

QUARTER 4 PERFORMANCE REPORT 2011/12 –January – March 2012

😊 on target 😐 up to 5% off target 😞 more than 5% off target ? data not available - data only / no target / not due

Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 2010/11	Q4 2010/11	2010/11	Q1 2011/12	Q2 2011/12	Q3 2011/12	Q4 2011/12	2011/12	Note	Quarterly target 2011/12
				Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value		Value
😊 LEnv 5	Average number of days to remove fly-tips	Environmental Services	Lower is better	1.39	1.31	0.64	1.03	1.15	0.65	0.63	0.50	0.6	0.6		1.5 days
😞 LEnv 3	Abandoned vehicles (% removed within 24 hours)	Environmental Services	Higher is better	75.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100%	68.75%	33.30%	100%	100%	0%	67%	Q4: Only one vehicle removed, not within 24 hour target. 2011/12 total:9 vehicles removed of which 6 were removed within 24 hours.	90.00%
😊 LEnv 7	Percentage of higher risk food premises inspections (category A&B) carried out with 28 days of being due	Environmental Services	Higher is better	92%	100%	100%	100%	98.9%	100%	100%	92%	100%	97%	10 programmed inspections for category A/B (High Risk)Food premises have been carried out in Q4 within the targeted timescale of 28 days.	100%

Comments from Community Performance Sub-Committee – 1 June 2012

LEnv 3 – Percentage of abandoned vehicles removed within 24 hours

The Sub-Committee noted that performance was off target this quarter but was advised that this related to one abandoned car that could not be removed because of where it was situated. It was noted that abandoned vehicles wasn't a particular problem in the borough because of the current cost of metal.

Members agreed that they wanted to continue to review this target next year in case the situation changed.

LEnv 7 – Percentage of higher risk food premises inspections (category A&B) carried out with 28 days of being due

The Sub-Committee asked about the food hygiene scheme and why some businesses did not put their rating up on their premises. Members were advised that unlike Wales, it was not compulsory for businesses to make this viewable although all the information was available online. It was also a national scheme so they could not influence this decision.

The Sub-Committee asked whether the service carried out inspections of people who visited properties with food and care homes. Members were advised that the Environmental Health Team did inspect residential and nursing homes for food hygiene standards. Environmental Health also inspected premises preparing 'meals on wheels' and ensured that the staff/volunteers were trained/supervised when delivering the meals. Each premises was given a rating after the inspection. The ratings could be viewed on the website. Following the meeting Members were also advised that Environmental Health did not inspect and had no enforcement remit for food prepared by domiciliary carers for people in their own homes. The Care Quality Commission were responsible for monitoring all domiciliary care services in England and made sure that they are meeting the required standards of care and welfare. Consequently, it was not something that would be appropriate for the Sub-Committee to review further.

Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 2010/11	Q4 2010/11	2010/11	Q1 2011/12	Q2 2011/12	Q3 2011/12	Q4 2011/12	2011/12	Note	Quarterly target 2011/12	
				Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value		Value	
😊	LLe 2a	Number of IN2 Passport to Leisure cards issued	Community Services	Higher is better	211	278	241	486	1216	400	351	376	413	1,540	Quarter 4 has been another successful month across the contract - particularly for Farnham Leisure Centre with over 65% of the total cards issued, due to the number of students at the University.	188
😊	LLe3	Total number of visits to Waverley leisure centres, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	2,451	2,883	2,891	3,413	11,643	3,402	3,305	3,125	3,554	13,386	An outstanding performance across all sites, with every leisure centre achieving or exceeding their challenging targets. It is the best quarter performance to date and holds a very positive outlook for the completion of the new Godalming Leisure Centre and the Herons refurbishment.	2925
😊	LLe3 a	Number of visits to Farnham Sports Centre, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	424	866	971	1177	3438	1,118	1,122	1,097	1,265	4,602	Q4 has seen another outstanding month for Farnham Leisure Centre, which still continues to exceed expectation and with the highest usage to date.	1,000
😞	LLe3 b	Number of visits to Cranleigh Sports Centre, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	524	553	511	567	2155	603	550	556	562	2,271)	The target was raised from 500 last year (2010/11) and now stands at 550.	600

Comments from Community Performance Sub-Committee – 1 June 2012

LLe 2a – Number of IN2 Passport to Leisure cards issued

The Sub-Committee asked that the next report outlined the number of people who had taken up the scheme and the number who had dropped out.

LLe 3b – Number of visits to Cranleigh Sports Centre, per 1,000 population

The Sub-Committee noted that performance was below target and **Members agreed to propose that 550 was a more appropriate target for 2012/13.**

Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2010/11	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	2011/12	2011/12	Note	Quarterly
				2010/11	2010/11	2010/11	2010/11	2010/11	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	Value	Value		Value
				Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	
☺	LLe3c	Number of visits to The Herons Sports Centre, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	843	882	812	1008	3545	970	1,021	919	1022	3,932	An extremely successful month at the Herons - exceeding the target and the same quarter last year.	800
☺	LLe3d	Number of visits to The Edge Sports Centre, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	297	226	260	303	1086	324	247	276	313	1,160	An extremely successful quarter at the Edge, exceeding target and the same quarter last year.	275
☺	LLe3e	Number of visits to Godalming Leisure Centre, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	362	356	335	361	1414	384	382	371	390	1,527	A very successful quarter against an increasingly more challenging target with the current facilities.	350
☹	LLe4a	Visits to and Use of museums & galleries - All Visits, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	112.19	101.99	98.73	65.65	378.56	91.38	100.3	101.69	84.43	377.80	Museum of Farnham = 53.23 Godalming Museum = 31.2	85
☹	LLe4b	Visits to and use of Museums & galleries - Visits in Person, per 1,000 population	Community Services	Higher is better	78	65	53.01	44.67	240.96	78.95	79.05	55.81	69.1	282.91	Museum of Farnham = 33.8; Godalming Museum = 35.3 Museum of Farnham results are similar to those of Q3	73

Comments from Community Performance Sub-Committee – 1 June 2012

LLe 4a – Visits to and use of museums & galleries – all visits, per 1,000 population / LLe 4b – Visits to and use of Museums & Galleries – Visits in Person, per 1,000 population

The Committee noted that performance was off target for both LLe 4a and 4b performance indicators and was advised that Farnham Maltings taking over the management of the Farnham Museum would make a positive impact on these figures. Members asked about the use of the Garden Room at Farnham Museum by the community and were advised that this was something that the Maltings would be looking into, to ensure its usage was increased.

Members asked for more detail on the management transfer to the Maltings at the next meeting. Furthermore, that the figures showed footfall as well as visits in person per 1000 of the population so could put it into context.

Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 2010/11	Q4 2010/11	2010/11	Q1 2011/12	Q2 2011/12	Q3 2011/12	Q4 2011/12	2011/12	Note	Quarterly target 2011/12	
				Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value		Value	
PLANNING																
☺	NI 157c	Processing of planning applications: Other applications - % determined within 8 weeks	Planning	Higher is better	94.75%	96.81%	94.94%	96.69%	96.09%	96.76%	96.37%	95.20%	92.00%	95.02%	1584 out of 1667 determined in time in the year	90.00%
☹	LPL1 a	Planning appeals allowed (cumulative year to date)	Planning	Lower is better	50.0%	25.0%	31.6%	35.6%	35.6%	38.7%	42.90%	46.3%	45.1%	45.1%	46 out of 101 appeals allowed in year	30.0%
☹	LPL3 b	Percentage of enforcement cases actioned within 12 weeks of receipt.	Planning	Higher is better	Indicator definition revised in 2011/12				88.70%	69.11%	37.67%	30.86%	47%	54 out of 174 resolved in 12 weeks While performance is well below the target it reflects the fact that the planning enforcement team is tackling the backlog of cases. As older cases are resolved this will affect performance against this indicator. The number of cases on hand has fallen from 626 in August 2011 to 508 in December 2011 and had been further reduced to 409 by the end of March 2012. During Q4 174 cases were actioned while 100 new cases were received. The target is to reduce the number of cases in hand to 250 by end of June 2012	70%	
-	NI 155	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	Planning	Higher is better	2010/11 Quarter 4 Report: 44 affordable homes on site, 185 with planning permission				3	0	0	24	27		No target set – aim to maximise	
☹	LPL5 a	Percentage of complete Building Control applications checked within 15 days.	Planning	Higher is better	New indicator for 2011/12				41.0%	65.0%	67.0%	63%	55%	Surveyors have been reminded to record the date of emails/phone conversations (with architects) when used in preference to a letter. Where there is no letter on a file and no record of a conversation, the final decision (approval/rejection) date is used, making the performance appear worse.	70%	

NI 157a – Processing of planning applications: Major applications - % determined within 13 weeks

The Sub-Committee noted that although in the last quarter the team had hit target, performance across the whole year was slightly down. The Sub-Committee noted the importance of ensuring these applications were properly considered and the need to get the right decision so it wasn't always possible to deal with some cases within 13 weeks.

LPL 1a – Planning appeals allowed (cumulative year to date)

The Sub-Committee noted that performance for the last quarter, and the whole year, for LPL1a was below target.

The Sub-Committee noted that since the last meeting, officers had carried out an analysis of all the appeals to find out if there was a particular area to improve on. Officers reported that the differences of opinion with the Planning Inspectorate mainly concerned matters of visual judgement. Waverley imposed high standards of design throughout the borough which did not always appear to be supported by the Planning Inspectorate. However an Action Plan had been produced to address some areas highlighted in the analysis. The Action Plan and analysis would be reported to the next cycle of Area Planning Committees

Following a question regarding recovery of costs, the Sub-Committee was advised that costs could only be awarded against (or in favour of) the Council if the Inspector considered that either side had been unreasonable in their behaviour. and resulted in unnecessary or wasted expense in the process. These occasions are relatively rare. **Any costs awards were highlighted in budget reports to the Executive and Officers would circulate this information to Members.**

A further question related to the difference in performance between decisions made by Committee and under officer delegated powers. Officers advised that the number of overturned officer decisions was in proportion to those decided by Members.

LPL 3b – Percentage of enforcement cases resolved within 12 weeks of receipt

The Sub-Committee noted that the enforcement team had not hit target for final quarter and, over the course of the year was regularly below target. Members were advised that the Enforcement team had increased its resources and, at the request of Members, were focusing on clearing the backlog of cases. The team was continually monitoring performance but whilst they were dealing with the backlog it would be difficult to immediately increase performance from 55% to 70%.

LPL 4 – Percentage of tree applications determined within 8 weeks

The Sub-Committee noted that although performance over the last quarter was above target, over the whole year they were slightly below. Members noted that the team normally only missed the target when negotiations with the applicant caused delay. The benefits of achieving a satisfactory resolution of a case outweighed the benefits of meeting the target.

NI 155 – Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)

The Sub-Committee noted that there was no target for this performance indicator but it was an area that it wanted to see progress on. Members noted that a report would be going to the July Executive with ambitious plans to increase the supply of affordable houses on Council owned land while a number of large private sites were being progressed which will further increase the supply of affordable houses..

LPL 5a – Percentage of complete Building Control applications checked within 15 days

The Sub-Committee noted that performance was below target for the quarter and year. Members noted that this was because of an issue with recording dates of emails and phone conversations when used in preference to a letter. When there was no letter on a file and no record of a conversation the final decision date was used, making the performance appear worse than it was. This had been picked up half way through the current quarter so performance in Quarter 1 (2012/13) should be better and more so in Quarter 2.

In relation to the performance indicators for planning, Members discussed the need to have statistics which gave them the information they needed to know exactly what was happening in the service. They were advised that Area Planning Committees already receives very detailed information particularly around appeals and enforcement on a quarterly basis. **Members agreed that the service should look to promote its achievements publically to improve perception of its service. The Head of Planning would discuss the best way forward for this with the portfolio holder.**

The Sub-Committee also suggested that Town and Parishes be made more aware of enforcement and appeal performance in its areas. This possibly could be achieved through receipt of the quarterly performance report or bi-annual at their cluster meetings.

	Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 2010/11	Q4 2010/11	2010/11	Q1 2011/12	Q2 2011/12	Q3 2011/12	Q4 2011/12	2011/12	Notes	Quarterly Target 2011/12
					Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value		
FINANCE																
😊	NI 181	Time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events	Finance	Lower is better	15.0	21.0	11.0	6.0	13.0	9.0	11.0	9.0	5.7			10.0 days
😊	LI6a	% of Council Tax collected	Finance	Higher is better	30.9%	59.9%	88.4%	99.0%	99.0%	30.8%	59.8%	88.2%	99.0%			99.0% (annual target)
😊	LI6b	Percentage of Non-domestic Rates Collected	Finance	Higher is better	31.3%	60.1%	87.3%	98.4%	98.4%	31.3%	58.7%	86.9%	98.2%			99.0% (annual target)
😊	LI7	% of eligible claims (received at the counter completed and with all evidence) processed within 5 days.	Finance	Higher is better	79%	60%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			95.0%
😞	LI8	Average annual rate of return on Council Investments above market rates	Finance	Higher is better	0.85%	0.56%	0.49%	0.55%	0.61%	0.51%	0.49%	0.27%	0.16%			0.50%

	Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 2010/11	Q4 2010/11	2010/11	Q1 2011/12	Q2 2011/12	Q3 2011/12	Q4 2011/12	2011/12	Notes	Quarterly Target 2011/12
					Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value		
DEMOCRATIC & LEGAL SERVICES																
☺	L11c	Percentage of complaints responded to within WBC target times (10 days)	Democratic & Legal Services	Higher is better	87%	88%	83%	95%	89%	87%	75%	80%	94%			95%
ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT																
☺	LI2	Working Days Lost Due to Sickness Absence	Organisational Development	Lower is better	0.66	1.45	1.28	1.31	4.7	1.20	1.03	1.14	1.18	4.55	Jan 0.33 Feb 0.46 Mar 0.39	1.38
	LOD1	Number of volunteering days taken through Employee Volunteer Scheme	Organisational Development	Higher is better	New indicator						73.5	100.5			To follow	100 (this is the target for the calendar year)
HOUSING SERVICES																
☹	LHM6	Percentage of responsive repairs completed 'right-first-time'	Housing Services	Higher is better	87%	85%	87%	87%	87%	85.47%	87.71%	85.36%	80.45%		Data which can be verified is only available for January 2012 as at the moment we are unable verify Mears data.	87%
☹	LHM9 b	Percentage of responsive repairs contractor appointments kept	Housing Services	Higher is better	86.30%	88.10%	86.96%	91.4%	88.91%	93.00%	90.40%	83.80%	57%		From data on 1499 jobs 852 reported that the appointment made at the first point of contact was kept.	85%
☹	LHM2	Percentage of annual boiler services and gas safety checks undertaken on time.	Housing Services	Higher is better	99.93%	99.91%	99.95%	100%	100%	100%	99.98%	99.99%	90.67		Mears started contract February and have experienced mobilisation issues. Officers working with Mears to improve performance.	100.00%
☹	LHM7 a	Percentage of minor aids and adaptations completed within 20 days.	Housing Services	Higher is better	72.6%	66.67%	70%	60%	69%	87.5%	72%	60%	48%			75%
☺	LHM7 b	Percentage of complex minor aids/adaptations completed within 60 days.	Housing Services	Higher is better	95.83%	100%	100%	73.33%	92.41%	100%	100%	87.5%	78%			75%
☺	LHO1 a	Percentage of estimated annual rent debit collected	Housing Services	Higher is better	25.18%	50.50%	75.00%	98.99%	98.99%	25.00%	50.00%	75.00%	98.95	98.95		98.6% This is the annual target

	Ref	Description	Service	What is good performance ?	Q1 2010/11	Q2 2010/11	Q3 2010/11	Q4 2010/11	2010/11	Q1 2011/12	Q2 2011/12	Q3 2011/12	Q4 2011/12	2011/12	Notes	Quarterly Target 2011/12
					Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value		
😊	LHO1 b	Total current tenants rent arrears as a percentage of the total estimated gross debit	Housing Services	Lower is better	1.15%	1.18%	1.33%	0.93%	0.93%	1.02%	1.07%	0.93%	0.82%	0.82%		1.1%
😊	LHO1 c	Total former tenants rent arrears as a percentage of the total estimated gross debit	Housing Services	Lower is better	0.3%	0.35%	0.35%	0.31%	0.31%	0.28%	0.35%	0.40%	0.36%	0.36%		0.5%
😊	LHO2 a	Percentage of tenants with more than 7 weeks arrears	Housing Services	Lower is better	2.28%	2.12%	2.28%	1.72%	1.72%	1.72%	1.85%	1.58%	1.44%	1.44%		2.90%
😞	LHO2 b	Percentage of tenants in arrears who have been served with a Notice Seeking Possession (NoSP)	Housing Services	Lower is better	2.82%	2.40%	1.37%	2.89%	7.75%	1.85%	3.25%	3.42%	3.98%		Q4 2011/12 - 3.98% - 65 NOSPs Q4 2010/11 - 2.89% - 48 NOSPs	2.45%
😊	LHO5	Housing advice service: Homelessness cases prevented per 1,000 households (Cumulative)	Housing Services	Higher is better	1.06	1.92	3.54	6.6	6.6	2.84	2.58	3.02	3.10			3.27
😊	NI 156	Number of households living in temporary accommodation	Housing Services	Lower is better	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	2	2			10

Performance Indicator Action Plan

PI Ref: LLe4b	PI Description: Visits to and use of museums and galleries – visits in person, per 1,000 population	Reporting Period: Q4 2011/12	
Lead Officer: Charlotte Hall		Target Value: 73	Current Value: 69.1
<p>Reasons for Failure to meet Target: <i>(Please explain why the Target Value has not been met)</i></p> <p>During Q4 2011/12, preparations for the transfer of the management of the Museum of Farnham to Farnham Maltings were underway, with the focus being put on successful handover of operations rather than initiatives to encourage increased attendance at that time.</p>			
<p>Proposed Remedial Action: <i>(Please list or describe the action steps that will be taken to improve performance)</i></p> <p>None at present, as the failure to achieve the target is likely to be due to the operational change and is not expected to denote an ongoing trend.</p>			
<p>Prospects for Improvement: <i>(Please indicate the likelihood that the proposed action steps will result in the Target Value being met)</i></p> <p>High. There is a new curator at Farnham and Godalming Museum enjoyed a record attendance in April 2012 due in large part to the Titanic Centenary exhibition.</p>			
<p>Anticipated Completion Date: <i>(Please indicate the anticipated timescales for completing each action step and for achieving the Target Value)</i></p> <p>It is expected that the target will be met in Q1 2012/13</p>			
<p>Any additional comments:</p>			

Performance Indicator Action Plan

PI Ref: LPL3b	PI Description: % of enforcement cases actioned within 12 weeks from receipt	Reporting Period: Q4 11/12	
Lead Officer: Beth Howland-Smith Enforcement Team Leader		Target Value: 80%	Current Value: 30.9%
Reasons for Failure to meet Target: <i>(Please explain why the Target Value has not been met)</i> Current focus in line with Members' direction is to reduce number of older cases. With every old case closed the % is reduced. This position has been explained and discussed at Area Planning Committees over past year and particularly the past seven months. As a consequence, whilst the Performance Indicator has not been met, the backlog of cases has reduced as follows – September 2011 – 606 Current (31/05/12) – 349			
Proposed Remedial Action: <i>(Please list or describe the action steps that will be taken to improve performance)</i> Enforcement Action plan (updated May 2012) (fully scopes work of team, identifies priorities, indicators and contains detailed action plan to meet objectives) in place which acknowledges 'performance' drop and sets time frames and targets for future performance.			
Prospects for Improvement: <i>(Please indicate the likelihood that the proposed action steps will result in the Target Value being met)</i> High			
Anticipated Completion Date: <i>(Please indicate the anticipated timescales for completing each action step and for achieving the Target Value)</i> September 2012 → ≥ 80% cases actioned in 12 weeks			
Any additional comments: The council has identified additional resources to reduce backlog of cases and September 2011 – 606 cases on hand Current – 356 cases on hand This is the focus of Members' main concern.			

Performance Indicator Action Plan

PI Ref:	PI Description:	Reporting Period:	
LPL5a	Percentage of complete Building Control applications checked within 15 days	2011/2012 Q4	
Lead Officer:		Target Value:	Current Value:
Paul Frame		70%	63%
<p>Reasons for Failure to meet Target: <i>(Please explain why the Target Value has not been met)</i></p> <p>An audit of the case files has revealed that when surveyors contact architects by phone or email (rather than by letter) they are not keeping a record of the date. With no evidence on the file, the final decision date is being recorded instead. Making the performance look worse than it is.</p>			
<p>Proposed Remedial Action: <i>(Please list or describe the action steps that will be taken to improve performance)</i></p> <p>A file sheet has been modified to include a field for recording the date and means of communication. All surveyors have been reminded to record this information.</p>			
<p>Prospects for Improvement: <i>(Please indicate the likelihood that the proposed action steps will result in the Target Value being met)</i></p> <p>Good</p>			
<p>Anticipated Completion Date: <i>(Please indicate the anticipated timescales for completing each action step and for achieving the Target Value)</i></p> <p>Actions completed. Should be at or above 70% target for 2012/13 Q1.</p>			
<p>Any additional comments:</p>			