

**COMMUNITY WELL-BEING PDG
30 JUNE 2015:**

PERFORMANCE AND RISK OUTTURN REPORT FOR 2014-15

Cabinet Member Cllr Colin Slade
Responsible Officer Head of Communities & Governance

Reason for Report: To provide Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for 2014/15 as well as providing an update on any key business risks.

RECOMMENDATION: That the PDG reviews the Performance Indicators and any Risks that are outlined in this report and feeds back areas of concern to the Cabinet.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Corporate Plan priorities and targets are effectively maintained through the use of appropriate performance indicators and regular monitoring.

Financial Implications: None identified

Legal Implications: None

Risk Assessment: If performance is not monitored we may fail to meet our corporate and local service plan targets or to take appropriate corrective action where necessary. If key business risks are not identified and monitored they cannot be mitigated effectively.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 provides Members with details of performance against the Corporate Plan and local service targets for the 2014/15 financial year.
- 1.2 The appendix is produced from SPAR, the corporate Service Performance and Risk Management system.

2.0 Performance

- 2.1 The number of **empty shops** is on or above target as reported previously.
- 2.2 The **Leisure** performance is slightly below target but has improved over the course of the year.
- 2.3 **Food Premises** inspections were very low; an Environmental Health Officer (Food) is being recruited at present to address the lack of resource.

3.0 Risk

- 3.1 The Corporate risk register is reviewed by Management Team (MT) and updated quarterly. Risk reports to Audit Committee and Cabinet continue to include risks with a total score of 15 or more and all those with an impact score of 5.

3.2 The Scrutiny Performance Working Group felt that risks should only be referred to the PDGs or Scrutiny if there is a problem that requires escalation e.g. if risks are not being mitigated adequately, or if the risk is associated with new policies, or budget cuts, or reported to the PDG as part of a decision making process.

3.3 On this basis there are no risks to report to the PDG this quarter.

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 That the PDG reviews the performance indicators and any risks that are outlined in this report and feedback any areas of concern to the Cabinet.

Contact for more Information: Amy Tregellas, Head of Communities & Governance ext 4246

Circulation of the Report: Management Team and Cabinet Member

CWB PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Quarterly report for 2014-2015

No headings

For Community Well-Being - Cllr Colin Slade Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Not calculable

Key to Performance Status:

Performance Indicators:	No Data	Well below target	Below target	On target	Above target	Well above target
-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------	-----------	--------------	-------------------

CWB PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Performance Indicators								
Status	Definition	Prev Year End	Annual Target	Current Target	Q1 Act	Q2 Act	Q3 Act	Q4 Act
Well above target	<u>The number of Empty Shops. (TIVERTON)</u>	18	20	20	15	16	15	12
Management Notes: (Quarter 4)								
January 2015 no. empty units - 12 / 245 = 4.90% (September 2009 = 30 / 245)								
(ZL)								
On target	<u>The number of Empty Shops. (CREDITON)</u>	7	10	10	12	10	10	10
Management Notes: (Quarter 4)								
January 2015 no. empty shop units - 10 / 118 = 8.47% (September 2009 = 17 / 114)								
(ZL)								
Well above target	<u>The number of Empty Shops (CULLOMPTON)</u>	12	14	14	12	13	15	11
Management Notes: (Quarter 4)								
January 2015 no. empty shop units - 11 / 94 = 11.70% (September 2009 = 17 / 91)								
(ZL)								
Well below target	<u>Percentage of food premises inspections that should have been carried out that were carried out for high risk premises</u>	92%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	46%
Management Notes: (2014 - 2015)								
The reason for the decline is the reduction in staff resources, as highlighted by the Food Standards Agency audit in January 2015 and the ongoing illegal meat case that has taken significant resources away from the food inspection programme.								
(JP)								
Above target	<u>The percentage of Leisure's operational expenditure recovered through customer receipts</u>	88.18%	87.50%	87.50%	86.51%	86.08%	86.57%	88.16%
Management Notes: (Quarter 4)								

