Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath District Council

Title of Report:	Key Performance Indicators and Quarter 3 Performance report 2014-15				
Report No:	PAS/FH/15/001				
Report to and date:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	29 January 2015			
Portfolio holder:	Stephen Edwards Portfolio Holder for Resources, Governance and Performance Tel: 01638 660518 Email: Stephen.edwards@forest-heath.gov.uk				
Lead officer:	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance Tel: 01638 719245 Email: rachael.mann@westsuffolk.gov.uk				
Purpose of report:	This report sets out the Key Performance Indicators being used to measure the Council's performance for 2014-15 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the third quarter of 2014-15.				
Recommendation:	Members are reques performance agains Indicators for Quart any further inform recommendations v	er 3, 2014-15 and identify nation required or make			

Key Decision:		Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which					
(Check the appropriate box and delete all those	definitio						
that <u>do not</u> apply.)			Decision - 🗆				
a b b	INO, IT IS	No, it is not a Key Decision - 🖂					
			eport has been prepared in consultation Il relevant staff and Leadership Team.				
Alternative option(s): The opperform			-	ng may result in poor			
		mance, monitoring	-				
			ht where remedial action may be				
needeo			d				
Implications:		tions?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂				
Are there any financial implications?							
If yes, please give details			While there are no direct financial				
				or budget implications arising from this report, it is possible that any			
			recommendati				
			Committee ma				
				, cations. For example,			
			resources may	need to be			
			reallocated to	-			
			performance in a future period.				
Are there any staffing implications?			Yes 🗆 No 🖂				
If yes, please give o			•				
Are there any ICT i		11	Yes 🗆 No 🖂				
yes, please give det		line					
Are there any legal and/or policy		-	Yes D No 🛛				
details	implications? If yes, please give		There are no legal implications from this report. Poor performance				
actans			levels may impact on the Council's				
			ability to implement its policies or				
			high-level strategies.				
Are there any equa		ions?	Yes 🗆 🛛 No 🖂				
If yes, please give o			•				
	Risk/opportunity assessment:		(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)				
Risk area	Inherent le	vel of	Controls	Residual risk (after			
	risk (before			controls)			
	controls) Low/Medium/	High*		Low/Medium/ High*			
Failure to achieve	High		Regular reporting of	Medium			
optimum or target			performance to Joint				
performance which may impact on			Leadership Team, Portfolio Holders and				
resources			to PASC can				
			highlight where				
			remedial action may be needed.				
Ward(s) affected:	Ward(s) affected:		All Ward				
	Background papers:		None				
Documents attack				Forest Heath, St			
			Edmundsbury and West Suffolk Key				
			Performance Inc	dicators 2014-15 –			
			-				
			Quarter 3 Results				

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Key Issues

- 1.1.1 The report at **Appendix A** presents performance against Quarter 3 2014-15 for both Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury, together with a combined performance for West Suffolk where this is relevant.
- 1.1.2 Forest Heath KPIs are denoted with a FH/ prefix, St Edmundsbury KPIs are denoted with a SE/ prefix and those for West Suffolk with a WS/ prefix.
- 1.1.3 The information included in the report has been provided by Heads of Service and service management. 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.

Quarter 3 2014-15	PI on or exceeded target	PI below target within tolerance	PI significantly below target	Data only Indicators
			•	
Forest Heath KPIs	12	4	0	10
St Edmundsbury KPIs	11	4	2	10
West Suffolk KPIs	7	4	1	7

1.1.4 The following table shows the status of the current performance for all indicators:

- 1.1.5 Where performance is below target the data is supported by notes and explanations from services.
- 1.1.6 An indicator for return on our investments was suggested by the committee and work continues on pulling together some proposed indicators for the 2015/16 KPI discussions.

1.2 **Planning Performance**

- 1.2.1 Generally performance in dealing with the various planning applications is steadily improving. Performance on both minor and other applications has improved significantly since quarter two, with both of these indicators either on or exceeding their targets. The team are now getting to grips with the inherent back log and we should see this improvement being sustained across all categories of applications.
- 1.2.2 As requested at the November committee meeting, there have been some indicators added in relation to planning enforcement. These indicators give details of the number of enforcement cases both opened and closed in the past quarter. They can be found in **Appendix A**, indicator numbers 59 to 62.
- 1.2.3 These figures give a snapshot of complaints over the last quarter and details of the work being carried out by consultants appointed by the Council to address the backlog and resource issues in enforcement. A new enforcement team will soon be in place with a Principal Enforcement Officer due to take up their post on 2 February 2015.

Forthcoming reports will contain more measureable indicators of enforcement performance. In addition, the Development Manager will be writing a monitoring report for the Council's Development Control Committee which will include key performance and outcomes for planning applications, appeals and enforcement.