals.	

STAFF INVOLVEMENT			
What members of staff were on the review team?	How were they selected?	What involvement did they have?	How were other members of staff involved in the review?
John Hartland	Consensus of Building Control Team	Attended meetings when workload permitted, Attended meeting with Builders	Introduction to Best Value and Review process Regular briefings as part of Wednesday Morning Training Sessions

Appendix 3	PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

<u>Performance Indicator</u>	<u>EBC</u>	<u>Hastings</u>	<u>Worthing</u>	<u>Wealden</u>	<u>Rother</u>
Proportion of staff who are members of The Association of Building Engineers or Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors	13%	40%	68%	52%	22%
Total Cost per head of population of the Building Control Service	£3.61	£2.33	£3.16	£3.95	£3.59
Number of applications dealt with	597	422	774	1689	863
Employee Costs per application	£346.73	£385.33	£337.21	£263.66	£289.73
Cost of Structural Calculation Checking (£0 means covered in employee costs above)	£44,000	"negligible"	£0	£0	£0
Turnaround Times	73% within 3 weeks	72.5% within 2 weeks	84.5% within 2 weeks	83% in 3 weeks	"within DSA guidelines"
% of total costs covered by charge earning account	52% (2000)	92% (1999)	not available	80% (2000)	74%