# ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE PLAN: PERFORMANCE FOR THE TEN-MONTH PERIOD TO JANUARY 2008

**Report By: Director of Environment** 

#### **Wards Affected**

County-wide

# **Purpose**

 To update Members on the progress towards achievement of the targets for 2007-08 in the Directorate Plan. The report has a similar format to that used for the Integrated Performance and Finance Report (IPFR), but reports on performance only.

# **Financial Implications**

2. All expenditure in respect of these performance indicators and targets is from approved budgets.

#### Content

### **HIGHLIGHTS OF PERFORMANCE**

- 3 of 30 Environment Directorate-lead indicators from the AOP are currently marked **R**. 10 remain **A** (two of which are measured through the council's Annual Satisfaction Survey; the change in performance for these is within the accepted statistical variance and not significant). 9 are judged **G**.
- 54% of indicators which may be used in external judgements, where data is available, are currently showing an improvement against last year's performance.
- Both LPSA indicators are judged G.

#### Progress against the Council's AOP Priorities (Appendix A)

1. Performance has been monitored for each indicator using the following system.

		G	On target/met target
	A		Some progress/data not yet available so not possible to determine trend
R			Not on target

2. Analysis of performance against target by Council priority is detailed below:

Priority	No. of	Judgement			
	Indicators	R	Α	G	n/a <sup>1</sup>
Improving transport and the safety of	9	1	5	3	0
roads					
Sustaining thriving communities	11	2	1	3	5
Protecting the environment	10	0	4	3	3
Total number of indicators	30	3	10	9	8

3. Details of the indicators within each of the priorities above are in **Appendix A**.

# Exceptions – indicators judged R at the end-of-September

3 indicators are now judged as R. These are:

#### 83a – Principal road condition

Although performance has improved considerably, 6% in an unsatisfactory condition compared with 14% for last year, the target of 5% was not achieved

94 HC - Grade for the year-on-year reduction in the total number of incidents and increase in total number of enforcement actions taken to deal with 'fly-tipping'

The number of fly-tipping incidents has increased since May, following the introduction of permits at household waste amenity sites. Performance against this indicator in recent months has improved, but is not anticipated to move above level 3 in the current financial year.

96 HC - % of abandoned vehicles removed within 24 hours from the point where the Council is legally entitled to remove the vehicle

Performance fell during the summer. One team deals with both abandoned vehicles and fly-tipping; handling a significant, and initially unexpected, increase in fly-tipping incidents resulted in a reduction in the response times for abandoned vehicles. Arrangements have now been put in place to provide back-up for the team and there has been sustained improvement in recent months; however, as the target is 100% this will not be achieved this year.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 10 indicators have been considered as not suitable for awarding a judgement in this report, essentially because they are either tracker indicators or indicators that require a baseline to be set during the year.

#### Strategic Monitoring Committee comments

4. The following is an extract from the minutes of the Strategic Monitoring Committee of 10<sup>th</sup> March:

"It was noted that performance against indicator 83a HC - principal roads condition had moved from amber (some progress/or data not yet available so not possible to determine trend) to red. Concern was expressed by Members at the perceived condition of both principal and non-principal roads based on their personal observation. However, noting that the target against the indicator for non-principal roads was on track to be exceeded it was proposed to formally record concern only about performance against the indicator on the condition of principal roads and highlight the need for improvement.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That (a) dissatisfaction be expressed at performance against indicator HC 83a: the condition of principal roads, and the need for improvement be highlighted;"

# Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA)

5. Both of the 2 LPSA targets were judged, G.

#### Local Area Agreement (LAA)

6. For the LAA, no indicators were judged **R**, 4 **A** and 5 **G**. These include the LPSA indicators.

#### Direction of Travel and CPA (Appendix B)

- 7. In addition to those indicators which the council measures itself against through its Annual Operating Plan, the council is externally judged on its performance against a number of national indicators, including Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPIs). Performance by the Environment Directorate against relevant indicators is shown in **Appendix B**. Primarily, the council is judged **on its performance against previous year**, rather than against target, and this comparison will be used by the Audit Commission to inform the annual Direction of Travel Assessment in February 2009.
- 8. Of those indicators where in-year data is currently available, the current direction of travel shows that 54% of indicators are on course to improve on last year, but 15% of indicators are currently predicted to be worse than last year.

9. The CPA service score for Environment was 3 star (covering performance in 2006-07) an improvement on the previous service score of 2 star.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT subject to any comments which Members may wish to raise, the report be noted.

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None