

MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

Quarterly report for 2015-2016

No headings

For Environment - Cllr Neal Davey 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 |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|

MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| Well below target | <u>Reduce the carbon footprint of our offices and public buildings by 2% pre adjustment</u> | +28.2 | +2.0 | +2.0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | -0.5 |
| <p>Management Notes: (2015 - 2016)</p> <p>Increases in the leisure properties do not necessarily mean this is a negative indication of poor energy management ie more people coming through the door using more electricity/gas. Also, this can be further explained in the annual EEVS (independent energy report). Electricity isnt degree day corrected.</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>Reduce the carbon footprint of our offices and public buildings by 0.5% post adjustment</u> | 21.7% | 0.5% | 0.5% | n/a | n/a | n/a | 3.4% |
| <p>Management Notes: (2015 - 2016)</p> <p>Last years reduction was following the installation of the energy saving project and high investment therefore, 2015/16 is showing at a much lower % reduction.</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| No Target | <u>Number of Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) Issued (Environment)</u> | 16 | No target - for information only. | No target - for information only. | 2 | 8 | 16 | 21 |
| <p>Management Notes:</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>Residual household waste per head (measured in Kilograms)</u> | 462.6 | 455.00 | 455.00 | 117.44 | 225.63 | 329.42 | 426.82 |
| <p>Management Notes: (Quarter 1 - 4)</p> <p>The large diversion of waste (nearly 10%) from residual collections to recycling and a reduction in overall total tonnage of waste collected is very encouraging and will relate to the new recycling scheme introduced. Figures yet to be verified by DCC</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | <u>% of Household Waste Reuse, Recycled and Composted</u> | 48.2% | 52.0% | 52.0% | 50.2% | 52.2% | 50.9% | 50.6% |
| <p>Management Notes: (Quarter 4)</p> <p>The recycling rate has increased in all quarters compared to the same quarters in the previous year. The recycling rate in the second half of the year rose by between 4% and 5% following the launch of the new scheme. Figures yet to be verified by DCC</p> <p>(SK)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Well | <u>Number of Households</u> | n/a | 15% | 15% | 0% | 0% | 18% | 20% |

MTE PDG Performance Report - Appendix 1

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| above target | <u>on Chargeable Garden Waste</u> | | | | | | | |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) There were 7,021 customers at the end of the financial year which is above the target set. Numbers continue to grow in April and move toward the final target of 10,000. (SK) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>% of missed collections reported per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u> | 0.10% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.02% | 0.02% | 0.02% | 0.02% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | <u>% of Missed Collections logged per Quarter (recycling)</u> | 0.13% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.05% | 0.08% | 0.13% | 0.12% |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Missed collections were up in the year due to two round reschedules for both phases of the roll out of the new scheme. The second phase of roll out in Q3 involved changing collections cycles and rounds to match refuse rounds. Perm staff were used for deliveries and agency staff used on rounds leading to reduced route knowledge. Missed collections began to reduce again in Q4 and were down to 66 (0.04%) in March as rounds became established and route knowledge grew. (SK) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>Number of Missed Collections reported per Quarter (refuse and organic waste)</u> | 1,797 | 540 | 540 | 99 | 203 | 354 | 472 |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | <u>Number of Missed Collections reported per Quarter (Recycling)</u> | 1,162 | 270 | 270 | 126 | 380 | 895 | 1,294 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Missed collections were up in the year due to two round reschedules for both phases of the roll out of the new scheme. The second phase of roll out in Q3 involved changing collections cycles and rounds to match refuse rounds. Perm staff were used for deliveries and agency staff used on rounds leading to reduced route knowledge. Missed collections began to reduce again in Q4 and were down to 66 (0.04%) in March as rounds became established and route knowledge grew. (SK) | | | | | | | | |

DAH PDG Performance Report - Appendix 2

Quarterly report for 2015-2016

No headings

For Decent and Affordable Homes - Cllr Ray Stanley 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 |
|-------------------------|---------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|

DAH PDG Performance Report - Appendix 2

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| Well below target | Deliver 15 homes per year by bringing Empty Houses into use | 12 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) | | | | | | | | |
| 2 year fixed term arrangement with Exeter CC for provision of an Empty Homes Officer working 2 days per week for MDDC. | | | | | | | | |
| (HS) | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | Number of affordable homes delivered (gross) | 58 | 80 | 80 | 0 | 14 | 19 | 27 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 1 - 4) | | | | | | | | |
| The original target of 80 new homes for the year has not been met as there has been some delays on various sites so these completions will roll over into the new financial year. | | | | | | | | |
| (AH) | | | | | | | | |
| On target | % Emergency Repairs Completed on Time | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | % Urgent Repairs Completed on Time | 99.94% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 99.8% |
| Management Notes: (March) | | | | | | | | |
| Throughout the year we completed 1270 jobs and 1268 of these were completed on time. Just two jobs were failed to be completed on time. | | | | | | | | |
| (AH) | | | | | | | | |
| On target | % Routine Repairs Completed on Time | 99.98% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 99.9% | 100.0% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | % Repairs Completed at First Visit | 99.87% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.28% | 98.30% | 97.75% | 97.63% |
| Management Notes: (March) | | | | | | | | |
| Throughout the year we completed 6,546 jobs and out of these 6,391 were completed during the first visit. Therefore, there were 155 jobs which were not completed on our first visit to the property. The reason for the majority of these is that we have had to leave site to order specific material such as glass, doors, heating parts etc. | | | | | | | | |
| (AH) | | | | | | | | |

DAH PDG Performance Report - Appendix 2

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| Above target | <u>Ratio of expenditure between planned and responsive repairs</u> | 81.19 | 70.30 | 70.30 | 29.71 | 55.45 | 69.31 | 73.27 |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | <u>Rent Collected as a Proportion of Rent Owed</u> | 100.09% | 100.75% | 100.75% | 97.16% | 99.04% | 99.36% | 99.74% |
| Management Notes: (March) | | | | | | | | |
| Although outside target, performance here was good. As Universal Credit is being rolled out in Mid Devon rent arrears may go up. Performance is closely monitored so we can review procedures if collection levels begin to fall. | | | | | | | | |
| (AH) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>Rent Arrears as a Proportion of Annual Rent Debit</u> | 0.60% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 0.94% | 1.05% | 0.81% | 0.66% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| On target | <u>% Decent Council Homes</u> | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.38% | 99.28% | 99.45% | 100.00% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | <u>% Properties With a Valid Gas Safety Certificate</u> | 99.86% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.72% | 99.72% | 99.91% | 99.86% |
| Management Notes: (March) | | | | | | | | |
| At the end of the financial year we had three properties without a valid gas certificate. Legal services are dealing with two of the instances, trying to gain access to the properties, and the remaining instance is due to an absent tenant. | | | | | | | | |
| (AH) | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>Average Days to Re-Let Local Authority Housing</u> | 14.9days | 17.0days | 17.0days | 15.2days | 15.5days | 16.1days | 16.3days |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| No Target | <u>Dwelling rent lost due to voids</u> | n/a | no target - for information only | no target - for information only | 0.73% | 0.64% | 0.68% | 0.75% |
| Management Notes: | | | | | | | | |

CWB PDG Performance Report - Appendix 3

Quarterly report for 2015-2016

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 3

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> | 12 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Empty shop count January 2016 = 16 empty shops out of 249 (ZL) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>The number of Empty Shops. (CREDITON)</u> | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Empty shop count in January 2016 = 7 empty shops out of 118 (ZL) | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>The number of Empty Shops (CULLOMPTON)</u> | 11 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 8 |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) Empty shop count in January 2016 = 8 empty shops out of 94 (ZL) | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | <u>Percentage of food premises inspections that should have been carried out that were carried out for A & B (High Risk) premises</u> | 46% | 100% | 100% | n/a | n/a | n/a | 75% |
| Management Notes: (2015 - 2016) There has been reduced resource in food, an Environmental Health Officer has now been recruited. This has helped to reduce the backlog of inspections which has improved the figure achieved this year. (SK) | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | <u>The percentage of Leisure's operational expenditure recovered through customer receipts</u> | 88.16% | 88.50% | 88.50% | 79.19% | 83.76% | 84.36% | 85.15% |
| Management Notes: (Quarter 4) There were a number of reasons why the operational recovery rate was slightly under target for the quarter, but the main areas of underperformance | | | | | | | | |

Printed by: Suzanne Kingdom

SPAR.net

Print Date: 12 May 2016 16:00

CWB PDG Performance Report - Appendix 3

Performance Indicators

| Status | Definition | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

were Health & Fitness and Westside. However, Front of House exceeded its target due to cash sales of advanced zest membership.

Going forward, the service will be monitored by business area which will give a clearer indication of performance.

(NC)

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Below target | <u>% of Leisure members retained from month beginning to month end.</u> | 95.33% | 96.50% | 96.50% | 96.87% | 95.46% | 95.65% | 96.13% |
|--------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

Management Notes:

(Quarter 4)

The performance for the final quarter for retention has recovered significantly since a dip in mid 2015/16.

We will be changing the way we record this to 'attrition rate' for 2016/17 in line with UK Active Benchmarking.

The national average for attrition across the sector is 5% (source UK Active data 2014/15) and as we have been performing at above 95% **retention** for all of 2015/16, our attrition rate is performing well against the national average, as it was less than 5%.

(NC)

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Above target | <u>Issue of TENS within 3 working days</u> | n/a | 97% | 97% | 94% | 97% | 98% | 99% |
|--------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

Management Notes:

Printed by: Suzanne Kingdom

SPAR.net

Print Date: 12 May 2016 16:00

AGENDA ITEM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 11TH MAY 2016

REPORT OF JENNY CLIFFORD, THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND REGENERATION

PLANNING PERFORMANCE 2015/16

RECOMMENDATION:

For information and discussion.

REASON FOR REPORT:

To provide the Committee with information on the performance of Planning Services for the quarter 4 and the full 2015-16 financial year

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION:

Performance against targets, Government proposals to implement further changes to the planning system and resources within the Planning Service.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATE PLAN:

The Planning Service is central to achieving priorities in the Corporate Plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: Planning performance has the potential for significant financial implications in the event that applications are not determined within 26 weeks or an extension of time negotiated. In that instance the planning fee is returned. Through the issue of planning permissions for new dwellings the Service enables the award of New Homes Bonus money to the Council.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS: The Government monitors planning performance in terms of speed and quality of decision making. In the event minimum standards are not met, an authority may be designated as underperforming with special measures applied that allow applicants for major development to apply for permission direct from the Planning Inspectorate and bypassing local decision making. The speed measure is the number of major applications determined within 13 weeks as measured over a 2 year period. The new target of more than 50% has been met. The quality measure is the percentage of major applications determined over a two year period that have been overturned at appeal. The less than 20% target has been met (10%). However the Government proposes to tighten performance requirements.

RISK ASSESSMENT: Financial risk as a result of fee return and the designation of planning authorities in special measures for underperformance is referred to above. These aspects are actively monitored, to allow priorities to be adjusted as required to reduce the risk. However this risk is increasing with the Government having identified through the Autumn Statement and subsequent technical consultation on planning changes the intention to tighten existing measures and introduce new ones.

1.0 PLANNING PERFORMANCE

Set out below are the Planning Service performance figures for quarter 4 from 1st January – 31st March 2016 together with the performance figures for the whole of the 15/16 financial year.

Performance data is published quarterly on the Council's website at <https://new.middevon.gov.uk/planning/performance-standards/>

Performance by year and quarter is set out below and expressed as a percentage unless marked otherwise and reports against a mix of Government and local performance targets.

| Planning Service Performance | Target | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | | | | 2015/16 |
|--|---------------------------|---------|---------|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | |
| Major applications determined within 13 weeks | 60% | 64 | *57 | *50 | *75 | *33 | 47% |
| Minor applications determined within 8 weeks | 65% | 67 | 68 | 73 | 74 | 64 | 68% |
| Other applications determined within 8 weeks | 80% | 78 | 91 | 85 | 75 | 89 | 86% |
| Householder applications determined in 8 weeks | 85% | 90 | 92 | 97 | 95 | 88 | 93% |
| Listed Building Consents | 80% | 70 | 70 | 67 | 85 | 70 | 71% |
| Enforcement site visits undertaken within 15 days of complaint receipt | 87% | 94 | 100 | 94 | 89 | 91 | 89% |
| Delegated decisions | 90% | 95 | 94 | 93 | 94 | 94 | 94% |
| No of applications over 13 weeks old without a decision | Less than 45 applications | 36 | 25 | 26 | 36 | 40 | 40 |
| Major applications determined within 13 weeks (over last 2 years) | More than 50% | 50 | 51 | 58 | 56 | 53 | 53% |
| Major applications overturned at appeal as % of all major decisions in last 2 years | Less than 20% | 14% | | | | | 10% |
| Determine all applications within 26 weeks or with an extension of time (per annum –Government planning guarantee) | 100% | 95 | 97 | 96 | 94 | 99 | 99% |
| Building Regulations Applications examined within 3 weeks | 95% | 74 | 70 | 70 | 76 | 67 | 72% |
| Building Regulation Full Plan applications determined in 2 months | 95% | 98 | 99 | 98 | 97 | 87 | 97% |

*Important note on major application statistic reporting: The 53% statistic for major applications determined within 13 weeks reported above includes all major applications and does not take into account any extensions of time agreed with the applicant or planning performance agreements (PPAs) that have been entered into. Government instructions to Councils over this performance target remove reporting applications with extensions of time or PPAs from this target as they are reported separately. Once these have been removed 87% of major applications were determined within 13 weeks compared with the target 60%. This performance target has therefore been met.

Application processing- Development Management.

The Government sets a range of additional performance targets for planning authorities in order to drive performance. Those for major planning application decision making are

currently used by the Government as indicators of performance in terms of both speed and quality of decision making as follows:

Speed: More than 50% of major applications determined within 13 weeks. MDDC 15/16 85% excluding those with extensions of time (see note * above).

Quality: Of major applications determined over a 2 year period, no more than 20% of decisions to be overturned at appeal. MDDC currently 10%.

Authorities not meeting these targets risk being designated as underperforming, resulting in the application of special measures. Some of these are set out in more detail in the accompanying report on appeal performance for 45/16.

The Autumn Statement and 'Technical consultation on implementation of planning changes' issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government in February 2016 indicate that it is the intention of the Government to tighten these performance measures and add to them. Through the Housing and Planning Bill this performance approach is to be extended for applications for non-major development. The Government is consulting on tightening the quality of decision making target to no more than 10% of major applications determined over a 2 year period to be overturned at appeal.

New non-major application performance targets currently being consulted upon are more than 60-70% of such applications to be determined within the required time including any agreed extension of time. Furthermore that as a quality of decision indicator there be no more than 10 – 20% of decisions on non-major applications overturned at appeal.

During 15/16 the Planning Service determined 1008 planning applications including 26 majors, 127 prior notifications, 85 certificates of lawful use and 49 notifications. Work in addition to this included pre-application advice requests as well as general advice and queries.

Planning enforcement.

Activity within the enforcement part of the Planning Service by quarter is as follows:

| Enforcement 2015/16 | Qu 1 | Qu 2 | Qu 3 | Qu 4 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| New enforcement cases registered | 14 | 71 | 54 | To follow |
| Enforcement cases closed | 47 | 53 | 39 | To follow |
| Committee authorisations sought | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Planning contravention notices served | Data available from Qu 2 | 9 | 5 | 10 |
| Breach of condition notices served | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Enforcement notices served | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

Statistics for the number of enforcement cases closed are an indication of there either not being a breach of control, or that the breach was resolved without formal action. Resolution of breaches may take significant work that is by its nature not clearly reflected in statistics. A report will shortly come before Scrutiny Committee with the results of benchmarking performance in enforcement against other authorities in the area. This benchmarking is currently underway. In addition, the establishment of more meaningful and measurable performance indicators for the planning enforcement is being progressed.

Staffing in enforcement was below the 2.5 FTE posts towards the beginning of the 2015/16 financial year. One Enforcement Officer post will be vacant at the time of the consideration of this report. Recruitment is underway and a temporary resource is proposed to assist the team during this period.

Building Control.

Building Control performance in plan checking has not met the local performance target over the last financial year. The Building Control team has seen significant changes over 2015/16 with the legacy following the redundancy of the previous Building Control Manager at the end of 2014. This previous Manger acted as an Inspector over part of the District and managed a caseload of applications. With the reduction in the size of the team the time taken for certain activities has increased. Staff levels have been low for part of this period following the departure of 2 Building Control Officers. The service has been restructured to replace them with Building Surveyors and appointments have been made to these posts. The new post holders are due to start work within approximately one month. Arrangements have been put in place to manage and cover plan checking during this period of reduced staffing. A review of the Building Control service including workloads and level of staffing has also been undertaken within 15/16 and there is now a Building Control Manager in place on a shared basis with North Devon Council. Authority has been given by Cabinet to develop a framework for future delivery of the service in partnership with North Devon Council.

Planning policy – Forward Planning.

Planning policy production targets reported in 2015 are as follows together with the updated position:

| Document | 2015 position | Current position |
|---|---|--|
| Local Plan Review | Pre-submission consultation in progress until 27th April 2015 | In progress (see below for more detail) |
| CIL Draft charging schedule | Pre-submission consultation in progress until 27th April 2015 | Draft charging schedule prepared. Consultation responses assessed. Awaits Local Plan Review due to proposed joint examination. |
| Annual Monitoring Report | 2014 AMR presented to Cabinet February 2015 | 2015 AMR agreed under delegated powers |
| Cullompton Article 4 Review | Consultation completed December 2014, target to Cabinet 4th June 2015 | Completed |
| Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans: Thorverton Morchard Bishop Newton St Cyres Cheriton Fitzpaine Silverton | In preparation Consultation completed mid March | Completed |
| Solar & Wind Landscape Sensitivity SPD | In preparation | Solar landscape sensitively to Cabinet June 2015 |
| Self Build guidance / SPD | In preparation | Self build register requirements met |
| Open Space SPD | In preparation | No longer required. |

The latest version of the Local Development Scheme (October 2015) indicates Local Plan Review timescale as follows:

- Sustainability appraisal scoping: May 2013 (completed)
- Preparation stage consultation : January 2014 (completed)
- Publication stage consultation: February - April 2015 (completed)
- Submission: June 2016
- Hearings: September 2016

- Adoption: January 2017
- Revision: 2020

Since the Local Development Scheme was prepared, further technical work in respect of flood modelling and highway infrastructure design at junction 28 of the M5 at Cullompton has been commissioned and is currently taking place. The outcomes of this technical work are expected in June / July. The latest estimate for Local Plan submission to the Inspectorate assuming no major modifications is August 2016.

At the meeting of Council on 27th April 2016 it was agreed that the outcomes of the Local Plan pre-submission consultation and subsequent technical work be considered by Council and Cabinet. It is likely that this will be via special meetings in August 2016. Plan submission now also expected August 2016 (assuming no major modification is made).

The Government has set out the expectation that Councils should have a local plan in place and that they should be kept up to date. It proposes to publish league tables setting out local plan progress and intervening where no local plan has been produced by early 2017. A new delivery test is also to be introduced to ensure delivery against the number of homes set out in local plans. The Government has indicated that priority for intervention will be Councils without a local plan in place and those that have not kept policies in local plans up to date.

The priority for the Forward Planning Team is currently the Local Plan Review and associated tasks. An interim Team Leader was secured in 2015 to supplement staffing and will cover a further period of maternity leave in 2016. Further resources have been secured via consultancy in order to ensure sufficient staff resources are in place to complete the Local Plan Review process through examination and to adoption.

Other current planning policy related work streams are as follows:

- Review of the Statement of Community Involvement
- Waste storage SPD
- Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems SPD
- Brownfield land register
- Strategic planning work
- Tiverton town centre masterplan
- Area B Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension masterplan
- Neighbourhood planning screening and support as resources allow

Over 15/16 the Planning Service has also produced a Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension design guide following the adoption of the Area A masterplan and adopted a masterplan SPD for the Cullompton NW Urban Extension.

Performance for 2015/16 shows that in the majority of instances targets are being met or exceeded. However there remain areas of concern, particularly given the ever tightening performance environment.

Planning Service staffing continues to still not be at full strength due to the maternity leave of several senior staff. This continues to have knock-on effects in terms of associated arrangements for cover and redeployment of staff into different roles and is expected to continue to do so into the first half of this financial year. Not all posts have been backfilled, but are being kept under review. The performance of the service in meeting the majority of targets over 15/16 represents a significant achievement, particularly in light of the challenges over this financial year referred to above.

Planning Service workload is expected to rise in 2016 due to the Local Plan Review and other emerging policy work, largescale major applications expected in Tiverton and Cullompton associated with urban extensions, the programmed submission of a planning

application for development at J27 and the implementation of further changes to the planning system.

Planning performance continues to be closely monitored. The performance of the planning service against targets is increasingly important, requires resourcing and presents an ongoing risk to the authority both financially and reputationally. Every effort continues to be made to maintain our charter standards of customer service and our performance levels within the eight and thirteen week government target periods.

Contact for Information: Jenny Clifford, Head of Planning and Regeneration
01884 234346

List of Background Papers: PS1 and PS2 returns
DCLG Improving planning performance – Criteria for designation. June 2014
DCLG Planning performance and the planning guarantee –Government response to consultation. June 2013
HM Treasury 'Fixing the foundations – creating a more prosperous nation' July 2015
Department of Communities and Local Government – Technical consultation on implementation of planning changes. February 2016

Circulation of the Report: Cllr Richard Chesterton
Members of Planning Committee

Working Environment Portfolio Performance - Appendix 5

Quarterly report for 2015-2016

No headings

For Working Environment and Support Services - Cllr Margaret Squires Portfolio

For MDDC - Services

Filtered by Performance Status: Exclude PI Status: Data not due, Data not entered

Key to Performance Status:

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

Working Environment Portfolio Performance - Appendix 5

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| No Target | <u>Number of phone calls to CF per month</u> | 12,670 | For Information Only | For Information Only | 11,192 | 11,420 | 12,483 | 12,492 |
| <u>Management Notes:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>Satisfaction with front-line services</u> | 81.75% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 81.50% | 81.33% | 80.75% |
| <u>Management Notes:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | <u>% complaints acknowledged w/in 3 days</u> | 46% | 80% | 80% | 45% | 57% | 76% | 66% |
| <u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 4) 100% of complaints were acknowledged, but the system only shows 45% as acknowledged with in 3 days. This is not accurate, checking against manual files indicates that more were acknowledged in time. Full analysis will be completed for the annual report to Members on complaints. (LR) | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>% of complaints resolved w/in timescales (10 days - 12 weeks)</u> | 97% | 90% | 90% | 93% | 100% | 98% | 93% |
| <u>Management Notes:</u> (Quarter 4) 7 complaints remain at investigation stage, but are still within the policy SLA. These complaints will be resolved in 2016-17. The % resolved within time over all is 96% . (LR) | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>% Emails received by Customer Services responded to within 5 days</u> | 98.0% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 99.00% | 98.50% | 98.67% | 99.00% |
| <u>Management Notes:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Not calculable | <u>Number of Complaints</u> | 74 | For information only | For information only | 61 | 39 | 87 | 95 |
| <u>Management Notes:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Not calculable | <u>Number of Digital payments</u> | 8,989 | For information only | For information only | 7,083 | 10,892 | 14,705 | 10,407 |

Working Environment Portfolio Performance - Appendix 5

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| <p>Management Notes: (Quarter 4)</p> <p>figures for 2015-16 include payments made at the post office, these will not be included in future years as digital as these are assisted cash- cheque payments.</p> <p>(LR)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| No Target | Number of web hits per month | n/a | For information only | For information only | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <p>Management Notes: (Quarter 4)</p> <p>data not available while the website is both Umbraco and Goss. Final Goss pages to be closed at the end of march.</p> <p>Communications Officer to receive training on Google analytics to ensure information can be gathered and reported from Umbraco for 2016/17</p> <p>(NC)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| On target | % electoral registration forms returned during annual canvass of electors | 0% | 90% | 90% | 0% | 0% | 98% | 0% |
| <p>Management Notes:</p> | | | | | | | | |
| On target | % Electoral Commission Registration Performance Standards | 0% | 90% | 90% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| <p>Management Notes:</p> | | | | | | | | |
| On target | % Electoral Commission Returning Officer Performance Standards | 100% | 90% | 90% | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| <p>Management Notes: (2015 - 2016)</p> <p>no elections until May and June 2016</p> <p>(JS)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Well below target | Response to FOI Requests (within 20 working days) | 95% | 100% | 100% | 70% | 90% | 88% | 87% |
| <p>Management Notes: (Quarter 4)</p> <p>145 requests responded to, 19 of which were over 20 days</p> <p>(LC)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Below target | Working Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence | 9.21days | 8.00days | 8.00days | 1.64days | 3.68days | 5.71days | 8.12days |
| <p>Management Notes: (Quarter 4)</p> <p>The total number of days lost to sickness absence is 3329 which is split into 2041 days for long Term Sickness (15 + days) and 1288 for short term sickness (less than 15 days).</p> <p>(JC)</p> | | | | | | | | |

Finance Portfolio Performance - Appendix 6

Quarterly report for 2015-2016
No headings
For Finance - Cllr Peter Hare-Scott Portfolio
For MDDC - Services

Key to Performance Status:

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

Finance Portfolio Performance - Appendix 6

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Status | Title | Prev Year End | Annual Target | Current Target | Q1 Act | Q2 Act | Q3 Act | Q4 Act |
| Below target | <u>% total Council tax collected - monthly</u> | 97.80% | 98.5% | 98.5% | 29.4% | 56.7% | 83.4% | 98.1% |
| <p>Management Notes: (March)</p> <p>Prior to this year the monthly targets were always achieved until the last month which in my opinion made them pointless. In order to make them more meaningful I asked Audit to change the Targets to reflect the best monthly figures we have achieved in the past. Therefore the figures give the Office something to aim for each month instead of waiting till the end of the year.</p> <p>(JC)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>% total NNDR collected - monthly</u> | 99.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 31.10% | 55.80% | 80.59% | 99.10% |
| <p>Management Notes: (March)</p> <p>Both Ctax and NNDR monthly collection rates have changed in their make up because we have now added 12 monthly instalments. The effect of this is that the April - January monthly instalment figures are slightly down on previous years where as the February and March instalments bring the collection back up.</p> <p>(JC)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Above target | <u>Percentage of Invoices Paid on Time</u> | 99.26% | 97.50% | 97.50% | n/a | 99.57% | n/a | 99.73% |
| <p>Management Notes: (October - March)</p> <p>The Creditors team continue to perform very well, continually looking to improve processes; including being very proactive in encouraging departments to GRN invoices promptly on receipt of goods.</p> <p>(RF)</p> | | | | | | | | |
| Well above target | <u>Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events</u> | 8days | 14days | 14days | 14days | 13days | 12days | 10days |
| <p>Management Notes:</p> | | | | | | | | |

Risk Report Appendix 7

Report for 2015-2016
 Filtered by Flag: Include: * CRR 5+ / 15+
 For MDDC - Services

Not Including Risk Child Projects records or Mitigating Action records

Key to Performance Status:

Risks: No Data (0+) High (15+) Medium (5+) Low (1+)

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: Asbestos Health risks associated with Asbestos products such as lagging, ceiling/wall tiles, fire control.

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Housing Services

Current Status:
Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Nick Sanderson

Review Note: Recommendations from the HSE after the events last year have now been implemented.

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: Breaches in HR Legislation Failure to keep Council policies up to date, that complement the appropriate legislation

Failure to develop staff knowledge and competence regarding legislation/changes

Effects (Impact/Severity): - The Council could face poor reports from assurance bodies
 - Failure to meet statutory duties could result in paying penalties, stretching already thin financial resources
 - Failure to comply with legislation could lead to legal challenge against individuals or the Council as a whole
 - Future legislation changes, their impact on services and the cost of implementing changes to policies, procedures and service delivery

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Human Resources

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Current Status: No Data | Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High | Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low |
|--------------------------------|---|--|

Head of Service: Jill May

Review Note: The council employs four Chartered Ins of Personnel and Development (CIPD) staff who undertake regular employment law updates. All policies are reviewed on an three year programme which has slipped lately due to pressure of work (reorganisations, consultations and redundancies) however we always prioritise legislative change. Therefore whilst this is a huge risk it is a risk which is managed.

Risk: Chemicals Staff using chemicals incorrectly.

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Leisure Services

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Current Status: Medium (5) | Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High | Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|

Head of Service: Jill May

Review Note:

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: Council Finances - Banking Arrangements Problems with banks and online services may affect ability to access funds when we need to or receive / process payments on a timely basis

Effects (Impact/Severity): Unable to promptly pay suppliers or treasury commitments

Causes (Likelihood): ICT systems down at Council or Bank so impossible to review cash position or make urgent payments

Service: Financial Services

Current Status:
Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Andrew Cawdron, Andrew Jarrett

Review Note:

Risk: Council Finances - Investments Failure to invest in the Council's funds in an efficient and effective manner may cause potential of a loss of monies invested

Effects (Impact/Severity): • Could result in cash flow loss of up to £3M

Causes (Likelihood): • Future banking collapses

Service: Financial Services

Current Status:
Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Andrew Cawdron, Andrew Jarrett

Review Note: Cabinet have recently agreed to invest in CCLA

Risk: Council Finances - Treasury Management Failure to comply with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management /local authority accounting would be a breach in statutory duty

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Financial Services

Current Status:
Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Andrew Cawdron, Andrew Jarrett

Review Note: Strategy is approved by Cabinet annually.
2015 Audit found no issue with this

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: Document Retention If documents fail to be retained for the statutory period then we may face financial penalties

Effects (Impact/Severity):

- The Council may be disadvantaged in taking or defending legal action if prime documents are not retained;
- Performance statistics cannot be verified;
- The external auditor may not be able to verify the Council's final accounts and subsidy may be lost.
- Mismanagement of burial records

Causes (Likelihood): • "Data debris" cluttering system and storage space

Service: Management Team

Current Status:
Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Liz Reeves

Review Note:

Risk: Failure to comply with card security standards As an organisation we need to comply with the requirements of TrustWave to be authorised as card payment processors.

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Management Team

Current Status:
Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Liz Reeves

Review Note: Annual review of policy and training for all staff. ICT advise on all payment systems to ensure comply to PCI standard.

Risk: Fire and Explosion Risks associated with storage of combustible materials, fuels and flammable substances and sources of ignition, as well as emergency procedures (existence, display and knowledge of), accessibility (or obstruction) of emergency exits and walkways to. Also, risks associated with use of fire extinguishers, having correct type in location, in date and trained operatives on site.

Effects (Impact/Severity): Very High (5) – Although the risk is low, a fire in the server or storage room could potentially cause loss of life, have serious financial implications and severely impact the councils ability to provide services due to loss of IT infrastructure.

Causes (Likelihood): Very Low (1) – The likelihood of a fire within ICT is extremely low. No quantities of combustible materials are stored within the work area. There is easy access to the emergency exit and all staff have received fire awareness training.

Service: I C T

Current Status: No
Data

Current Risk Severity: 5 -
Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 -
Very Low

Head of Service: Liz Reeves

Review Note: we had an incident 7 pm Tuesday evening and our heat sensors and recovery team worked all as it should and problem averted

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: H&S RA - Refuse Driver/Loader Risk Assessment for Role - Highest risk from role RA. - Risk of RTA from sever weather conditions

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Street Scene Services

**Current Status:
Medium (10)**

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 2 - Low

Head of Service: Stuart Noyce

Review Note: Annual Review of Risk Assesment

Risk: Information Security Inadequate Information Security could lead to breaches of confidential information, damaged or corrupted data and ultimately Denial of Service. If the council fails to have an effective information strategy in place.

Risk of monetary penalties and fines, and legal action by affected parties

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: I C T

**Current Status:
Medium (5)**

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low

Head of Service: Liz Reeves

Review Note:

Risk: Legionella Legionella

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Leisure Services

**Current Status:
Medium (5)**

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low

Head of Service: Jill May

Review Note:

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: Plant Rooms plant rooms

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Leisure Services

Current Status: Medium (5)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low

Head of Service: Jill May

Review Note:

Risk: St Andrew Street A staircase in the new development does not meet current building regulations due to conservation requirements.

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Property Services

Current Status: High (15)

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Head of Service: Nick Sanderson

Review Note: The staircase has to remain in position, no further issues reported from the housing team. We will continue to monitor and will take action where possible and permitted.

Risk: Vehicles, Transport, Driving Risk of collisions with other moving or stationary vehicles, cycles and/or pedestrians.

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood):

Service: Street Scene Services

Current Status: No Data

Current Risk Severity: 5 - Very High

Current Risk Likelihood: 1 - Very Low

Head of Service: Stuart Noyce

Review Note:

Risk Report Appendix 7

Risk: Waste Collection - Health and Safety Inadequate training with regards to Manual Handling and workplace hazards (eg contact with broken glass) could result in Health and Safety risks

Effects (Impact/Severity):

Causes (Likelihood): - Increasing demand and service costs due to increasing population, consumer society and an increasing amount of waste

Service: Street Scene Services

Current Status:
Medium (9)

Current Risk Severity: 3 - Medium

Current Risk Likelihood: 3 - Medium

Head of Service: Andrew Jarrett, Stuart Noyce

Review Note: All staff received manual handling training in Dec 2015 with M Lowe

Printed by: Catherine
Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: 04 May 2016 18:10