
| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| REPORT TO: | ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE | AGENDA ITEM: 9(b) |
| DATE OF MEETING: | 24th AUGUST, 2006 | |
| REPORT FROM: | DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE | |
| MEMBERS' CONTACT POINT: | IAN REID (5790) | DOC: s:\cent_serv\committee reports\environmental & development\24 august 06\eds pm report overall perf (b).doc |
| SUBJECT: | 'ACHIEVING MORE' - PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES CTTEE | REF: IR/SAC |
| WARD(S) AFFECTED: | ALL | TERMS OF REFERENCE: |

1.0 Recommendations

That the Committee

- 1.1 Notes the continuously improving performance within its' area of responsibility.
- 1.2 Reviews where performance is not on track and agree the proposed remedial measures in those cases.
- 1.3 Agrees the proposed targets for BVPI 217a & 217b in relation to Contaminated Land.
- 1.4 Reports all agreed actions back to the Improvement Panel.

2.0 Purpose of Report

- 2.1 To report current performance levels in relation to this Committee's contribution to the Council's Corporate and Improvement Plans, the Community Strategy Action Plan as well as the Best Value Performance Indicators for which it is responsible. This performance has previously been considered by the Improvement Panel and, where appropriate, their comments and requests are included in the report.

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 An earlier report on this agenda contains details of current performance, broken down by service area responsible for delivery. These tables contain reports of the current position or performance level and assess whether the target will be achieved.

3.2 This report summarises the position in relation to this committee’s responsibilities and provides an opportunity for Members to note performance levels but also review those areas that are not “on track” to achieve the agreed target by the end of the year.

3.3 The information is detailed below and divided into the following headings

- Corporate Plan
- Improvement Plan
- Community Strategy Action Plan
- Best Value Performance Indicators

Corporate Plan

3.4 This committee has responsibility for 12 actions, of a total of 53, within the Corporate Plan and the current projected performance is shown in the table below.

Table 1: Corporate Plan – Projected performance against targets

| Theme | On Track | At Risk | Probable Failure | Total |
|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-----------|
| Total for Committee | 10 (83%) | 2 (17%) | 0 (0%) | 12 |
| Total for Council | 49 (92%) | 4 (8%) | 0 (0%) | 53 |

Table 2: below, lists those actions that are not “on track”, and the committee area asked to review the position and assess whether they consider the proposed remedial measures to be satisfactory at this stage.

Table 2: Targets “at risk” of failure

| No. | Target | Service | Position at 30 June 2006 | Remedial Measures |
|-----|---|----------|--|--|
| 44 | Planning guidance on affordable housing published | Planning | Research undertaken New guidance from DCLG still awaited | Progress ASAP after guidance published by DCLG – possibly before end of March 2007 |
| 45 | Rural Transport Partnership – secure funding beyond Sept 2006 | Planning | Review by EMDA/DDEP current. Future funding depends on outcome of review | Monitor position and work with partners when review published |

Improvement Plan

3.5 The Council’s Improvement Plan has 19 actions that mainly focus on internal business improvement issues. These are almost all within the responsibility of the Finance and Management Committee. In the current year there are no targets within the Improvement Plan for which this committee has responsibility.

Community Strategy Action Plan

3.6 The Council has responsibility for 27 actions, from a total of 73, within the Community Strategy Action Plan. This committee has responsibility for 11 actions, which are spread across all of the 6 Strategy themes. The first action plan ran from July 2005 until July 2006, and therefore the reported position represents the “end of year” position on this plan. The Local Strategic Partnership has now agreed a new action plan, and progress on this will be reported at future meetings. The table below shows current projected performance for those 11 targets.

Table 3: Community Strategy Action Plan – Projected performance against targets

| Theme | Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved | Total |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------|
| Total for Committee | 10 (91%) | 1 (9%) | 0 (0%) | 11 |
| Total for Council | 21 (77%) | 5 (19%) | 1 (4%) | 27 |

The table below list those actions that are not achieved. The table includes an explanation of why the target was not delivered and how the LSP has agreed to address the situation.

Table 4: Target only “partially achieved”

| No. | Target | Service | Position at 30 June 2006 | Revised Proposal |
|-----|--|---------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 5 | All partners to implement at least one waste minimisation initiative | Env. Services | Achieved by some partners (DWT, DCC Countryside service) | Engage all partners in 2006/07 |

Best Value Performance Indicators

3.7 Of a total of 85 Best value Performance Indicators across the Council, this committee has responsibility for 37. Of the overall total, we have specified 31 “priority indicators” and established a more demanding set of targets over the period of the plan for these. 12 of these priority indicators are within the responsibility of this committee.

We expect the priority indicators to

- Be above the lower quartile level by 2007
- Achieve upper quartile performance by 2009
- Continuously improve each year

A summary of BVPI performance for this committee is displayed in the table below

Table 5: Best Value Performance Indicators – Projected performance against targets

| | On Track | At Risk | Probable Failure | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------|------------------|-------|
| All Indicators (this committee) | 35 (95%) | 2 (5%) | 0 (0%) | 37 |
| All Indicators (Council) | 69 (81%) | 11 (13%) | 5 (6%) | 85 |
| Priority Indicators (this committee) | 12 (100%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 12 |
| Priority Indicators (Council) | 24 (78%) | 5 (16%) | 2 (6%) | 31 |

No targets have been set for BVPI 216a & 216b because officers considered that the definition from the Audit Commission was not sufficiently well defined for us to set a reliable target. These indicators have therefore been defined as “probable failure” as we cannot achieve a target that has not been set. Whilst Environmental Services officers still have those concerns, they have now set targets for both the indicators for the period of the plan and these are tabled below and recommended to the committee.

| BVPI No. | Description | Service | Target 2006/07 | Target 2007/08 | Target 2008/09 |
|----------|--|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 216a | Number of sites “of potential concern” within the local authority area with respect to land contamination | Environmental Services | 1274 | 1274 | 1274 |
| 216b | Number of sites for which sufficient detailed information is available to decide whether remediation of the land is necessary, as a percentage of all “sites of potential concern” | Environmental Services | 4% | 7% | 10% |

Table 6: Summary BVPI position of indicators for review by committee

| BVPI No. | Description | Service | Target | Expected Outturn | Remedial Measures |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Priority Indicators – Probable failure (Red) | | | | | |
| | NONE | | | | |
| Priority Indicators – At risk of failure (Amber) – NONE | | | | | |
| | NONE | | | | |
| Non-priority indicators – Probable failure (Red) – NONE | | | | | |
| | NONE | | | | |
| Non-priority indicators – At risk of failure (Amber) | | | | | |
| 216a | Number of sites “of potential concern” within the local authority area with respect to land contamination | Environmental Services | No target set | No target set | Target now proposed |
| 216b | Number of sites for which sufficient detailed information is available to decide whether remediation of the land is necessary, as a percentage of all “sites of potential concern” | Environmental Services | No target set | No target set | Target now proposed |

4.0 Financial Implications

4.1 There are no specific financial implications relating to this report. The need to continually improve whilst delivering the ambitions of the new corporate plan will require a sustained efficiency programme including the shifting of resources to the priority areas.

5.0 Corporate Implications

5.1 The Council aspires to be an “excellent” Council in order to deliver the service expectations of our communities. This performance report evidences a further significant improvement in how we are meeting those demands and expectations.

6.0 Conclusions

6.1 This Committee’s performance levels are very good and compare favourably with the position across the Council. Delivery on Corporate Plan actions is the only area where Committee performance lags slightly behind the Council average, but the 2 actions in question are both “at risk” for reasons beyond the control of the Council.

6.2 The performance being delivered within the Committee’s services are of a high standard and are improving. The committee can take pride in this achievement, which is the product of the focus and hard work of both employees and Members.

6.3 In order to improve services further, the Committee should review the areas where performance might not achieve our agreed targets and satisfy themselves that the planned actions will achieve our plans for the services we deliver.