

July 11, 2013

MONTHLY PERMIT ACTIVITY REPORT

PERMITS UP 13% -- CUSTOMERS UP 68% -- FEES UP 5%

JUNE 2013

June Permit Comparison 2012-2013			
Type	2012	2013	Percent Difference
Building Code Enforcement	6	10	67%
Boundary Line Adjustment	4	1	-75%
Residential Building	80	109	36%
Burn Permit	2	1	-50%
Commercial Building	17	8	-53%
Development Regulation	11	9	-18%
Disaster	0	1	0%
Parcel Combination	2	1	-50%
Planning Enforcement	13	12	-8%
Fire Protection System	6	6	0%
Forest Practice Application	3	2	-33%
Geotechnical Report	4	5	25%
Grading Permit	1	0	-100%
Mason Environmental Permit	4	4	0%
Pre-Application Conference	2	3	50%
SEPA Revenue	8	12	50%
Shoreline Permit	1	0	-100%
Shoreline Exemption	4	6	50%
Site Pre-Inspection	6	6	0%
Short Plat	2	2	0%
	176	198	13%

The table to the left is a compilation of permits received in June 2013 as compared to that of June 2012.



Enforcement: Building cases made a sharp increase in June over last year, while planning shows a slight decline. Every complaint is issued a case number when it is received. These totals reflect the number of new complaints.



Construction: In this month, residential building is up 36% from 2012, while commercial permits made a significant decrease.



Land Use: The fluctuation in these types of permits is predictably inconsistent. They do not follow the same season cycle as building permits, although some tend to more than others. An increase in Pre-Apps is positive for future permits, and site inspections remains consistent.



Permit Center: Visitor activity in the Permit Assistance Center again continues to rise. Compared to June of 2012, levels have increased by 68%. A good sign that development interests and building potential remain optimistic.

Monthly Sign-Ins for 2012 and 2013.

	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
2012	139	204	215	237	275	213	262	335	243	250	190	142
2013	264	262	311	352	364	359						



Revenue Tracking: The table below shows a comparison of 2013 building and planning revenues to those of 2012. Recognizing that there are a variety of sources that compose the Department's revenue (e.g. grants, fines, fees, etc.), the overall analysis is generally positive.

Revenues YTD - 6/30	2012	2013	% Difference
Building	\$422,673.49	\$445,406.57	5%
Planning	\$183,415.47	\$178,582.78	-3%



Permit Review: Maintaining workable permit review times is an important part of our customer service. This monthly report provides an opportunity for us to look at the average number of days a permit remains in each division, excluding Environmental Health and Public Works. It's important to remember that any single permit can go through as many as six separate reviews before being issued; and any one project can be subject to obtaining permits from five separate authorities, not including any state or federal permits. This Department strives to make the journey of an application as expeditious possible. At present, there are four Building Inspectors – one is in the field full time, one does full time plan review, and two alternate their time between field and office. Below is a table of review times of the Building Staff (inspectors and plans examiners) for the month of June 2013.

Building Review Times	
Type	Average Days
New Single Family	22
Single Family Additions	27
Single Family Accessory	22
Commercial	10



Building permits are also reviewed by Planners and Environment Health Specialists. The average review time in June 2013 for Planning is 21 days. Planners also review permits specific to land use that may have little or no association to a building permit. Projects subject to critical areas, shorelines, forest practices, zoning changes, variances, SEPA review, property line adjustments, appeals, subdivisions, platting and the like require additional time commitments that can be substantial – not only for the applicant but for the staff. These permits generally require public notice, public comment, one or more public hearings, staff reports, outside agency coordination, interdepartmental coordination and various consultations. Outside of reviewing building permits, a Planner's review time can be greatly impacted by time obligations of other non-building responsibilities. The table below is a year to date total of permits received for review by Planners together with an average estimation of the total hours to review compared to the number of Planners on staff.

Permit Types ¹		Average Hours ²	2013 YTD	
			# of Permits	Hours
Development Regulation Review ³	DDR	2	48	96
Boundary Line Adjustment	BLA	4	13	52
Declaration Parcel Combo	DPC	2	7	14
Enforcement	ENF	10	60	600
Forest Practice Application	FPA	10	2	20
Large Lot Subdivision	LRG	12	1	12
Mason Environmental Permit	MEP	10	25	250
SEPA Checklist	SEP	10	58	580
Shoreline Exemption	SHX	6	46	276
Site Pre-inspection	SPI	5	51	255
Short Plat	SPL	10	3	30
Plat	PLT	70	1	70
Shoreline permit	SHR	50	7	350
Commercial Building	COM	3	81	243
Residential Building	BLD	3	559	1677
Totals			962	4525
Estimated Total fte's to Complete Permits ⁴				5.0
Actual Staffing Levels				3.0

This type of analysis has been provided to the Board in previous years as a tool for gauging minimum staffing levels. It is an estimate but nonetheless demonstrates the amount of time permit review – beyond that of building permits – can impact permit review times. As mentioned above, permits are reviewed by a number of people and our information speaks only to the building and planning staff. However, plans are reviewed by all departments simultaneously so any other extraneous activities of reviewing staff members should parallel with these times as opposed to extending them.



Suggestion Box: Up until 2011, the Department provided comment cards to Permit Center visitors querying their satisfaction level with the service received. Cards were handed out in the office in Shelton and the office in Belfair, since closed. We will be bringing back the comment cards and including them with all information that is distributed over the counter. An interactive comment page has also been linked to the Department's home page to provide another avenue for communication. The staff has received a great deal of praise over the years and this would be a way of spotlighting their efforts. On the other hand, suggestions on how we could do better would also be of tremendous benefit.

¹ Does not include any long range planning activities or activities not currently monitored in Tidemark (e.g. Habitat Management Plans, Stormwater Plan review, wetland delineations, danger tree determinations)

² Hours do not include any managerial or clerical provisions or support.

³ These types of permits include variances, rezones, plan and regulation amendments, and special use permits

⁴ Calculated by dividing total number of estimated hours of completion by estimated actual number of working hours for six months per fte