## WEST SUFFOLK - PLANNING & GROWTH BALANCED SCORECARD

Appendix D

<u>FY</u>

2016 - 2017 Oct 16 - Dec 16 -**Nov 16** Apr 15-Mar 16 Apr 16 - Sep 16 QUARTER MONTH **HALF YEARLY** \* These indicators are at organisational level ANNUAL **Current Value** Target Frequency Type Trend Comments **Current Value** Target Frequency Type Trend Comments DevControl £119k, Solar Farm (£-160k), Year end forecast variance (under) / 10 - Development Control / Building 42,007.00 0.00 M 10 Cumulative Environmental Mgmt £60k. As detailed in the Number of formal complaints No target Period only over spend against budget - FHDC budget monitoring report 15 - Development Control / Building DevControl £114k, Building Control £69k. As Year end forecast variance (under) / Number of formal 201,156.00 0.00 M 20 В Cumulative No target Period only Control, 1 - Land charges, 4 over spend against budget - SEBC detailed in the budget monitoring report compliments Environmental Health. Spend on professional fees in relation Number of successful appeals M 14,702 No Target M Cumulative No Target Period only FHDC had one successful appeal to planning appeals - Planning Application decisions needing Of the 47 late applications 37 needed an (£1,804,189.72 (£1,763,330.00) M 37 M Income received against budget Cumulative an extention of time to No Target Period only extension of time omplete The number had decreased significantly as the three new planning apprentices as part % of non-disputed invoices paid M M 100.00 95.00 56 Invoices processed in November 50 Period only Total validation backlog No Target Cumulative within 30 days of there training programme had been working to clear the backlog. There were 248 applicants during the FHDC debt £1,956.00 - 65.70% over 90 days. month of which 90 (36%) were invalid % of invalid planning M M 63.40 10.00 36.00 % of debt over 90 days old Cumulative No Target Period only SEBC debt £4,876.32 - 61.10% over 90 days applications received which is an improvement on previous Trend **Current Value** Target Type Trend **Current Value** Frequency Comments Frequency Comments Target Type There were 6 major applications in the month 5 for SEBC and 1 for FHDC. 4 of SEBC were Renewable energy generated % of major planning applications 83.33 60.00 M Period only 49,627 Q Period only No Target determined within 13 weeks completed in time 80% and FHDC there was 1 on Council properties (KWh) which was completed in time 100% % of food businesses There were 33 applications in the month 25 for % of minor planning applications receiving a top food hygiene 80.30 84.00 65.00 SEBC and 8 for FHDC. SEBC completed 21 in time 60.00 Q Period only Period only determined within 8 weeks achieving 84% and FHDC achieved 7 in time 88% rating (rating of 5) There were 135 applications 103 for sebc of which 71 were completed in time. For FHDC % of other planning applications 92.00 80.00 M Period only determined within 8 weeks there were 32 applications for FHDC of which 23 were completed in time. SEBC 68% FHDC 71% There were 19 new cases opened in SEBC and 16 Number of new enforcement cases 35 No Target M Period only new cases in FHDC There were 15 cases closed in SEBC and 16 cases Number of enforcement cases closed 31 No Target M Period only closed in FHDC Total number of enforcement cases There are 191 open cases in SEBC and 103 cases 294 M No Target Period only Name Project Lead Project Stage **Project Status** Approval details Approved Forecast Spend Variance Comments

	RISK ID NUMBER	Туре	Title	Description - What are we trying to avoid?	WS Inherent Risk	WS Residual Risk	Last updated
RISK	WS6 (on all scorecards)	Political	Managing public / councillor expectations with less resources	Falling short of providing the level of service that the public and councillors expect and demand.	Probability - 5; Impact - 4	Probability - 3; Impact - 4	December 2016
	WS8b	Political / Social	Failure to deliver Growth Agenda inc coping with growth and increase in demand	Opportunities being missed to create or influence the provision of: (i) beneficial growth that enhances prosperity and quality of life; (ii) existing businesses that are thriving and new businesses brought to the area; (iii) people with the educational attainment and skills needed in our local economy; (iv) vibrant, attractive and clean high streets, village centres and markets.	Probability - 4; Impact - 5	Probability - 3; Impact - 4	December 2016
	WS14 (on all scorecards)	Physical / Social / Legal	Service failure through unplanned events	Reduced level or failure to deliver services to both internal and external clients due to unforeseen events.	Probability - 3; Impact - 4	Probability - 2; Impact - 2	December 2016
	WS12	Partnership	Loss of a key employer (for example USAFE, Racing Industry, Greene King, WS Hospital, Centre Parcs, British Sugar) - See WS2 for USAFE	Failure to retain major employers in the area and the economic impact that it would have	Probability - 3; Impact - 5	Probability - 2; Impact - 5	December 2016
	WS22	Economic / Social	Effects of the closure of RAF Mildenhall	Negative impact on the local economy, families and community or the housing market	Probability - 5; Impact - 4	Probability - 5; Impact - 2	December 2016