Planning Support - Gateway Model Business Case – Mid Kent Improvement Partnership Shared Service

Overview

- A project team consisting of the Director of Regeneration and Sustainability (TWBC), the Heads of Planning and Development Manager (MBC, SBC and TWBC), Planning Support Manager, Human Resources Manager and MKIP Programme Manager have looked at the creation of a shared planning support service.

- Staff engagement and information events have been carried out by the team including site visits to each authority, briefings to all support staff across the three authorities and a joint event for all staff at Oakwood House.

- The preferred model for planning support based on an assessment of critical success factors is Model 2 – 1 site, 1 manager. Whilst the critical success factors assessment supports the 1 manager / 1 site approach, further detailed assessment will be required to determine on a function by function basis whether this model should be adopted across the planning support service.

- Sharing planning support using model 2 will deliver improved processes and resilience for the planning support functions whilst delivering minimum savings of £137,000 per annum (see Appendix D for cost of service calculations).

- Service improvements will also be expected through the introduction of electronic working, sharing best practice and the size of a single team allowing restructuring to respond to the needs of the service.

- Additional efficiencies would be delivered through releasing resource from validation duties at Maidstone and Swale.

- Financially it has been possible to make the case for a planning support shared service on the basis of staff savings alone. Further efficiency savings above staff savings will be expected to be delivered above the headline figure of £137,000 as the service progresses.

Purpose of Document

The purpose of this document is to allow the Mid Kent Improvement Partnership Board to take a decision as to whether to progress a shared service for the service described below and scoped by MKIP. The MKIP Board is not a formal decision making body and each authority that is to join the shared service will need to take a formal decision to form a shared service.

The successful delivery of shared services through MKIP has established shared services as a viable means of delivering services for all partners. As a result this is a high level, rather than detailed, Business Case on which the Board will consider whether to proceed. Once approved the details of the business case and shared service will be established, developed throughout the life of the project and delivered. Therefore this document is a living document and will evolve throughout the project subject to project controls.

The documents will be monitored and amended under the ownership of the Project Sponsor throughout the project. Updates on the documents will be provided to the Board on a quarterly basis and any variations beyond the final limits agreed in this document will need to be approved by the MKIP Board.

Service Description

Planning Support – functions that support development management, planning enforcement and conservation. Also includes the land charges functions for the three authorities. Please see scope of business case report for full breakdown.

Feasibility Assessment

The MKIP Board have given the go ahead to look at sharing planning support. The steer from the Board has been clear that planning support is to be looked at distinct from planning (development management and policy) as this is an area that members wish to retain complete local discretion over.

Looking at planning support will have an inevitable indirect impact on the whole of planning. It would not be feasible to share planning support and deliver improvements without this being the case. Each partner will maintain discretion on managing the indirect impacts on planning.

The majority of planning support work can be classified as back office functions and is administrative and process based in nature. It has been demonstrated nationally and through MKIP that those are exactly the kinds of activities that lend themselves to sharing, and in doing so, to delivering efficiency savings. There are other examples that those leading the change will be expected to draw from.

There are examples of sharing planning functions nationally and these will be looked at as the design and implementation of a planning support shared service progresses. For example, Suffolk Coastal and Waveney agreed to share the whole of planning, including support functions, in January 2012 and this may provide some suitable learning points for MKIP.

MKIP has internal examples of successful sharing of administrative, process based, functions. The key example to draw from is revenues and benefits which handles an estimated 70,000 transactions across two authorities. Numerous lessons have been learned and support the view that sharing planning support is feasible, chief among these being that ICT difficulties can be overcome and support shared service delivery which in the case of revenues and benefits took five months. In drawing comparisons between planning support and revenues and benefits it is also important to understand the practical differences between the two services.

The MKIP ICT service is in the process of being implemented and this would be the first shared service to be

implemented with joint ICT to support the process making overcoming technology difficulties easier. It is through the MKIP ICT partnership and in support of its business strategy that the procurement of joined up ICT systems for planning (as a whole) and environmental health will be looked at. This will be done independently of any shared service decision as it is expected to stand up on its own business case, but will clearly form a crucial element of delivering a shared service (see assumptions below).

Some practical considerations remain in delivering a shared service. For example the need and use of physical documents by planning officers and how if a single site for a shared service is used this need can be met. This is not considered to be insurmountable as potential solutions exist including the options of a courier between sites, upgrading the ICT at each site to enable the handling of electronic documents and providing facilities for planners to produce large scale plans as required.

Critical Success Factors

1. Efficiencies – Delivery of significant savings through economies of scale, sharing systems and processes and carrying out common work once.

2. Quality – Provision of reliable, accurate and flexible support to the Mid-Kent planning teams in order to enable them to meet their targets.

3. Resilience - Robust cover and sharing of specialisms to reduce the impact of absences and spikes in workload on service quality and provide opportunities for staff to learn and develop.

4. Culture - Creation of a service where the culture is pro-active in serving the Mid-Kent public as a whole and for the benefit of all Mid-Kent planning authorities.

Models Considered

1. **3 sites with 1 manager**

   See Appendix A for structure (includes 2 options, 1a. and 1b.)

   Option 1a – Recommended for Critical Success Factor assessment

Single Manager	A key lesson learned by MKIP through delivery of all of its previous shared services is the need for an individual with the drive and ability to bring a shared service together and take it forwards.
	A key principle of shared services is the reduction of common work (i.e. the same activity being performed at more than one authority) and this has a particular impact on management.
	Another key element of shared services is bringing best practice, policies and processes together; having a single manager more readily enables this to happen.
	Working across three sites would represent a challenge to the manager post, particularly in creating a single culture across the team and initially there will be a significant requirement on the manager to be present at Swale whilst electronic working is fully introduced. This will need to be carefully managed to deliver an equal service across all three partners.
Technical teams at each site	Technical teams within this model refers to planning support staff who carry out all functions except land charges and scanning.

		A team will be required at each site to provide direct support to their own planning teams. The numbers of staff would be based on delivery of improved ICT systems and processes for each, but this would impact more at some sites than others. The largest improvement would demonstrably be at Swale with the introduction of electronic working and workflow for all planning staff (including planning officers). Validation would change at Maidstone and Swale with the full validation process for non-major applications coming into planning support and being moved away from officers. This represents an efficiency as less costly staff would be carrying out the function. In turn this would free up planning officer resource at those two authorities for the service to determine how to utilise as this project does not include planning officers within its scope. The Heads of Planning have indicated that they support this change and would welcome it, however, major applications would not be fully validated within the support team as a 'cradle to grave' approach with planning officers would be taken for majors, again this is fully supported by the Heads of Planning. Whilst there would be significant changes driven by new ICT systems and processes at all three sites redesigning team structures at each site represents a lot of work for the manager and would need to be done on a continuous basis over a longer period of time once the service was up and running to drive further efficiencies. Initially the approach taken in order to improve resilience within the shared service would be to cross train staff on a variety of roles so that they can cover absences, rather than have staff specialise. This would help compensate for the fact that cover between sites would be harder to achieve under this model though not impossible with staff expected to cover across sites if required. Maidstone's staff numbers increase under this model due to the increase in validation work in the team. Planning policy support is also currently carried out from within the existing Maidstone team and has been excluded from this model. The Head of Planning at Maidstone has indicated that he would prefer planning policy to remain part of the team if this is the case then Maidstone's team would be required to grow by 1 FTE to accommodate the work. Maidstone's team is also currently supported by its corporate support model. The scanning element of this is considered below, the contact centre support equates to 0.64FTE and would continue under this model.
	Single land charge team	A single land charge team would be created whether operating at one site or three. This is due to the increasing drive to digitise land charges and reduce interactions with customers, particularly on personals searches which are free. Technology will be crucial to support this change and electronic searches are already carried out at Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells which has allowed a reduction in staffing to take place. The new staffing numbers are based on reducing staff to match Maidstone's 1FTE whilst improving resilience through locating staff at one site. Analysis of the numbers of searches demonstrates that the volumes of work supported by appropriate processes can be accommodated in a team of this size.

Table of land charge volumes and existing FTE

	Maidstone	Swale	Tunbridge Wells
Numbers of official searches	**2550**	**1660**	**2161**
Number of personal searches*	796	998	429
Total number of searches	3346	2650	2590
FTE (Existing)	1.0	2.64	2.0

*The aim will be to reduce the method of dealing with personal searches to avoid contact with customers and make this element 'self service' if possible.

It is important to note that land charge legislation prevents land charges from making a surplus over any three year period. Land charge income would therefore be expected to drop by an equivalent amount to any savings delivered through the service through a reduction of fees to the customer. As personal searches are free the cost of dealing with these is not recovered by the council and they therefore need to be minimised.

Single scanning team	With electronic documentation and workflow, scanning, and quality of scanning, underpins the whole process of handling planning applications.

Currently three different methods of scanning are used across the three authorities – within team (TWBC), corporate support (MBC) and externally (SBC). The amount of resource put into this function breaks down as follows:

MBC	2.4FTE	£48k
SBC	(1.4 FTE)	£28k*
TWBC	2FTE	£40k

*Swale receive a different service level from their external supplier than Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells receive internally. Swale's scanning takes place in order to present information through their website with documents being sent externally with a five day turn around. Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells work with same day scanning onto electronic planning files for officers to work from, with the appropriate information also presented onto the web.

A single team would increase resilience and ensure that the new processes and technology are supported appropriately with service levels equivalent to that received by Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells.

The best method for delivering the scanning requirements of the service has not been determined at this stage. Any of the three methods (within service, corporate support or external) are viable options. The planning support manager leading the shared service would need to determine the best method based on service need and cost, but the final solution will need to cost the same as or less than the estimate used in this business case.

Post would need to be received on one site in order to support this model as this would allow the scanning to take place at the earliest point and start the workflow

	and processing of applications as early as possible. This could present difficulties to the operation of three separate teams as they would currently need to operate from hardcopy documents. This additional challenge could be addressed to an extent through a courier service and through liaising with external bodies requiring hardcopies so that work can be done electronically as far as possible.
Single ICT systems and processes	Underpinning the shared service will be the delivery of improved systems and processes. The staffing numbers used in these models are based on electronic working throughout planning as well as planning support and it is crucial that a single ICT system and set of processes are agreed across the three sites. This will not be an insignificant amount of work and will form the greatest part of the manager's workload in delivering the shared service once the new structures are agreed. Confidence that these proposals are deliverable arises from the three authorities already using three sets of approaches to planning processes, with Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells using electronic working on a greater scale than Swale. The estimates are therefore based on the knowledge that operating planning services in this way is possible. Culturally, implementing these changes will be more difficult across three sites with cross training and support not taking place as organically as if staff were located at one site. However, cross training and visits can be undertaken to help with this and to build up a single team ethic. A clear political steer has been given that local place shaping and decision making on planning are not included within these changes and this will be the case with the focus being on the process driven elements of the service. Close working with the MKIP ICT partnership will be crucial throughout the delivery of the shared service and beyond.

Option 1b – Recommended for Critical Success Factor assessment

Scanning function at each site	In order to reduce the challenge of having planning support teams at different sites from where post is received (an issue identified above under 1a. Single scanning team) it would be possible to have 2FTE scanning requirement delivered at each site. This would require larger scanning staff numbers overall than the single site model and would not be as resilient. However, it would enable post to be received by the scanning teams on the same site as the planning support staff. Maidstone's existing requirement is for 2.4FTE, however, review work carried out with the corporate support manager has indicated that as the scanning team at Maidstone do not receive the post directly this introduces inefficiencies into the process that if resolved would reduce the FTE requirement. This lesson is also important when considering the needs of a single scanning team.

2. **1 site with 1 manager – Recommended for Critical Success Factor assessment**

   See Appendix B for structure

	Single Manager	A key lesson learned by MKIP through delivery of all of its previous shared services is the need for an individual with the drive and ability to bring a shared service together and take it forwards.

A key principle of shared services is the reduction of common work (i.e. the same activity being performed at more than one authority) and this has a particular impact on management.

Another key element of shared services is bringing best practice, policies and processes together; having a single manager more readily enables this to happen. |
| | Technical Teams split into three roles | An advantage of bringing staff together into a single team on a single site is that they can specialise in areas of the process whilst improving resilience. Heads of Planning have indicated that they support validation being done by the planning support team with the exception of major applications which are critical to the delivery of a quality planning service, have the largest impact on the local area and represent a large proportion of income. For major applications the Heads of Planning would prefer a 'cradle to grave' approach taken by the planning officers. This also allows the three authorities to be in a position to respond to proposals from government that could involve the fee being lost for applications that are not determined in time further increasing the importance of determining majors on time.

Technical Team – Example Functions

- Amendments
- Decision Notices
- Pre-Application
- TPO
- High Hedges
- Enforcement Notices
- Histories
- Enforcement Complaints
- Committee Presentations
- Invoices
- Phone calls

Validation – Example Functions

- Registering and validating:
    - Minor
    - Other
    - SUBS
    - TREECAS/TPO
    - Licensing
- Printing Planning Portal Planning Applications
- Production of Weekly List

Majors

The majors team becomes worthwhile within a single team due to the joint |

numbers of majors received. Individually these are not significant enough to warrant a specialist team.

Majors 2011/12	Maidstone	Swale	Tunbridge Wells
	70	75	23

The team would liaise directly with planning officers handling majors and would carry out some stages of the validation of those applications though a large part of the validation would sit with the case officer. The team would also concentrate on other important and sensitive elements of the planning service including appeals and s106 monitoring and would cover the rest of team when required though priority would be given to major applications. It maybe that the resourcing for this team needs to be flexible and this is something the Planning Support Manager would need to manage.

| Single Land Charges team | A single land charge team would be created whether operating at one site or three. This is due to the increasing drive to digitise land charges and reduce interactions with customers, particularly on personals searches which are free.

Technology will be crucial to support this change and electronic searches are already carried out at Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells which has allowed a reduction in staffing to take place. The new staffing numbers are based on reducing staff to match Maidstone's 1FTE whilst improving resilience through locating staff at one site.

Analysis of the numbers of searches demonstrates that the volumes of work supported by appropriate processes can be accommodated in a team of this size.

Table of land charge volumes and existing FTE

	Maidstone	Swale	Tunbridge Wells
Numbers of official searches	***2550***	***1660***	***2161***
Number of personal searches*	796	998	429
Total number of searches	3346	2650	2590
FTE (Existing)	1.0	2.64	2.0

*The aim will be to reduce the method of dealing with personal searches to avoid contact with customers and make this element 'self service' if possible.

It is important to note that land charge legislation prevents land charges from making a surplus over any three year period. Land charge income would therefore be expected to drop by an equivalent amount to any savings delivered through the service through a reduction of fees to the customer. As personal searches are free the cost of dealing with these is not recovered by the council and they therefore need to be minimised. |

| Single scanning | With electronic documentation and workflow, scanning, and quality of scanning, |

team	underpins the whole process of handling planning applications.	

Currently three different methods of scanning are used across the three authorities – within team (TWBC), corporate support (MBC) and externally (SBC). The amount of resource put into this function breaks down as follows:

MBC	2.4FTE	£48k
SBC	(1.4FTE)	£28k*
TWBC	2FTE	£40k

*Swale receive a different service level from their external supplier than Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells receive internally. Swale's scanning takes place in order to present information through their website with documents being sent externally with a five day turn around. Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells work with same day scanning onto electronic planning files for officers to work from, with the appropriate information also presented onto the web.

A single team would increase resilience and ensure that the new processes and technology are supported appropriately with service levels equivalent to that received by Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells.

The best method for delivering the scanning requirements of the service has not been determined at this stage. Any of the three methods (within service, corporate support or external) are viable options. The planning support manager leading the shared service would need to determine the best method based on service need and cost, but the final solution will need to cost the same as or less than the estimate used in this business case.

Post would need to be received on one site in order to support this model as this would allow the scanning to take place at the earliest point and start the workflow and processing of applications as early as possible. The operation of the planning support team from a single site would work well with this approach.

Single ICT systems and processes	Underpinning the shared service will be the delivery of improved systems and processes. The staffing numbers used in these models are based on electronic working throughout planning as well as planning support and it is crucial that a single ICT system and set of processes are agreed across the three sites. This will not be an insignificant amount of work and will form the greatest part of the manager's workload in delivering the shared service once the new structures are agreed.	

Confidence that these proposals are deliverable arises from the three authorities already using three sets of approaches to planning processes, with Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells using electronic working on a greater scale than Swale. The estimates are therefore based on the knowledge that operating planning services in this way is possible.

A one site model would allow cross training and support to occur organically but this will need to be supported by a programme of training and support for all staff.

A clear political steer has been given that local place shaping and decision making on planning are not included within these changes and this will be the case with

the focus being on the process driven elements of the service.

Close working with the MKIP ICT partnership will be crucial throughout the delivery of the shared service and beyond.

3. **Start with 3 sites and merge to 1 site over agreed timescale - Not Recommended to go forward for Critical Success Factor assessment**

Structure at April 2014 same as model 1a. Structure at April 2015 same as model 2.

This model has been considered in order to provide a variation in implementation of the service for comparison to models 1 and 2. In essence the plan would be to have a single manager, followed by single land charge and scanning teams. From April 2014 to April 2015 work would be done to bring planning support and the wider planning teams up to speed on the new ICT system and processes and to share best practice. Once each planning department, with on site support from planning support, have been brought to the same level a single planning support team would then be created at one of the authorities to realise further efficiencies.

It is not recommended that this go forwards for assessment at the disadvantages of putting staff through two major change processes and delaying the benefits of model 2 are not outweighed by the only significant benefit of allowing more time to bring each site up to the same level of systems and processes.

Advantages	Disadvantages
Extra time to bring all authorities up to same level of technology and processes before implementing full service	Staff go through two major change processes with two sets of risk of redundancy and two sets of implementation costs
Initial savings from three site model delivered	Hard to create a single team culture initially
Potential for additional savings when combining to one site arising from Manager having understanding of each authority's needs when designing single site service	Takes longer to implement and there is a risk that cultures of each site will become embedded in shared service prior to one site change.

4. **No change (for comparison)**

See Appendix C – structure provided for comparison to new models.

Critical Success Factor Assessment

1. **Efficiencies – Delivery of significant savings through economies of scale, sharing systems and processes and carrying out common work once.**

Efficiencies	Comments	Score (out of 45)
Model 1a	This factor has been used as a quantifiable factor of cost of service. The work done in designing the service structures has taken into account economies of scale, sharing systems and carrying out common work once. The maximum score has been given to the lowest cost service and the others scored relative to that (See Appendix D for cost estimates and breakdown).	31
Model 1b	See above	26
Model 2	See above	45

2. **Quality – Provision of reliable, accurate and flexible support to the Mid-Kent planning teams in order to enable them to meet their targets.**

Quality	Comments	Score (out of 20)
Model 1a	Three sites supported by improved ICT and processes would represent a good quality service to the planning departments. On site location at each authority would also allow close working with planning officers and enable staff to have face to face contact and carry out minor tasks and location based duties for the teams. Disadvantages arise from the issue of post coming in at one site in order to drive the new processes through scanning to enable electronic working. The quality of service received from the Planning Support Manager would be diminished by operating across three sites and would have to be carefully managed.	12
Model 1b	Three sites supported by improved ICT and processes would represent a good quality service to the planning departments. On site location at each authority would also allow close working with planning officers and enable staff to have face to face contact and carry out minor tasks and location based duties for the teams. Disadvantages arise from the quality of service received from the Planning Support Manager being diminished by operating across three sites and this would have to be carefully managed.	14
Model 2	A single site would enable the use of electronic working to be fully maximised driven by receipt of post at one point with a larger team brought together able to specialise on priority and sensitive areas such as major applications and appeals. The planning support manager would be able to maximise their time and efforts by being at one site and embedding a team ethic and culture whilst improving processes and policies. They would be able	16

| | to visit the planning teams at other sites as appropriate.

Disadvantages are that remaining hardcopies from the processes would need to be couriered between sites introducing a delay in receipt (though this would be mitigated by electronic working) and not having an on site presence to provide face to face contact with planning officers. | |

3. **Resilience - Robust cover and sharing of specialisms to reduce the impact of absences and spikes in workload on service quality and provide opportunities for staff to learn and develop.**

Resilience	Comments	Score (out of 20)
Model 1a	Resilience improvements will be deliverable through cross training staff within each individual team. Resilience in land charges would be improved through a single team. Resilience in scanning would be achieved through a single team. Working across sites reduces the overall resilience of the service though staff could be required to work at different sites from time to time. Additional opportunities for staff will be limited with individual team structures, though if opportunities arose across sites those would be available to MKIP staff.	10
Model 1b	Resilience improvements will be deliverable through cross training staff within each individual team. Resilience in land charges would be improved through a single team. Working across sites reduces the overall resilience of the service though staff could be required to work at different sites from time to time. A split scanning team introduces a weakness in terms of resilience as this process drives the timescales for planning applications and having two staff on one site could lead to backlogs in the event of absences or support being required from within the wider planning support team. Additional opportunities for staff will be limited with individual team structures, though if opportunities arose across sites those would be available to MKIP staff.	7
Model 2	The greatest resilience is achieved through locating staff on one site. This naturally lends itself to more cover being available in the event of absences planned or unplanned. In addition the three team design enables resilience on priority areas, whilst cross training would enable	17

| | each team to support another as required.

There will be greater opportunities for staff within a single team as there would be multiple areas to learn and focus on and cross training and support would be available from within the team. It will be important to keep up links with each of the planning departments should opportunities for support staff arise within the wider planning sections. | |

4. **Culture - Creation of a service where the culture is pro-active in serving the Mid-Kent public as a whole and for the benefit of all Mid-Kent planning authorities.**

Culture	Comments	Score (out of 15)
Model 1a	Creating a single team culture across three sites, particularly where each site already operates differently from the others will be extremely challenging for the Planning Support Manager. Teams are likely to identify more with the planning section and geographic location than with serving the Mid-Kent public as a whole.	7
Model 1b	Creating a single team culture across three sites, particularly where each site already operates differently from the others will be extremely challenging for the Planning Support Manager. Teams are likely to identify more with the planning section and geographic location than with serving the Mid-Kent public as a whole.	7
Model 2	A single site for the team will enable the creation of a single team ethic supporting each other in delivering to their customers. This should not be mistaken for assuming that this will be easy and will require careful thought, planning and full engagement of planning support staff. In so doing however, the resilience and quality of service would be expected to improve.	15

Preferred Model

Based on the Critical Success Factors scoring model 2 is the preferred model and clearly demonstrates that a shared service is not only feasible but would deliver significant benefits for the three partners in quality, resilience and reduced costs.

Whilst the critical success factors assessment supports model 2, further detailed assessment will be required to determine on a function by function basis as to whether this is the model that should be adopted across the planning support service as options 1a and 1b also demonstrate that a shared service is feasible and would deliver benefits.

	Model 1a	Model1b	Model 2
Efficiencies	31	26	45
Quality	12	14	16
Resilience	10	7	17
Culture	7	7	15
Total	60	54	93
			PREFERRED

Next Steps

Set-out and agree method of cost split for Cabinet decision – January –March 2013
Agree minimum acceptable service levels for the change period – January – March 2013
Tri-Cabinet Meeting for final approval – March 2013
Appointment of Planning Support Manager – March – May 2013
Determine service location on service need and cost basis –March - May 2013

Staff Input

Staff site visits took place in June 2012 by small teams of staff to look at each partner's validation processes and working environment.

A staff briefing note was presented to all staff in August 2012.

A staff briefing event was held on 12 November 2012 to update staff and provide them with the opportunity to ask questions regarding the proposals coming forward.

Follow-up meetings with Heads of Service have been held and a list of questions and answers produced.

Following a decision to enter into a shared service staff are formally consulted on proposals and then would be fully engaged in the implementation of a shared service.

Timescales and Project Plan

See Appendix E

Assumptions

The key assumption is that the business case for ICT procurement is successful and is delivered on time and that electronic working can be embedded across the authorities.

It is assumed that the existing working practices at the authorities are replicable at the other authorities

The structures used to make the broad assessments in this business case assume that work volumes (i.e. application numbers) across the partners will remain roughly consistent in order to support the work estimates (see Appendix F for 2011/12 figures).

Shared Service Delivery Requirements

Item	2013/14 Cost	2014/15
Business Improvement/Delivery Sections	£10,700	£0
HR Support (0.2FTE)	£6,200	£0
Investment (training and equipment)	£12,000	£3000
Redundancy cost allowance	£117,000 (Average cost between lowest and highest values)	£0
Total	**£145,900**	**£3,000**
Project Support (MKIP central budget)	£20,000	

Finance Appraisal

This table shows the staffing levels as at 2012/13, in Year 1 (delivery of the shared service) and Year 2 (operation of shared service)

	2012/2013 Budget	Year 1 (2013/14)	Year 2 (2014/15)	*Years 3 -5**
FTE – in Service	37.1	37.1	30.0	*30.0*
FTE – Outside	0.6	0.6	0.6	*0.6*
Total FTE	37.7	37.7	30.6	*30.6*
Change between Years		-	-7.1	*-*
Staff Costs	£941,100	£941,100	£777,900	*£777,900*
Other Costs[1]	£28,000	£28,000	0	*0*
Reduction in Land Charge Income [2]			£54,100	*£54,100*
Net cost	£969,100	£969,100	£832,000	*£832,000*
Change between Years	-	-	-£137,100	*-*

*Work has not been done to project future savings from year 3 onwards. This business case assumes only the first level of staff savings deliverable. Further savings would be expected and would need to be estimated and delivered by the Planning Support Manager and this business case updated as appropriate.

Cash flow	Expenditure			Savings	Cumulative Cash Flow
	Capital	Non-capital	Total		
Year 1	-	£145,900	£145,900	-	-£145,900
Year 2	-	£3,000	£3,000	£137,100	-£11,800
Year 3	-	-		£137,100	£125,300
Year 4	-	-		£137,100	£262,400
Year 5	-	-		£137,100	£399,500
Totals	-	£148,900	£148,900	£548,400	

---

[1] Refers to external scanning cost at SBC

[2] Land Charge service need to be shown at a breakeven level

Risks

Risk	Control	Action
Performance impact on planning services	Managed through the project by agreeing quality tolerance (see tolerances below)	Managed by Planning Support Manager during delivery
Failure to deliver project impacting on return on investment	Managed through project controls and managing a subset of risks to be identified by the Planning Support Manager	Managed by Planning Support Manager during delivery, maintain a risk register, regular reporting to the Project and MKIP Board
Employment change risks	Numerous risks associated with significant changes for staff. Full project support to the project manager required including HR support	Managed by Planning Support Manager during delivery, maintain a risk register, regular reporting to the Project and MKIP Board
Redundancy cost risks (i.e. maximum redundancy costs are required)	Estimates based on midpoint of lowest and highest redundancy costs.	If likely to occur planning support manager will need to review the business case, revise cashflow projection and get approval from Project and MKIP Board
ICT project risks	Management through the ICT Project	Managed by the Head of ICT (or delegate) through maintaining risk registers and controls in ICT project

Project Governance

Project Board

Project Sponsor – Jonathan MacDonald, Director (TWBC)
Senior Customer(s) – Rob Jarman, James Freeman (Heads of Planning, MBC, SBC, TWBC)
Senior Supplier(s) – Ryan O'Connell (MKIP Programme Manager), Andrew Cole (Head of ICT Partnership)

Maximum Tolerances

Maximum cost - £163,790 (£148,900 +10%)
Maximum timescale – Delivery by April 2014
Maximum impact on planning services – no drop below agreed targets (to be confirmed by March 2013)