

Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 2 Performance report 2017-2018	
Report No:	PAS/FH/17/032	
Report to and date:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	29 November 2017
Portfolio holder:	Stephen Edwards Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01799 530325 Email: stephen.edwards@forest-heath.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Rachael Mann Assistant Director (Resources and Performance) Tel: 01638 719245 Email: rachael.mann@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	This report sets out the West Suffolk Balanced Scorecards being used to measure the Council's performance for 2017-18 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the second quarter of 2017-18.	
Recommendation:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Members are requested to review the Council's performance using Balanced Scorecards for Quarter 2, 2017-18 and identify any further information required or make recommendations where remedial action or attention is required to address the Council's performance.	

Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>		<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Consultation:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This report has been prepared in consultation with all relevant staff and Leadership Team. 	
Alternative option(s):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option of doing nothing may result in poor performance, monitoring performance can highlight where remedial action may be needed 	
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While there are no direct financial or budget implications arising from this report, it is possible that any recommendations of the Committee may have some resource implications. For example, resources may need to be reallocated to improve performance in a future period. 	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no legal implications from this report. Poor performance levels may impact on the Council's ability to implement its policies or high-level strategies. 	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
Failure to achieve optimum or target performance which may impact on resources	High	Regular reporting of performance to Joint Leadership Team, Portfolio Holders and to PASC can highlight where remedial action may be needed.	Medium
Ward(s) affected:		All Ward	
Background papers:		PASC - May 2017 - Item 8 - Balanced Scorecard Targets 2017-18	

Documents attached:

Appendix A – Resources and Performance Balanced Scorecard

Appendix B – Families and Communities Balanced Scorecard

Appendix C – Human Resources, Legal and Democratic Balanced Scorecard

Appendix D – Planning and Regulatory Balanced Scorecard

Appendix E – Operations Balanced Scorecard

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Performance Measures

1.1.1 Attached at appendices A to E are the current Balanced Scorecards (based on Assistant Director area) which present Quarter 2 2017/18 performance. Unless otherwise stated, all performance figures on the scorecards are from a West Suffolk perspective. Where the performance for either individual Council is significantly different from the West Suffolk figure that it would have a different Red-Amber-Green (RAG) rating, details of this are highlighted in the comments box.

1.1.2 The information included in the report has been provided by Assistant Directors and service managers. Most indicators report performance against an agreed target using a traffic light system with additional commentary provided for performance indicators below optimum performance. Other KPIs report a data value only (e.g. no target performance) in order to track performance over time.

1.2 Quarter 2 Performance

1.2.1 Within Resources and Performance, the “% of non-disputed invoices paid within 30 days” corporate indicator across both councils shows we have achieved positive results in the second quarter, reporting 94% of invoices paid within 30 days. The finance and performance team will continue to work with service areas to try and improve performance against this indicator to achieve the 95% target, with monthly business intelligence reports being sent out with details of all invoices processed.

1.2.2 Enforcement cases on hand

Members previously requested further information regarding the number of enforcement cases on hand and the general upward trend of this figure over recent months. The on hand figure shown on the Balanced Scorecard has come down slightly since the last report with 356 cases being on hand - at the time of writing this report this has been reduced further to 342 cases.

This number obviously varies based on what new cases come in, as well as what complex cases may be keeping the team busy in any given month - particularly where officers may be involved in formal enforcement notice appeals or prosecution work.

It may be useful for Members to note the reasons for enforcement cases being closed down from a sample of 328 recent cases:

No Breach/Permitted Development – 43%
Not expedient to enforce – 20%
Planning application invited and approved – 17%
Breach remedied without formal action – 15%
Notice issued and complied with – 1%
Prosecution – 1%
Complaint referred to other services – 3%

These figures bear out the general approach of our Enforcement Team in trying to resolve complaints without recourse to expensive and time consuming formal and legal processes – 32% of cases being resolved either informally or through the planning application process. It also highlights the large amount of complaints investigated that do not relate to breaches of planning control. Whilst not all complaints received are logged as such if the alleged breach clearly isn't a breach, many complaints require investigating before non-breach becomes apparent. The enforcement team works hard, particularly with Parish Councils and through the Councils' Parish Forum to provide training relating to breaches of planning control to help triage possible complaints.

The Council has been investigating the best way to notify Ward Members of ongoing enforcement matters in their area while making sure the authority complies with Data Protection laws, which are also due to be strengthened next year. There are data protection challenges with publishing the whole live caseload list for Members. To meet both these aims officers are now looking at whether planning software can be used to automatically notify ward members when a complaint is logged on the system

1.2.3 Validation figures and Pre-application enquiry service

The Planning Technical Support team has been working hard to reduce the number of applications waiting to be validated and the backlog has reduced significantly. However, a large number of the applications being processed are still invalid when submitted to the department. Planning Officers and Technicians are working hard to address this, particularly in relation to our Pre-application Enquiry service which can provide applicants with more information about getting the right submission from the start. Of the 800 applications received between 1 July 2017 and 30 Sept 2017, 52% of them were invalid when first submitted – only 13% of the invalid applications received pre-application advice, which is a good indication that the pre-application service is working well, although improvements can evidently still be made.