

## National & Local Performance Indicators - Leeds is a highly competitive, international city

Economic Development		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
<b>Council Priority Indicators</b>													
CP-ED50	Increase the proportion of local businesses who say they are satisfied that the Council and its partners are helping to create a good business environment in Leeds	new indicator			54.2%	increase	39.9% (1)	no comparative data			increase	increase	increase
CP-ED52	Increase the number of international students enrolled at the city's universities	new indicator		8,850	8,960	increase	8000 (2)				increase	increase	increase
CP-ED53	Achieve recognition in the European Cities Monitor as an important business location			13th	3rd	increase	28th (3)				increase	increase	increase
CP-JS55	Increase the percentage of the population of working age qualified to NVQ level 4 & 5	new indicator		27.5%	n/a	increase	26.2% (4)				increase	increase	increase
<b>Local Key Indicators</b>													
LKI-ED3	Assisting local and new companies to invest in Leeds: total number of enquiries dealt with	1,410	1,462	1,500	2,083	2,000	2,277	no comparative data			2,000	2,000	2,000
LKI-ED10	Regeneration Support Projects - Investment secured from private sector/public grants by current projects	new indicator		£395.5m	£367.4m	£197m	£253.4m				£232.7m	n/a	n/a
<b>Indicators to be deleted</b>													
CP-ED54	Achieve the national ranking (5th) of Leeds' prime shopping quarter	new indicator		n/a	6th	5th	n/a (5)	no comparative data			future targets not required		
CP-ED55	Increase the number of trips (inward and outward) made on scheduled services from and to Leeds Bradford International Airport	new indicator			2,165,435 (6)	increase	2,393,851 (7)						
LKI-ED11	Total number of companies assisted through business grants (all funding streams)				194	80	92						
LKI-ED12	Total number of new jobs created through Leeds City Council's Business Grant Programme				157	125	132						
LKI-ED13	Increased business sales through Leeds City Council's Business Grant Programme				£17m	£2.5m	£25.3m						

### Footnotes:

1. Although this result is significantly lower than that achieved in 2005/06 only 116 companies out of a total of 1,600 Chamber members responded to the survey giving a response rate of 7.3% which is slightly lower than the 8.6% rate in 2005. Furthermore, given there are 18,215 VAT registered businesses in Leeds, with an estimated 43,000 enterprises, the validity of the findings is questionable. Consideration will be given to whether a more robust method for data collection can be established, however, gaining information from any other source is likely to be costly.
2. This indicator has not achieved the target set, however, it is difficult for the Council to take any actions to influence the outcome. The reason for the decrease in the number of international students in Leeds is due to the way in which the statistics are collected. HESA discount both exchange students and those who study their courses outside of the UK. Both LMU and Leeds University in recent years have started to deliver courses in other countries, including China.
3. In previous years Leeds has ranked 3rd in a secondary list of "other" cities which business leaders were familiar with. For the first time in 2006, Leeds broke into the top 33 list of the best cities in Europe to locate a business and therefore the ranking of 28th reflects a significant increase in previous years.
4. At April 2007, the latest available information is for January to December 2005. There has been a slight increase in the number of people achieving NVQ4+. The availability of data for this indicator is sporadic, however, it is planned to continue reporting against this indicator despite the erratic flow of data.
5. The data source for this indicator is no longer available. In view of this, and that there is no suitable replacement, the indicator is to be deleted.
6. This figure has been amended from that published last year of 2,175,435 - this was a typographical error.
7. This indicator is to be deleted as there is concern that it is in direct opposition to the Council's sustainability and climate change objectives.

Planning		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
<b>Council Priority Indicators</b>													
CP-PL50 BV-109	Percentage of planning applications determined in line with development control targets as follows:												
	(a) % of major applications determined within 13 weeks	48.00%	65.00%	60.60%	53.30%	60.00%	61.01%	74.90%	Middle	64.73%	60% (1)	60% (1)	60% (1)
	(b) minor commercial and industrial applications determined within 8 weeks	58.00%	75.10%	65.30%	70.70%	65.00%	69.89%	81.07%	Middle	75.36%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
CP-PL51 BV-205	Quality of the Planning Service against as measured by a service checklist.	new indicator		67.0%	72.2%	82.6%	72.2% (2)	100.0%	Bottom	90.7%	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	To be confirmed
<b>Best Value Indicators</b>													
BV-106	Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land	86%	89%	93%	96.1%	90%	96.92%	96.74%	Top	95.05%	92% (3)	92% (3)	92.00%
BV-109	Percentage of planning applications determined in line with development control targets as follows: (c) other applications determined within 8 weeks	60.00%	84.00%	80.50%	81.00%	80.00%	83.58%	91.39%	Middle	85.46%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
BV-111	Satisfaction with the planning service	not required	66%	not required		n/a	59% (4)	80%	Bottom	69%	n/a	n/a	see footnote (5)
BV-200	(a) Did the local planning authority submit the Local Development Scheme (LDS) by 28 March 2005 and therefore maintain a 3 year rolling programme?	new indicator			Yes	Yes	Yes	no comparative data			Yes	Yes	Yes
	(b) Has the Local Planning Authority met the milestones which the current Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out?	amended indicator			No	No	No				No	No	
BV-204	The percentage of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse on planning applications	new indicator		39.0%	23.5%	30.0%	37.4%	25.0%	Bottom	28.5%	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%
<b>Indicators to be deleted</b>													
BV-200	(c) Did the local planning authority publish an annual monitoring report by December of the last year?	amended indicator			Yes	Yes	Yes	no comparative data			future targets not required		

**Footnotes:**

1. These are central government targets which may be re-defined as a result of changes to the way major applications are categorised.

2. BV205 footnote to follow

3. These targets have been amended from those previously published in light of the 2007 based housebuilding trajectory.

4. Satisfaction surveys in 2003/04 and 2006/07 are not directly comparable as in 2003/04 face to face surveys were performed whilst in 2006/07 postal surveys were used (as per government guidelines).

5. Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.

Museums & Galleries		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
<b>Council Priority Indicators</b>													
CP-MG50	The percentage of residents satisfied with Museums and Galleries (LCC Annual Residents' Survey)	new indicator			48%	increase	n/a (1)	no comparative data			increase	increase	n/a (1)
<b>Best Value Indicators</b>													
BV-119c	The % of residents satisfied with Museums and Galleries	not required	64%	not required		64%	50% (2)	51% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	59% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	see footnote (3)
BV-170a	The number of visits / enquiries / website hits to museums per 1,000 population	amended indicator	736	876	933	900	942	958	Middle	2093	935 (4)	1,000 (4)	1,200 (4)
BV-170b	The number of those visits that were in person per 1,000 population	520	501	526	582	440	534	523	Middle	1,330	530 (4)	590 (4)	780 (4)
BV-170c	Number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school groups	24,082	27,768	29,641	29,200	27,200	26,151	8,156	Middle	34,406	27,900 (4)	30,850 (4)	33,800 (4)
BV-170c	Number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school groups	new indicator			Level 2	n/a	Level 2	no comparative data			Level 2	Level 2	Level 2

**Footnotes:**

1. The LCC Annual Residents' Survey is not carried out in the same year as the Best Value General Survey is undertaken, therefore as the BV survey was carried out this year, there is no result available for this indicator and a target is not applicable for 2009/10 which is the next year the BV survey will be undertaken.
2. Satisfaction surveys in 2003/04 and 2006/07 are not directly comparable as in 2003/04 face to face surveys were performed whilst in 2006/07 postal surveys were used (as per government guidelines).
3. Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.
4. Revised targets for future years compared to those shown in the 2006-07 Council Plan, with the figure of 1,200 originally targeted in 2008/09 now moved back to 2009/10. This reflects the closure of the Art Gallery through to the end of quarter 1 2007-08; the opening of the Discovery Centre for only part of that year; and the opening of the new City Museum in the third quarter of 2008-09 rather than first quarter as originally anticipated. All of these factors will lead to a slower growth in visitor numbers as the facilities open, promotions begin to have an impact, and group sessions with school children are arranged.

Culture		Our Performance						Comparison			Future Years		
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
<b>Council Priority Indicators</b>													
CP-ADE50	The percentage of residents satisfied with Theatres and Concert Halls (LCC Annual Residents' Survey)	new indicator			52%	increase	n/a (1)	no comparative data			increase	increase	n/a (1)
CP-CU50	Visits to the City Council's cultural facilities	new indicator			4,814,494	4,663,372	4,992,807				4,985,827	5,073,266	To be confirmed
	a. Libraries, museums and galleries and arts and events				4,105,506	3,950,000	4,152,075				4,100,000 (2)	3,900,000 (2)	3,950,000 (2)
	b. Sport and active recreation				59,228,470	n/a	61,213,587				n/a (3)	n/a (3)	61000000 (3)
	c. Parks and countryside				3	4	4				Amended indicator see below		
CP-CU51 (Old)	New builds - major cultural facilities	amended indicator									£24,015,000	tbc	tbc
LAA-EDE26	Restore, refurbish and increase the cultural infrastructure of the City.										15	18	tbc
	a) amount spent on building/refurbishing new existing cultural facilities												
	b) number of physical infrastructure capital build projects that will increase and/or improve cultural provision												
<b>Best Value Indicators</b>													
BV-119d	The % of residents satisfied with Theatres and Concert Halls	not required	73%	not required	70%	56% (4)	53% (2006/07 All England Top Quartile)	Middle (after Confidence Interval applied)	64% (2006/07 Core Cities Average)	n/a	n/a	see footnote (5)	

**Footnotes:**

- The LCC Annual Residents' Survey is not carried out in the same year as the Best Value General Survey is undertaken, therefore as the BV survey was carried out this year, there is no result available for this indicator and a target is not applicable for 2009/10 which is the next year the BV survey will be undertaken.
- The target for 2007/08 has slightly increased on what was specified at the beginning 2006/07. This is due to the fact that relative performance in 2006/07 has been better than expected. The 2008/09 target remains as originally specified due to the predicted closure of sites due to the Private Finance Initiative developments. The 2009/010 target is slightly higher as it is hoped the Private Finance Initiative project will be completed by this time. However, until a comprehensive capital investment strategy is completed it is difficult to accurately determine targets.
- The survey will not be conducted in 2007/8 or 2008/9. For 2009/10, the service will seek to maintain the same level of performance for visits, whilst providing a higher quality service evidenced through other performance indicators.
- Satisfaction surveys in 2003/04 and 2006/07 are not directly comparable as in 2003/04 face to face surveys were performed whilst in 2006/07 postal surveys were used (as per government guidelines).
- Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.

Traffic Management		Our Performance					Comparison			Future Years			
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
<b>Council Priority Indicators</b>													
CP-TM50	Ensure the annual assessment of our Local Transport Plan scores 4 out of 4 (a "well above average" assessment)	new indicator			n/a	Good	Good	no comparative data			n/a	Very Good (1)	Very Good (1)
CP-TM51 LKI-TM2	Increase the percentage of in-bound non-car journeys in the morning peak period	new indicator		42.3%	43.1%	43.5%	43.5%				43.9%	44.3%	44.7%
<b>Best Value Indicators</b>													
BV-103	% of respondents satisfied with local provision of public transport information	not required	43%	not required		n/a	58% (2)	54%	Middle	57%	n/a	n/a	see footnote (3)
BV-104	% of respondents satisfied with the local bus service	not required	51%	not required		n/a	62% (2)	60%	Middle	64%	n/a	n/a	see footnote (3)
BV-165	The percentage of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people	69.0%	84.0%	92.0%	82.1%	96.5%	82.1% (4)	99.6%	Middle	72.5%	82.1% (5)	see footnote (5)	see footnote (5)

**Footnotes:**

- The first progress report for LTP2 will be submitted in July 2008 to cover 2006-2008 and scored in December 2008. The target score, to be reported in April 2009 (for 2009-09) is "very good". It is not yet known whether further assessment will be on an annual or two yearly basis. It is planned that the progress report submitted in July 2010, to be assessed in December 2010 and reported in April 2011 (for 2010-2011) will be assessed as "excellent". These targets have changed from those published in last year's Council Plan as more information about LTP assessments has become available.
- Satisfaction surveys in 2003/04 and 2006/07 are not directly comparable as in 2003/04 face to face surveys were performed whilst in 2006/07 postal surveys were used (as per government guidelines).
- Targets for Best Value General Survey indicators will be confirmed the year prior to the next survey (2009/10) in order to take into account any factors affecting performance which may influence customer satisfaction.
- A survey is currently being carried out to verify the random representative sample of 39 sites chosen for the audit in 2006. The agreed result for 2005/06 was 82.1% derived from 32 crossings being considered "fit for purpose" from a sample of 39 which represented all types of crossing in the City. Submitted/evidenced data is the list of 35 random sites checked by Audit. A complete audit of all 485 sites is also being carried out to verify a new base figure, working on "fit for purpose" basis; the audit will be completed shortly but it is unlikely this will be available to report before publication date of 30th June 2007.
- The target set for 2007/08 as an interim figure based on the agreed out-turn for 2005/06 and reported for 2006/07. It will be possible to set further targets when the survey of crossings is complete and a baseline figure is determined.

Jobs and Skills		Our Performance					Comparison			Future Years			
Indicator	Title of Indicator	2002/03 Result	2003/04 Result	2004/05 Result	2005/06 Result	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Result	2005/06 All England Top Quartile	Position against All England Quartiles	2005/06 Core Cities Average	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/10 Target
<b>Local Key Indicators</b>													
LKI - JS6	The percentage point (pp) difference between the annual average rate of unemployment in the 6 worst wards and the 6 best wards of the city	7.2 pp	4.6pp	5.1pp	5.3pp	Consistent downwards trend in percentage point difference		no comparison data			Consistent downwards trend in percentage point difference		
LKI - JS7	Annual average Leeds unemployment rates compared to the annual average GB rate	2.9% / 2.6%	4.9% / 5%	5.0% / 4.8%	2.8/2.4	Maintain at or below the GB rate for 2002 to 2005					Maintain at or below the GB rate		
LKI- JS8 NRF Floor Target	Number of wards in the city with a claimant proportion 2.5 percentage points higher than the city average	amended indicator				4 wards					4 wards	4 wards	