



CAI.04 16/17

Challenge and Improvement
Committee

Date: 23rd May 2016

D

Subject: To present a revised format for Progress & Delivery Reporting for 2016/17

Report by:	Director of Resources
Contact Officer:	Ian Knowles Director of Resources 01427 676500 ian.knowles@west-lindsey.gov.uk
Purpose/Summary:	To approve the revised format of the Council's Progress & Delivery report for 2016/17

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- 1. Members agree the revised format of the Progress and Delivery report for 2016/17**
- 2. Members recommend to Policy Committees (*Corporate Policy and Resources and Prosperous Communities*) that the revised format be adopted**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None

Financial: FIN/17/17

Staffing: None

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights: None

Risk Assessment: None

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities: None

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Wherever possible please provide a hyperlink to the background paper/s
If a document is confidential and not for public viewing it should not be listed.

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman) **Yes** **No**

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications **Yes** **No**

1. Background

- 1.1 At a meeting of the Challenge & Improvement Committee on 22nd December 2015, it was agreed that a working group be established to review the Progress & Delivery reporting process and report back with its recommendations.
- 1.2 The Members of the group were:
- Cllr Bond (Chair)
 - Cllr Darcel
 - Cllr Curtis
 - Cllr England
- 1.3 The purpose of the working group was set out as to:
- a) Review the measures reported in 2015/16 and determine their on-going appropriateness
 - b) Consider how these measures provide a performance framework for the organisation that allows Members to monitor progress against the Corporate Plan, service delivery and project development
 - c) Consider the reporting format for future reports

2 Progress to Date

- 2.1 The working group, supported by officers, has met on three separate occasions.
- 2.2 Members have reviewed the current reporting format and content, scrutinised the Council's current Corporate Scorecard, had sight of a proposed set of measures to oversee delivery against the new Corporate Plan priorities and were introduced to the concept of a measure definition sheet to be used internally so as to ensure consistency of reporting.
- 2.3 The Working Group expressed overall satisfaction with the Progress and Delivery format and content, however they suggested the following improvements:
- Direction of Travel indicators to be used in reporting
 - Consistent usage of explanations and rectification actions where appropriate
- 2.4 The format of the P&D report has been modified to include these recommendations and ensure that a culture of performance management is applied throughout the Council. The revised report has the following six distinct sections.
- **Executive Summary:** Provides the reader with an overview of the reports context
 - **Corporate Health measures:** Key performance measures which give the reader a high-level view of the Council overall. Full performance is to be reported (red, amber and green) within this section.
 - **Corporate Plan measures:** Reporting against performance measures aligned to the themes and priorities of the Corporate Plan. Full

performance is to be reported (red, amber and green). Please note that these measures will be included in the P&D report on a six-monthly basis

- **Commercial Plan measures:** Reporting against the measures contained within the Commercial Plan. Please note that these measures will be included in the P&D report on a six-monthly basis.
- **Programmes and Projects:** Identification of Council programmes and projects that are not progressing as anticipated and identification of actions needed to improve.
- **Service measures:** Performance of services areas on an exception basis; red or green measures

- 2.5 This revised report format is contained within this report for Members' consideration.
- 2.6 To provide a greater understanding of the report; 2015/16 Period Four data has been populated in the new report format. (Please note that due to the recent adoption of the Corporate Plan, these associated measure are currently being scoped and are not included within this report.)

Progress and Delivery

PERIOD FOUR

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
Executive Summary	8
Section 1: Corporate Health Measures.....	12
Section 2: Corporate Plan Measures.....	14
Corporate Plan Theme: Open for Business.....	14
Corporate Plan Theme: People First.....	17
Corporate Plan Theme: Asset Management.....	18
Corporate Plan Theme: Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.....	19
Corporate Plan Theme: Partnerships/Devolution	20
Corporate Plan Theme: Excellent Value for Money Services	21
Section 3: Commercial Plan measures	23
Section 4: Project and Programme Delivery.....	25
Section 5: Service Exceptions	26
Customer Satisfaction.....	26
Benefits.....	26
Council Tax.....	27
Building Control	28
Local Land Charges.....	29
Development Management.....	30
Enforcement	31
Environmental Protection.....	31
Food Safety	32
Licensing	32
Street Cleansing	33
Waste Collection.....	33
Trinity Arts Centre.....	34
Democratic Services.....	35
Financial Services.....	36
Economic Development.....	37
Localism and Community Safety	37
Markets.....	38
Assets and Facilities Management	39
Housing	39
Home Choices	40
Healthy District.....	42
ICT.....	43
Systems Development.....	44

Introduction

Councillors have received progress and delivery reports since 2012. They have sought to give councillors information on how the council is performing through its services, project delivery and finances. This has given councillors the opportunities to question officers on performance and ensure that any rectification measures proposed to remedy poor performance are sufficient to tackle the issues identified.




This report is about the services the council is delivering in order to meet the objectives it has set itself in the corporate plan.

For clarity this report will provide information on those services that are either performing below their target level or have exceeded the performance expected of them. This will be done within certain tolerance levels therefore services which are just below their target performance will not be reported at this stage, but will be monitoring through the council's services leadership team. Generally explanations and rectifications are given where an aspect of a service is performing below the required standard.

In addition the report will contain information on services which were included in the last period's exceptions report, but have subsequently improved to the extent that they are not included in this report. This is to demonstrate to members that remedial measures which have been put in place are working.

How to use this report

RAG Performance Indicators

	Performance against this indicator is better than the set target
	Performance is in line with its target
	Performance is lower than predicted

Direction of Travel

↑	Performance is improving
→	Performance is remaining static
↓	Performance is declining

Executive Summary

This report covers the period from January to March 2015. It is a report “by exception” which contains information on those programmes/projects that are current during the reporting period and are at risk of not delivering their outcomes and/or may not be completed within prescribed timescales or costs.

Programme/Projects Overview

To oversee programme/project development and delivery the Council has established three ‘themed’ Boards – Transformation; Commercial and Growth. Each Board oversees projects relating to their particular theme and seeks assurance from project managers that where issues are identified rectifications are in place.

A fourth Board is in existence; The Entrepreneurial Board, which has an overall view of programme/project delivery with each of the three Boards report to it and highlight successes or areas/issues to be addressed. By having an overarching view, the Entrepreneurial Board plays a key role in resource allocation and prioritisation of work.

Programmes/Projects by Exception

The following programmes/projects are considered to be at risk of delivery within agreed timescales and/or costs, or the intended outcomes are at risk of being realised. Recommendations and/or rectifications have been offered by the relevant project managers and have been considered by both the respective Board and the Entrepreneurial Board.

Fraud Investigation Services: AMBER

Following the creation of the Single Fraud Investigation Service (SFIS) and the subsequent transfer of Housing Benefit investigation responsibilities to the Department for Work and Pensions, many local authorities took the decision to transfer on block their investigatory staffing resource. West Lindsey District Council recognised the need to retain investigatory resource to protect the integrity of its systems and processes and to explore potential commercial opportunities. A new business case has been approved and this project will no longer be amber in future reports.

Hemswell Masterplan: AMBER

The Masterplan is not completed at this time. It is anticipated that a revised completion date of June 2016 is achievable. However capacity to deliver the subsequent action plan continues to be a concern.

Movement since the Previous Report

There is one project that was previously reported as Amber.

Gainsborough South West Ward Programme – GREEN

The South West Ward is a priority area and has a number of issues associated with high levels of deprivation. A multi-agency Strategic Group has been developed to tackle the issues and causes. Additional resources have been provided to tackle environmental and ASB issues. The partners engaged in this programme are now developing their own tactical plans for the area.

Conclusion

Across the Council there is a significant volume of programme/project associated work underway. The Boards are playing a key role in ensuring that business cases are effectively scrutinised and where projects are initiated progress is maintained. Any potential issues affecting progress or the delivery of projects are assessed and remedial actions are applied.

From the report provided, Members can be assured that the current position of programme/project development is as stated and that this represents a positive position.

Update on Issues highlighted in the Third Quarter report

Complaints received

Complaints continued at a similar rate during the last quarter. A separate report on feedback will be brought to policy committee later in the year. Planning continued to represent over 30% of the total number of complaints.

Gainsborough Markets

This service has recently become the responsibility of the Projects and Growth Team who are currently exploring the options to improve this service. A separate paper was taken to Prosperous Communities Committee in May.

Local Land Charges

Performance has improved and is now below the target of ten days for returning a search. This does come at a cost and although work is ongoing to secure a IT solution for the longer term.

Development Management

Performance against the key measures continues to improve and is now above the government set targets. However complaints have continued at similar levels throughout the year whilst allowed appeals are higher than we would like. A

restructure is currently being implemented and is expected improve the situation further.

Enforcement

Demand within the Enforcement Team has increased over the last quarter and has caused the length of time to resolve cases to become extended. The resource requirement in this team is currently being reviewed.

Measures to highlight for this quarter not already mentioned

Assets and Facilities Management

The level of customer satisfaction for this team is higher than the target set and should be recognised. In addition the work undertaken on reducing void periods for property for rent has taken this measure to below 5%, ahead of our target and appropriate benchmarks.

Council Tax

The council tax collection rate for 2015/16 is 98.34% which is an increase of 0.11% from the previous years' total which in monetary terms equates to an increase of £23,000.

The liability for council tax increased by £1.474 million for 2015/16 and the team collected just under £1.5 million more than 2014/15.

An additional 425 council tax properties were brought into the valuation list by the Valuation Officer during 2015/16 and we have just over 5,000 council taxpayers paying by 12 monthly instalments compared to 4,000 at the end of last year. We also now have just over 75% of council tax payers paying by direct debit.

National non domestic rate collection for 2015/16 also improved from 2014/15 by 0.27% to 99.44% despite an increase in liability over the year of £232,000.

Trinity Arts

Cost of delivery – early indications from the closedown process are that the Centre operated on a deficit or circa £65,000 last year which compared to £96,000 the previous year shows significant improvement. This is also below the £80,000 target set, being the cost of maintaining the building as empty.

The surplus from the artistic programme was £56,600 against a target of £36,000. This demonstrates effective programming, and the fact that we are securing shows on financially advantageous terms and keeping other costs down.

Audience figures were 17,600 against a target of 9,600 with an average occupancy of 57% across all performances.

Highlights from areas not mentioned above

Whilst this is an exception report which deals primarily with under or over performing measures, we would like to provide members with a flavour of activity currently ongoing in those areas which are on target and delivering as anticipated.

Home Choices has been actively seeking to improve on its performance indicators. Whilst the cost of homelessness has fallen to the Authority thanks to a new approach, there has been an audit of the CBL (housing register) system and associated processes. This has validated concerns raised by the service relating to Acis nominations performance, wider strategic CBL partnership and ICT functionality and stability. A significant amount of work and intervention from WLDC during the quarter has led to improved Acis nominations performance, along with tracking of nominations activity.

We are pleased to advise that a home choices advisor has been nominated for a 'young future housing leaders' award and has been shortlisted to the top 30.

The HR Team have been busy supporting managers with absence management. The absence figures for the year 2015/16 are the lowest they have been at 6.16 days per FTE, there are a number of supporting reasons for this and specifically the proactive management of absence.

The staff survey was conducted in the summer of 2015 and an enthusiastic group of staff members have formed a focus group to work on proactive solutions to the themes identified in the survey. A further survey will be explored by the group in 2016.

Section 1: Corporate Health Measures

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Customer										
Received complaints	Monthly	144	72	●	Cumulative measure		-	-	-	
Received compliments	Monthly	168	180	★	Cumulative measure		-	-	-	
Employee satisfaction	Six Monthly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Customer satisfaction	Annual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Perspective: Financial										
Annual net greenhouse gas emissions	Annual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Position against the Councils budget including deficit and/or surplus	Quarterly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Projected savings/income generation initiatives	Quarterly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Monies owed to WLDC	Quarterly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Perspective: Quality										

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Percentage of demand received through self-serve	Monthly	26%	90%	●	↑	24%	●	-	-	-
Percentage of calls answered	Monthly	92%	85%	★	→	92%	★	-	-	-
Staff Absenteeism (days)	Monthly	0.38	0.63	★	↑	0.73	●	-	-	-
Volume of vacancies against establishment	Quarterly	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 1: Corporate Health measures

SAMM

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Increase in visitor numbers	Annual									
Increase in employment in the sector	Annual									

Table 2: Open for Business Measures

SAMPLE

Corporate Plan Theme: People First

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Priority: Ease and convenience of access to a range of public services offered by the Council and partner organisations										
Customer satisfaction with Council and services provided	Annual									
Priority: Enhance and maintain a safe, natural and built environment										
Percentage reductions in no. of ASB/ Community Safety incidents reported	Annual									
Residents satisfaction surveys	Annual									
Priority: Meet local housing needs and aspirations										
Percentage increase in population of District	Annual									
Priority: Increase opportunities for arts, culture, night-time economy, sport and leisure for residents										
Health Survey	Annual									

Table 3: People First Measures

Corporate Plan Theme: Asset Management

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Priority: To develop and maximise the return on and value of our asset base										
Percentage increase in yields (return on capital employed)	Six monthly									
Percentage increase in income derived from assets	Six monthly									
Priority: Maximise the benefits of our assets for our communities										
Tenants' satisfaction levels	Annual									
Priority: Utilise our asset base to facilitate inward investment										
Occupancy rate of Council properties	Annual									

Table 4: Asset Management Measures

Corporate Plan Theme: Central Lincolnshire Local Plan

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Priority: Local Plan is adopted										
Local Plan is in place by 31st December 2016	Annual									
Priority: Establish the appropriate number of Neighbourhood Plans required across the District and ensure they are supported and developed										
Number of requests for Neighbourhood Plans	Annual									
Number of Neighbourhood Plans approved	Annual									
Priority: The key growth and regeneration priorities for Gainsborough to deliver Local Plan priorities are identified in the Gainsborough Chapter of the document										
Number of proposed schemes relevant for Gainsborough alone.	Annual									
Percentage of schemes developed out	Annual									
Priority: The key growth and regeneration priorities for Gainsborough to deliver Local Plan priorities are identified in the Gainsborough Chapter of the document										
Value of external funding secured for infrastructure development	Annual									

Table 5: Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Measures

Corporate Plan Theme: Partnerships/Devolution

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Priority: To work in partnership to explore opportunities for joined-up service delivery										
Number of ley partnerships entered into	Annual									
Priority: To work with national and regional organisations to deliver services locally										
Number of shared service delivery initiatives implemented	Annual									
Priority: To build successful commercial partnerships and Joint Ventures										
Number of commercial partnerships formed	Annual									
Income generated from commercial activity	Annual									
Priority: To work with partners to deliver local services at as local a level as possible										
Number of community based service delivery mechanism in place.	Annual									
Annual number of volunteering hours undertaken across the District	Annual									
Monetary value of volunteering hours	Annual									

Table 6: Partnerships/Devolution Measures

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Corporate Health measures										

Table 7: Excellent Value for Money Services measures

SAMPLE

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
corporate objectives										
Proportion of members that understand corporate objectives	Six Monthly									

Table 8: Commercial Plan measures

SAMPLE

Section 4: Project and Programme Delivery

Project Name	Description	RAG	Reason
Commercial Board			
CP1 – 002	Utilise WLDC Corporate Fraud Investigation Officer both internally and offer services externally to both cover the cost to WLDC and achieve additional income through day rate work with other LA's and private companies.	●	Paper to CB in April to revisit original proposal to run independent service. Intelligent targeted marketing of the Fraud Officer is needed.
Growth Board			
Gainsborough SW Ward	The South West Ward is a priority area and has a number of issues associated with high levels of deprivation. A multi-agency Strategic Group is being developed to tackle the issues and the causes	●	Need for approval and adoption of new Tactical plans by SWW Partnership before presenting to Growth Board
Transformation Board			
Agile 2	The first phase of the Agile Working project enabled the majority of WLDC officers to be based on the 3rd floor of the Guildhall. The second phase (this project) will focus on categorising officers into work styles and enabling/encouraging officers to work away from the Guildhall.	●	Project to be closed to re-examined work streams

Table 9: Project and programme delivery

Section 5: Service Exceptions

Cluster: Customer First

Customer Satisfaction

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Customer contacts received through phone and face to face	Monthly	23%	10%	●	↓	33%	●	-	This was an ambitious target and will be reviewed for the new year.	-

Table 10: Customer Satisfaction measure exceptions

Benefits

The processing of Housing Benefit and Council Tax Support has remained pretty constant despite changes to staffing and the uncertainty of Housing Benefit regulations and entitlement. The number of claims taking in excess of 30 calendar days has fluctuated but has only been at extraordinary levels over the Christmas period. The recovery of overpaid Housing Benefit remains good at 64% at year end. The average time taken to process and New Claim or a change to a claim is 5.3 days compared to 6.5 days for 2014/15 which is good given the Welfare Reform agenda affecting Housing Benefit and staffing changes within the team.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Quality										
Average processing times	Monthly	6 days	2.5 days	★	↓	4.3 days	★	-	Due to volume of changes processed urgently for the New Year calculations, the	Seasonal

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
									monthly processing times have improved dramatically	
Overpayments created – overpayments collected	Quarterly	63.98%	50%	●	↓	65.5%	●	-	-	-

Table 11: Benefits measure exceptions

Council Tax

The council tax collection rate for 2015/16 is 98.34% which is an increase of 0.11% from the previous years' total which in monetary terms equates to an increase of £23,000. The liability for council tax increased by £1.474 million for 2015/16 and the team collected just under £1.5 million more than 2014/15.

An additional 425 council tax properties were brought into the valuation list by the Valuation Officer during 2015/16 and we have just over 5,000 council taxpayers paying by 12 monthly instalments compared to 4,000 at the end of last year. We also now have just over 75% of council tax payers paying by direct debit. National non domestic rate collection for 2015/16 also improved from 2014/15 by 0.27% to 99.44% despite an increase in liability over the year of £232,000.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of delivering the Council Tax service	Monthly	£221,724	£243,108	★	↑	£259,325	●	-	-	-
Perspective: Quality										
Council Tax in year collection rate	Monthly	98.34%	98%	★	Cumulative measure		★		Increase on last year's collection rate equating to a total of £23,000.	

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
NNDR in year collection rate	Monthly	99.44%	99%	★	Cumulative measure			★	Increase on last year's collection by 0.27%.	

Table 12: Council Tax measure exceptions

Building Control

The Building Control service has embarked on a new commercial business plan which looks at providing additional commercial services whilst maintaining and building on the current market share. The figures for the last three months show that the team has maintained a market share at around 70% and that whilst income has fluctuated this is expected for the last 3 months of the financial year due to the impact of weather on building projects. A number of staff are currently undertaking training to support the Council's commercial aspiration for this coming year and it is anticipated that work associated with this will start to come through in 2016/17.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of delivering the Building Control service	Monthly	(£8,715)	£4,977	★	↑	£4,270	●	-	-	-
Cost of delivering the Building Control service per head of population	Monthly	(£0.10)	£0.06	★	↑	£0.05	●	-	-	-

Table 13: Building Control measure exceptions

Local Land Charges

The Local Land Charges service has stabilised over the past 6 months, moving from a position where search times were up to 45 days to a position where they are holding around 6 to 8 days. This is mainly down to the service being appropriately resourced with knowledgeable and willing staff. The IT procurement for LLC is in its final stages and will be taken to Transformation Board and Entrepreneurial Board for approval in the coming weeks. It is generally accepted that any changes and improvements to the services will only be delivered once the IT system has been implemented and the process streamlined.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of delivering the local land charge service	Monthly	(£102,186)	(£22,896)	★	Cumulative measure			-	-	-
Cost of delivering the Local Land Charge service per head of population	Monthly	£0.00	(£0.02)	●	↑	£0.03	●		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The service is still very resource heavy due to the paper based process. ▪ Insufficient IT systems 	Implemented on new ICT system in conjunction with Development Management and Building Control.
Income lost to private search companies	Monthly	£116,366	£104,496	●	Cumulative measure			-	-	-
Perspective: Quality										
Time taken to process a search	Monthly	6 days	10 days	★	↑	7 days	★	-	-	-

Table 14: Local Land Charges measure exceptions

Development Management

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Quality										
Percentage of appeals that are allowed	Monthly	36%	20%	●	-	Cumulative measure		-	8 decisions have been appealed of which 22 have been determined and 8 allowed. Of the 22 determined, 5 were committee overturns of which 4 were allowed.	-
Invalidity Rate	Monthly	54%	20%	●	↓	53%	●	-	Data has now been captured to understand the reasons for invalids.	Work with 'frequent' offenders to reduce invalid rate, increase awareness through supporting material
Majors determined within government guidelines	Quarterly	75%	50%	★	↑	82%	★	-	Performance is exceeding government targets	-
Others determined within government guidelines	Monthly	97%	80%	★	↑	88%	★	-	Performance is exceeding government targets	-

Table 15: Development Management measure exceptions

Enforcement

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Process										
Housing enforcement requests received	Monthly	146	120	●		Cumulative measure		-	The service has experienced consistent and high demand since January 16	Additional resources have been requested via CLT, but not agreed to date
Planning enforcement requests received	Monthly	248	264	●		Cumulative measure		-	The service has experienced consistently high levels of demand during 15/16	Additional resources have been requested via CLT.
Perspective: Quality										
Time taken to resolve a housing enforcement request (days)	Monthly	88	60	●	↓	15	★	-	The demand on the service has increased in 15/16	Additional resources have been requested via CLT
Time taken to resolve a planning enforcement request (days)	Monthly	191	90	●	↓	165	●	-	The service has seen an increased demand and has less resources available to deal with this.	Request for additional resources has gone to CLT.

Table 16: Enforcement measure exceptions

Environmental Protection

We haven't achieved the number of targeted food inspections this year, this is down to a number of premises that needed more time spent on them due to infestations and/or general condition of some of the premises that have been inspected.

Though the number of service requests for Environmental Protection has been similar to last year the team have had a challenging 7 months due to picking up work with regard to Anti-social behaviour.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Quality										
Nuisance complaints completed within timescales	Monthly	100%	95%	★	→	100%	★	-	-	-

Table 17: Environmental Protection measure exceptions

Food Safety

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Quality										
Customer Satisfaction	Six monthly	100%	80%	★	↑	50%	●	-	-	-

Table 18: Food Safety measure exceptions

Licensing

Income from taxis has seen a downturn this year, due in part to the effect of policies put in place in 2013. There have been additional changes to the taxi policy again this year and recently a more robust convictions policy has been approved by the members of the licensing & regulatory committee, along with the requirement for drivers to take part in an e-learning safeguarding module also.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Process										
Customer Satisfaction	Six monthly	0%	96.5%	●	↓	100%	★	-	Only one "customer" returned the questionnaire and this was a negative unjustified response, hence the zero score.	

Table 19: Licensing measure exceptions

Street Cleansing

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Customer										
Complaints	Monthly	2	12	★	Cumulative measure			-	Performance ahead of target mainly due to well-motivated, well trained workforce. Absence levels low so few issues with replacement staff who possess less knowledge.	-
Compliments	Monthly	16	12	★	Cumulative measure			-	Performance on track	-

Table 20: Street Cleansing measure exceptions

Waste Collection

Another excellent year for Operational Services with further recognition on the national stage through the APSE benchmarking process. The targets set in the Progress and Delivery process have been achieved. The only area for concern is the recycling rate, data from LCC remains outstanding for March but we expect the rate to drop to around 52% this year which is a reduction of around 2%. This is in line with national trends, however local factors have also contributed such as a poor growing year for garden

waste and the introduction of a new sampling procedure at our Materials Recycling Facility which has resulted in increased contamination. Satisfaction with waste services remains at over 90% and there has been an increase in voluntary litter-picks mainly through campaigns such as Clean for the Queen. There have been a couple of real success stories, one has been the reduction in missed bins for which Supervisors have worked hard to achieve a 16% reduction during the last two years, another is the first year of the roll out of a full Commercial Waste service which has achieved the targets set out in the business plan and continues to flourish. All this has been achieved without a rise in cost of service.

No performance exceptions reported in period

Trinity Arts Centre

Cost of delivery – early indications from finance are that the Centre operated on a deficit or circa £65,000 last year which compared to £96,000 the previous year shows significant improvement. This is also below the £80,000 target set, being the cost of maintaining the building as empty.

The surplus from the artistic programme was £56,600 against a target of £36,000. This demonstrates effective programming, and the fact that we are securing shows on financially advantageous terms and keeping other costs down. Audience figures were 17,600 against a target of 9,600 with an average occupancy of 57% across all performances.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of delivering the Trinity Arts Centre	Monthly	£85,556	£80,004	●		Cumulative measure		-	Ahead of tolerance levels set but significantly under budget.	Review of measure tolerances
Cost of Trinity Arts Centre per user	Monthly	£4.75	£7.07	★	↑	£7.39	●	-	Good audience numbers providing value for money	-
Received surplus	Monthly	£56,686	£36,000	★		Cumulative measure		-	Received surplus well ahead of target – shows being booked on advantageous terms.	-
Perspective: Process										

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Audience Figures	Monthly	17,619	9,600	★	Cumulative measure			-	Good attendance at performances.	-
Perspective: Quality										
Event Occupancy	Monthly	64%	50%	★	↓	68%	★	-	Good audience numbers and attractive programme	-

Table 21: Trinity Arts Centre measure exceptions

Cluster: Democratic and Business Support

Democratic Services

Robust PA service in place but one vacancy will add pressure to this area. Positive feedback for PA and Support from CExec Directors and Strategic Leads. Standards complaints continue to be received from Parish Councils regarding governance issues. Civic re-design focusing on community and business value whilst continuing to deliver national expectations. Savings being achieved but the redesign has not been well received by some Members.

Democracy Working Group requested a “debating forum” layout for full Council Meetings, various layouts trialled but Council voted to retain the original layout. FOI performance mainly running at 100% responses within timeline due to robust chasing process. Throughout the year 3 late responses due to staff sickness / absence and one review request. Focus currently on completion of Conferencing System and issues with the installation and integration with webcasting – penalty clause imposed. Training underway for the Committee Admin System configuration and implementation (which is a very large project for the team considering the Committee timetable and demand for extra meetings. Measures reviewed and will include Civic Event attendance within the West Lindsey district to monitor the effectiveness of the redesigned service.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Total cost of member and support services per member	Monthly	£513	£1,528	★	↑	£1,976	●	-	Employee insurance profiling issue	Profiling issue resolved

Table 22: Democratic Services measure exceptions

Financial Services

Financial Services have had a successful quarter's performance, with High Assurance on both the Budget Monitoring and Budget Preparation Audits, has implemented the Intelligent Scanning/matching system for creditors invoices, and is due to go live with a new Bank Reconciliation system in May, the investment in these systems has provided ongoing savings for the Council, in addition to providing efficiencies within these processes for the whole of the organisation.

The recruitment to the new Finance Structure is almost complete, and ensures the team have a wide range of skills to support both Services and the Council in achieving a sustainable future, through effective use of resources, commercialism and transformation.

No performance exceptions

Cluster: Economic Development and Neighbourhoods

Economic Development

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of providing the Economic Development service per head of population	Monthly	£0.39	£0.34	●	→	£0.39	●	-	Costs for February and March have increased following return of TM.	-
Perspective: Process										
Number of business assisted		248	200	★	Cumulative measure			-	-	-

Table 23: Economic Development measure exceptions

Localism and Community Safety

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Process										
Investigated community safety reports	Monthly	51	1,368	★	Cumulative measure			-	Performance under projected target	Unsure of the reasons why a target is assigned to this measure

Table 24: Localism and Community Safety measure exceptions

Markets

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Customer										
Satisfaction levels of Gainsborough market traders	Annual	77%	66%	★	-	-	-	-	-	-
Perspective: Process										
The number of stalls on a Tuesday	Monthly	40	66	●	↓	55	●	-	Markets has been managed by the Localism Team during 2015/16 and was passed to Projects and Growth in March. There has been little time to address the poor performance in 2015/16	In view of this, a review is being undertaken to look at options for outsourcing the market to be presented to PC in September. Note that the operation is now with Operational Services
The number of stalls on a Saturday	Monthly	21	30	●	↓	20	●	-	Markets has been managed by the Localism Team during 2015/16 and was passed to Projects and Growth in March. There has been little time to address the poor performance in 2015/16	In view of this, a review is being undertaken to look at options for outsourcing the market to be presented to PC in September. Note that the operation is now with Operational Services

Table 25: Markets measure exceptions

Cluster: Housing and Regeneration

Assets and Facilities Management

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Customer										
Internal tenants satisfaction	Annual	83.5%	66%	★	↑	66%	●	-	-	-
Perspective: Financial										
Maintenance Fund (planned/unplanned)	Monthly	82%/18%	70%/30%	★	-	-	-	-	-	-
Perspective: Quality										
Void Rate	Monthly	5%	10%	★	↑	7%	★	-	-	-

Table 26: Assets measure exceptions

Housing

The demand on the enforcement based services continues to increase and steps are being taken to manage these within the policy priorities. An additional request for resources has gone to CLT, but to date, no decision has been made on this. Targets for the coming year have been amended to reflect this. The number of empty properties remains at an acceptable level and the DFG service continues to positively impact residents.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
The average spend per DFG	Monthly	£4,624	£3,500	●	↓	£4,628	●	-	The number of large complex grants has increased in year.	No action needed

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?	
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.				
Total spend on completed disabled facilities grants	Monthly	£1,620,828	£336,996	●		Cumulative measure		-	Remaining budget allocated to jobs for completion.	No action needed	
Perspective: Process											
Number of affordable homes delivered	Quarterly	29	48	●		Cumulative measure		-	The number of sites on which affordable housing has been delivered has decreased. This is mainly due to changes in government grant levels and a lack of funding for the delivery of affordable housing.	The Council is engaging with the HC in regards to future delivery. However it is likely that delivery of affordable homes will decrease generally moving forward	
Perspective: Quality											
Average days from DFG approval to completion	Monthly	68	60	●	↓		59	●	-	The measure was 8 days above target for this month due to complex cases.	Nothing. The overall timescale is still within the target for the completion of works

Table 27: Housing measure exceptions

Home Choices

A review of progress and delivery measures for this service area has taken place to ensure that members receive more meaningful performance information. A revised suite of internal performance monitoring measures has also been developed.

An audit of the CBL (housing register) system and associated processes has taken place. This has validated concerns raised by the service relating to Acis nominations performance, wider strategic CBL partnership and ICT functionality and stability. A significant amount of work and intervention from WLDC during the quarter has led to improved Acis nominations performance, along with tracking of nominations activity. The Home Choices team has retrained Acis staff and continues to provide support to the

Acis staff team. A home choices advisor has been nominated for a 'young future housing leaders' award and has been shortlisted to the top 30. A further shortlisting exercise (top 20) takes place Friday 15th April 2016 and we are hopeful that Charlotte will continue to be considered for this award

WLDC continues to lead countywide homelessness strategy work. A conference was hosted by WLDC on 29th March 2016, attended by over 50 people. A video to showcase the work achieved during the current strategy has been commissioned and can be viewed here: https://youtu.be/dEcq4Ke_5H4. A new countywide homelessness strategy is currently in development for the period 2016 – 2020. A presentation was delivered to Full Council on 11th April 2016.

We have been successful in our proposal to LCC to deliver 12 further domestic abuse training sessions on behalf of LCC during the financial year. These will be delivered by the domestic abuse coordinator within the home choices team. We will receive £350 per training session, an income of £4200.

We are now using the Cross Street building as our temporary accommodation provision. This has significantly reduced the use of B&B accommodation for homeless households and reduced spend in this area.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of temporary accommodation	Monthly	£24,058	£47,604	●	↓	£11,871	●	-	This is significantly reduced due to a change in TA provision during the period.	New model of delivering temporary accommodation was delivered in Feb.
Perspective: Process										
Number of applicants rehoused per year from the housing register	Monthly	277	444	●	Cumulative measure			-	Dependent on number of void properties. Improvement plan with Acis has ensured that allocations are policy compliant.	Continue to work closely with Acis.

Table 28: Home Choices measure exceptions

Healthy District

100% of personal improvement plans are being completed; 76% of the health trainer participants were from our most deprived areas. Whilst this is excellent performance the Health Trainers are currently going through a redundancy process and this service will cease on the 31st May 2016.

Customer satisfaction has remained high with scores consistently above 95%; Contractor has been successful in driving new participants to the leisure facilities by attractive programming and effective marketing. Target exceeded by 3091 or 11%. Cost per user has been consistently below target at around 80p against a target of £1.20. West Lindsey Leisure Centre achieved Quest Plus in February this year with all areas measured (eg. Programming, health and safety, staff management etc) being scored as Good or Very Good. Usage of the facilities remains high but the only concern is that our contractors are tasked with a 2% increase in usage year on year. After the spike in membership in 2013/14 after the refurbishment this has been difficult to achieve.

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Customer										
Customer Satisfaction of leisure facilities and activities		96%	80%	★	↓	97%	★	-	Customer satisfaction remains high across all three facilities.	-
Perspective: Financial										
Cost of Leisure Management fee per service user		£0.74	£1.20	★	↓	£0.71	★	-	Good usage of the centres providing good value of money	-
Perspective: Process										
Cost of Leisure Management fee per service user		£0.74	£1.20	★	↓	£0.71	★	-	Performance well ahead of target. New users being attracted to facilities by marketing activity and high quality provision.	-
Perspective: Quality										
Percentage of Client Support		100%	70%	★	↑	91%	★	-	Health Trainer team currently in process of	-

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
programmes that are completed									redundancy and getting all records up to date.	

Table 29: Healthy District measure exceptions

Cluster: Organisational Transformation

ICT

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Process										
Incident and Problem Management	Quarterly	91.8%	85%	★	↓	100.3%	★	-	-	-
Change Management	Monthly	122%	50%	★	↑	103.3%	★	-	-	-
Perspective: Quality										
Service and System availability	Monthly	100%	98%	★	→	100%	★	-	-	-
Service and System availability: Secure Network	Monthly	100%	98%	★	→	100%	★	-	-	-

Table 30: ICT measure exceptions

Systems Development

Performance Measure	Reporting Frequency	Current Period				Previous Period		YTD perf.	What is affecting performance	What do we need to do to improve and by when?
		Actual	Target	Perf	DoT	Actual	Perf.			
Perspective: Process										
LLPG Standard	Monthly	Gold (3 above ANS)	Achieve National Standard	★	↑	Silver (2 above ANS)	★	-	Achieve 3 levels above target	Nothing, this is the best we can be. Just need to maintain this standard ideally.
Perspective: Quality										
Website Availability	Monthly	100%	98%	★	→	100%	★	-	Excellent proactive monitoring of servers	Ensure we keep the same standard

Table 31: Systems Development measure exceptions

SAMPLE