Informal Joint Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee

St Edmundsbury BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	**Key Performance Indicators and Quarter 4 Performance report 2014-15**	
Report No:	**PAS/SE/15/008**	
Report to and dates:	**Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee**	4 June 2015
Portfolio holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Performance and Resources **Tel:** 01284 810074 **Email**: ian.houlder@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 fourth quarter of 2014-15.	
Recommendation:	**Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee:** **Members are requested to Review the Council's performance against the Key Performance Indicators for Quarter 4, 2014-15 and identify any further information required or make recommendations where remedial action or attention is required to address the Council's performance.**	

Key Decision: *(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that **do not** apply.)*	*Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?* Yes, it is a Key Decision - ☐ No, it is not a Key Decision - ☒		
Consultation:	• This report has been prepared in consultation with all relevant staff and Leadership Team.		
Alternative option(s):	• The option of doing nothing may result in poor performance, monitoring performance can highlight where remedial action may be needed		
Implications:			
*Are there any **financial** implications? If yes, please give details*	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.		
*Are there any **staffing** implications? If yes, please give details*	Yes ☐ No ☒ •		
*Are there any **ICT** implications? If yes, please give details*	Yes ☐ No ☒ •		
*Are there any **legal and/or policy** implications? If yes, please give details*	Yes ☐ No ☒ • 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 **equality** implications? If yes, please give details*	Yes ☐ No ☒ •		
Risk/opportunity assessment:	*(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)*		
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:		None	
Documents attached:		Appendix A – Forest Heath, St Edmundsbury and West Suffolk Key Performance Indicators 2014-15 – Quarter 4 Results	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation

1.1 Key Issues

1.1.1 The report at **Appendix A** presents performance against Quarter 4 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.

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

Quarter 4 2014-15	PI on or exceeded target	PI below target within tolerance	PI significantly below target	Data only Indicators
Forest Heath KPIs	7	7	1	10
St Edmundsbury KPIs	10	3	2	10
West Suffolk KPIs	8	4	2	7

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 has remained steady from quarter 3. Performance on major and other applications has improved since quarter three.

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 enforcement complaints over the last quarter. The new enforcement team is now in place with a Principal Enforcement Officer taking up their post in early February 2015. 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.