

The background features a collection of 3D rectangular blocks of various heights and colors, including teal, red, orange, and pink. These blocks are arranged in a way that suggests depth and perspective, with some blocks appearing to be stacked or connected. The overall aesthetic is modern and geometric.

STREAMLINE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FUNDING PROJECT

Brief Project Overview for Report PL-02-23

PROJECT PRIORITIES

Modernize, streamline, and accelerate processes for managing and approving housing applications

Training for Staff

Lean Six Sigma training for project staff
29 staff trained

Pre-building Permit Process Review

1. Environmental Scan
2. Value stream mapping
3. Identify key pain points and prioritize solutions
4. Design and experiment with solutions
5. Direct involvement with the customer

Development Charges Process

1. Assessment and validation of already completed process review work (including recommendations)
2. Validate future state proposal with key stakeholders
3. Design and implement process improvements (including dependent processes)

Pre-consultation & Other Supporting Process Improvements (as applicable)

1. Identify areas for improvement - focus on Amanda improvements
2. Prioritize improvements to supporting process considering impact to overall process outcomes - includes Forestry & DC process improvements

PROJECTS RUNNING IN PARALLEL



Audit and Accountability Funding

- Land Management Development Platform Review - Amanda technology
- Enterprise Web Architecture & Modernization Review



Burlington Lands Partnership/ Housing Strategy

- Strategic use of available land for housing
 - Assessment of issues/ opportunities associated with the acquisition & re-use of former school sites re: attainable housing



Community Benefit (new)

- New process required by legislation
- Launch June 2022

IMPORTANT CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT FUNDAMENTALS




- Psychological Safety
 - Collaboration
 - Direct customer engagement
- Designing for the win win



- Make it flow, make it visible
- Solving problems at the root
 - Making room For improvement & strategy



- Reduce task switching
- Focus on the value-add
- Plan Do Check Act
 - Experimentation





UNDERSTANDING THE CURRENT STATE

ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

Interviews with Oakville, Markham & Brampton

- poor quality submissions, interruption through file escalations, culture is important


VOICE OF THE CUSTOMER

- Before value stream mapping, during application experiment, during visibility tool design

BASELINE DATA COLLECTION

- Collected during value stream mapping, used capacity analysis data from 2021

PBP - HOW DOES THE PROCESS WORK?




VALUE STREAM MAPPING

CURRENT STATE

PT = Processing time – the amount of time to perform the task

ET = Elapsed Time – amount of time for the application to move from one step to the next

%CA = % Complete & Accurate – percent of time the information coming is correct and staff can use it to complete their task



PRE-BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS – CURRENT STATE MEASURES

- ET = minimum 6 months
- Elapsed time sits with the applicant 50% of the time and with staff 50% of the time
- Worst case scenarios can extend to a maximum of 24 months – these tend to be outliers or exceptions

KEY ROOT CAUSES

| To what extent does the ROW cause the COLUMN? <div style="text-align: center;">↑</div> Major cause: 10 Minor cause: 5 | Lack of process visibility | Bad Application form | Too much back and forth | AMANDA not utilized properly | Complex requirements and bylaws | Overprocessing/ manual process @ RDT | Files get escalated | Staff not utilized properly | E2E process ineffectiveness, including 3 levels of approval | Lack staff capacity | No continuous improvement routines | Too long to process payments / not visible | #REF! | #REF! | #REF! | ROWS: impact of this cause on all other |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Lack of process visibility | | | 10 | | | 5 | 10 | | 5 | | 5 | | | | | 35 |
| Bad Application form | | | 10 | | | 10 | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | | | | 40 |
| Too much back and forth | | | | | | | 10 | 5 | | 10 | | | | | | 25 |
| AMANDA not utilized properly | 10 | | 10 | | | 10 | | 10 | 5 | 10 | | 5 | | | | 60 |
| Complex requirements and bylaws | | 10 | 10 | | | 5 | 5 | | 10 | 10 | | | | | | 50 |
| Overprocessing/ manual process @ RDT | | | 10 | | | | 10 | | | 5 | | | | | | 25 |
| Files get escalated | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | | | | 10 |
| Staff not utilized properly | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | | | | 5 |
| E2E process ineffectiveness, including 3 levels of approval | | 5 | 10 | | | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | | | | | 55 |
| Lack staff capacity | | | | | | | 10 | 10 | | | | 5 | | | | 25 |
| No continuous improvement routines | | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | | 10 | | | | 80 |
| Too long to process payments / not visible | | | 5 | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | | | | | | 20 |
| COLUMNS: how many other causes impact this cause | 1 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

IMPROVEMENTS



Initial File Circulation

Experiment 1



- Reduce ET by 5-10 days
- Improved internal visibility



Improved Application Form

Experiment 2



- Reduction in failure demand (%CA was 50%, now 80%)
- Improve the client and staff experience
- Saving staff effort to answer queries, because we now provide them with our checklist



Simplification of Review Requirements Site Engineering

Experiment 3



- Eliminated 5 app types, 25% of apps
- Saves 20hrs/app, 1500hrs PT/year for Site Engineering Team



SHIELD Experiment 2 Phases

Experiment 4



Phase 1 – pre-screen:

- PT = 1.25-2 hours instead of 17.75-24 hours (saving 92%)
- ET = 2-6 days instead of 41-108 days (saving 95%)
- Significant improvement to client experience
- Saving 3 handoffs, eliminated the backlog

Phase 2 – review – 3 cycles to 2:

- Reduce PT from 36-65 hours down to 27-45 hours (saving 25-32%)
- Reduce ET from 107-270 days down to 45-141 days (saving 48-58%)




Deficiency Form Improvement

Experiment 5




- Centralized record management creating consistency across groups
- Minimizing back and forth

IMPROVEMENTS



Development Charges Process Improvement

Experiment 6




- DC administration is done once by the right staff at the right time thus eliminating unnecessary back and forth handoffs
- 370 hours of Zoning staff capacity a year which can be re-deployed toward development applications subject to Bill 109



Amanda Improvements for Pre-consultation

Experiment 8




- Improved consistency in practice across application types
- Streamlined and automated process



Process Visibility Tool

Experiment 9




- Estimated savings of 60 hrs per week in inquiries
- Consolidation of 3 folders into 1
- Improved visibility for staff doing reviews
- Saved time looking in different folders for information
- Saved time in updating information in folders

TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS

THE HIGHLIGHTS

IMPROVEMENTS



HOW IMPROVEMENT CHANGES EXPERIENCE

FOR THE CUSTOMER

- Applications will take less time
- Customers can see where in the process their application is sitting
- Customers feel included and informed, and this will build trust
- Reduction in frustration
- Ability to meet their own (business) needs


FOR THE STAFF

- Found capacity will help reduce overwhelming workloads and work will feel more valuable
- Backlogs will be reduced/eliminated
- Satisfaction in providing good service to clients
- Reduction in stress from dealing with frustrated customers
- Increased collaboration between departments
- Improved teambuilding, engagement and empowerment


CULTURAL CHANGES

How are we changing the way we work and how we do business


- March**
- Siloed operations
 - Risk aversion
 - Change adverse
 - Customers not included



- July**
- Embracing fear of failure
 - Experimenting
 - Working cross-functionally




- Today**
- Staff are generating experiments independently
 - Choosing when risk is right
 - Enablers not enforcers
 - Readily reaching across borders
 - Empowering staff to lead
 - Working with customers



NEXT STEPS

- Align process with Bill 23
- Continue to measure the impact of improvements on the overall process
- Establish a continuous improvement plan to move forward with beyond SDAF
 - In collaboration with partnering departments (building, site engineering, forestry, IT)
- Scale solutions to other planning processes



THANK YOU

Questions?