Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee



COMMILLEE						
Title of Report:	Key Performance Indicators and Quarter 3 Performance report 2014-15					
Report No:	PAS/SE/15/001					
Report to and dates:	Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	29 January 2015				
Portfolio holder:	Dave Ray Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01359 250912 Email : david.ray@stedsbc.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 again Indicators for Quart any further inform recommendations w	dit Scrutiny Committee: sted to Review the Council's st the Key Performance ter 3, 2014-15 and identify nation required or make where remedial action or d to address the Council's				

Key Decision: (Check the appropriate	definitio	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i>					
box and delete all those that do not apply.)			Decision - \Box				
	No, it is	No, it is not a Key Decision - 🖂					
		eport has been prepared in consultation Il relevant staff and Leadership Team.					
۲ ۲		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?</i> <i>If yes, please give details</i>		 Yes □ No ⊠ 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?</i> <i>If yes, please give details</i>		ons?	Yes □ No ⊠				
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		If	Yes □ No ⊠ •				
Are there any legal	and/or po	licy	Yes 🗆 No 🗵				
<i>implications? If yes, please give details</i>			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.				
Are there any equa If yes, please give o	Are there any equality implications?			Yes □ No ⊠ •			
Risk/opportunity assessment:		(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)					
Risk area	Inherent lev risk (before controls)		Controls	Residual risk (after controls)			
Failure to achieve optimum or target performance which may impact on resources	Low/Medium/ High	High*	Regular reporting of performance to Joint Leadership Team, Portfolio Holders and to PASC can highlight where remedial action may be needed.	Low/Medium/ High* Medium			
Ward(s) affected:			All Ward				
Background papers:			None				
Documents attached:		Appendix A – Forest Heath, St Edmundsbury and West Suffolk Key Performance Indicators 2014-15 – Quarter 3 Results					

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations

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
	I	\bigtriangleup	•	×**
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 the performance of other applications exceeding its target. 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.