



Report of the Head of Policy, Performance and Improvement

Meeting: City Development Scrutiny Board

Date: 20th November 2007

Subject: Performance Report Quarter 2 2007/08

Electoral Wards Affected:

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report discusses the key performance issues considered to be of corporate significance identified for the City Development Scrutiny Board as at end September 2007. In addition, the report also includes a predicted Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) score for 2007/08 and a performance table detailing all Performance Indicators (PIs) for this Board.

2 Purpose of the Report

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to present the key areas of under performance at the end of Quarter 2 (1st July to 30th Sept 2007).

3 Background Information

- 3.1 This 'highlight report' has been prepared in readiness for the Accountability process, which includes the Corporate Leadership Team meeting on 30th October 2007, Leader Management Team on 1st November 2007 and Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 6th November; separate reports will be prepared for each of the scrutiny boards in readiness for the November cycle of meetings.
- 3.2 The issues discussed in this report have been identified because performance in these areas impacts upon one or more of the following; the delivery of effective services, the delivery of our corporate priorities; our CPA score; or our ability to deliver efficiency savings. This report is supported by detailed PI information.
- 3.3 Any improvement in assessment scores should potentially have a positive impact on the council's Direction of Travel assessment and overall CPA Star Rating.

4 CPA Performance issues

4.1 The table below summarises our predicted CPA scores for February 2008.

	Direction of Travel	Star Category	Corporate Assessment	Level 1 Services			Level 2 Services			
				Use of Resources	Children & Young People	Social Care (Adults)	Benefits	Culture Service Assessment	Environment Service Assessment	Housing Service Assessment
CPA 2006	Improving Adequately	3 star	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
CPA 2007 (provisional)		3 star	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3

- 4.2 The CPA 2007 provisional score is based on, the category scores allocated in 2006, and our best informed judgement of our performance over the last year. This information will be updated as and when assessment scores are confirmed during 2007/08. Scores highlighted in grey have been confirmed.
- 4.3 The provisional CPA 2007 Service Assessment scores for Culture, Environment and Housing are included in each Accountability report. These are mainly based on 2006/07 year-end performance indicator returns, however there are a number of instances where other methods are used.
- 4.4 The Audit Commission have confirmed the PIs which are to be included in the 2007 CPA Service Assessments and the thresholds to be used to calculate the scores. The above scores have been updated to reflect this. The Culture score is still giving us some concern as we hover between a 2/3 score. The eventual outcome on this will depend on the results of specific PIs, for which we are still waiting.
- 4.5 At this stage we are unable to make an informed judgement as to our predicted Direction of Travel score.
- 4.6 For a more detailed breakdown of the CPA service assessment scores please see Appendix 1.

5 Scrutiny Board Performance Issues

5.3 City Development

5.3.1 Planning Appeals

Performance against BV 204 (the percentage of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse on planning applications) continues to miss target. At the end of 2006/07, the result for this indicator was 37.4% against a target of 30%. At the end of quarter 2, 2007/08, performance stood at 51%, with a predicted year end result of 40% (against a continuing target of 30%). The nature of the indicator is such that the aim is to reduce the number of appeals allowed, but, as these figures indicate, the number of appeals allowed is increasing.

Having identified in 2006/07 that there were performance issues relating to this indicator, various measures were taken to improve performance, including the provision of additional training for members and officers.

There is an inherent delay in the appeals process, as they are allowed for up to six months after a decision has been taken; following this the length of time taken by the Planning Inspectorate to come to a final decision can vary from a number of weeks to a number of months, depending on the complexity and form of the appeal (it can involve a public inquiry, for example). Because of this potentially protracted timescale, there was an appreciation that there would be a significant time lag before the benefits of training and other improvements would be seen.

Unfortunately, the benefits are still not evident and an urgent review has begun to examine the reasons for our level of performance and to identify improvements in the quality of our submissions. The outcome will be reported to Development Scrutiny in January 2008

6 Recommendations

6.3 It is recommended that the City Development Scrutiny Committee considers the Quarter 2 performance information and highlight any areas for further scrutiny.