

Appendix F:

GESP team staff resources: future options

Option 1: Maintain the status quo

This option would see the GESP team remain at 5.2 FTEs, with each team member employed solely by their individual authority. Under this option, there would be no financial equalisation agreement.

Benefits	- No additional financial costs for the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to those already committed
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Insufficient resources to meet the GESP timetable and deliver effective consultation, as well as accommodate any peaks in workload- Current staffing commitments by the four LPAs are not financially comparable- No appointed team leader – The project would continue to be coordinated by the two Principal Officers in the team- There is no resilience to future staff changes or losses

Option 2: Retain existing staff and identify additional resource to bring staffing levels up to 8.0 FTEs

There are 3 scenarios under this option:

2a. Identify resource from within the existing planning teams and, subject to how these staffing contributions come forward, agree financial equalisation arrangements as necessary between the four LPAs covering the full LPA resource. Officers would continue to be employed solely by their individual authority. This would require all LPAs to reprioritise current plan programmes in order to divert staff to the GESP.

2b. Recruit additional staffing resources through a competitive recruitment process. The full costs of LPA staff in the team would be apportioned equally between the four LPAs by way of a financial equalisation agreement, payable to a host authority. New officers appointed would be employed by a single host authority. This would improve the contractual management arrangements for the GESP team.

2c. A hybrid between 2a and 2b whereby additional resources are obtained through a combination of existing team members and external recruitment. All contributions, whether financial or existing officers, would be balanced equitably through a financial equalisation agreement for the four LPAs. New officers appointed would be employed by a single host authority.

Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May be difficult for the LPAs to identify surplus resources within existing teams for 2a to be a realistic option on its own. However, if they could be identified or additional external resource could be brought in, then there would be sufficient resources to meet the GESP timetable and deliver effective consultation, as well as accommodate any peaks in workload - Financial contributions would be equitable between the 4 LPAs - Potential to provide defined roles within the team such as an appointed team leader and technician – either internally or externally appointed - Less ability for individual LPAs to withdraw resource by way of a unilateral decision - Better resilience to future staff changes or losses
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The different status of existing team members and new employees would not entirely overcome the informal arrangements of the existing staff team - Need to backfill staff if internal recruitments are made - Administrative/HR processes involved in establishing a host authority may take some time, delaying recruitment - Total additional costs of resourcing are likely to be in the region of £100,000 annually - Total annual GESP staff cost to each LPA is likely to be approximately £62,000 (depending on the composition of the team-assumptions have been made that the team could include a team leader and technician but this is to be determined)

Option 3: All GESP team members (excluding DCC officers) to be hosted by a single LPA

This would comprise both existing and new GESP team members who would be seconded to a host authority, with all financial contributions underpinned by an equalisation agreement. As per option 2, additional staff members would be recruited to bring staffing levels up to 8.0 FTEs.

Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient resources to meet the GESP timetable and deliver effective consultation, as well as accommodate any peaks in workload - Financial contributions would be equitable between the four LPAs - Potential to provide defined roles within the team such as an appointed team leader and technician – either internally or externally appointed
----------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less ability for individual LPAs to withdraw resource by way of a unilateral decision - Better resilience to future staff changes or losses - All team members would have the same status-employed by a single host authority. This would overcome the existing issues with informal staffing arrangements - Line management would move to the Team Leader/Principals to improve project coordination
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative/HR processes involved in establishing a host authority may take some time, delaying recruitment of additional staff - Total additional costs of resourcing are likely to be in the region of £100,000 annually - Total annual GESP staff cost to each LPA is likely to be approximately £62,000 (depending on the composition of the team-assumptions have been made that the team could include a team leader and technician but this is to be determined) - Withdrawal of a LPA from the formal equalisation process and GESP would result in financial implications for the remaining authorities

Financial implications of options 2 and 3:

Options 2 and 3 – Equalisation			
	Annual existing staff cost/contribution (£)	Annual equalised contribution or equivalent resource cost for the additional staff (£)	Total annual equalised staff cost/contribution (£)
Staff costs (TOTAL)	145,952	103,000	248,952
East Devon	39,213	25,750	£62,238
Exeter	28,670	25,750	£62,238
Mid Devon	44,933	25,750	£62,238
Teignbridge	33,136	25,750	£62,238