

**PERFORMANCE AND RISK FOR THE FIRST TWO QUARTERS OF 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 reflects the changes suggested by the Scrutiny Working Group and is produced from SPAR, the corporate Service Performance and Risk Management system.

## **2.0 Performance**

- 2.1 In quarter 2 the number of empty shops has gone down for Crediton, which is now on target, however both Tiverton and Cullompton have 1 more empty shop this quarter compared to quarter 1.
- 2.2 The Leisure performance is slightly below target.

## **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	<b><u>Target is a maximum of 8.00% empty shop units out of total shop units (as per Planning Use Classes). (TIVERTON)</u></b>	18	20	20 (2/4)	15	16		
<b>Management Notes:</b> (Quarter 2)  July 2014 no. empty units = 16 / 244 (September 2009 = 30 / 245)  (ZL)								
On target	<b><u>Target is a maximum of 8.00% empty shop units out of total shop units (as per Planning Use Classes). (CREDITON)</u></b>	7	10	10 (2/4)	12	10		
<b>Management Notes:</b> (Quarter 2)  July 2014 no. empty shop units = 10 / 119 (September 2009 = 17 / 114)  (ZL)								
Above target	<b><u>Target is a maximum of 15.00% empty shop units out of total shop units (as per Planning Use Classes). (CULLOMPTON)</u></b>	12	14	14 (2/4)	12	13		
<b>Management Notes:</b> (Quarter 2)  July 2014 no. empty shop units = 13 / 94 (September 2009 = 17 / 91)  (ZL)								
Below target	<b><u>The percentage of Leisure's operational expenditure recovered through customer receipts</u></b>	88.18%	87.50%	87.50% (2/4)	86.51%	86.08%		
<b>Management Notes:</b> (Quarter 2)  Expenditure is over budget mainly due to increased pension costs and some equipment at Culm Valley however income at Culm Valley is over budget as well.  (SB)								
Below target	<b><u>% of Leisure members retained from month</u></b>	95.2%	95.50%	95.50% (2/4)	94.30%	94.90%		

**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
	<u>beginning to month end.</u>							

**Management Notes:**

(Quarter 2)

Although the retention rate is slightly below target the core membership base has grown from 3,173 to 3,675 over the last year which is pleasing.

(SB)

Printed by: Catherine Yandle

SPAR.net

Print Date: Monday, November 17, 2014  
14:14