

## ENVIRONMENT: PERFORMANCE FOR THE FOUR-MONTH PERIOD TO JULY 2008

Report By: Director of Environment & Culture and Director of Regeneration

### Wards Affected

County-wide

### Purpose

1. To update Members on the progress towards achievement of targets for 2008-09 relevant to the Environment Scrutiny Committee and contained within the Environment & Culture Directorate and the Regeneration Directorate. It has been the practice for this report to have a similar format to that used for the Integrated Performance and Finance Report (IPFR), but reporting on performance only. As a significant number of the performance indicators are new (from the National Indicator set) a different format has been chosen for this report only to enable a more detailed description of each indicator to be provided. Future reports will revert to the normal format.

### Financial Implications

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

### Content

3. Performance has been judged using the following criteria:

**Red** Not on target and planned activity not taking place

**Amber** Not on target, but planned activity undertaken and remedial measure in place; or no data available but planned activity undertaken

**Green** On target, or baseline data is not available for a new indicator and planned activity has taken place

### ***Progress against the Council's Corporate Plan Priorities – Environment and Culture Directorate (see Appendix A)***

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

| Priority                            | No. of Indicators | Judgement |          |          |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
|                                     |                   | R         | A        | G        |
| Economic development and enterprise | 2                 | 0         | 2        | 0        |
| Safer and stronger communities      | 1                 | 0         | 0        | 1        |
| Sustainable communities             | 4                 | 0         | 2        | 2        |
| <b>Total number of indicators</b>   | <b>7</b>          | <b>0</b>  | <b>4</b> | <b>3</b> |

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

#### ***Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA)***

6. The one remaining LPSA target is judged **G**.

#### ***Local Area Agreement (LAA)***

7. For the LAA, no indicators are judged **R**, 3 **A** and 1 **G**.

#### ***Overall performance***

8. Overall performance is considered to be on track for all Local Area Agreement, Community Strategy and Corporate Plan indicators on which the Environment and Culture Directorate leads or towards which it is making a significant contribution. There is a similar picture for other indicators, including those from the National Indicator set.

#### ***Customer satisfaction***

9. The Environment and Culture Directorate has been undertaking regular monthly customer satisfaction surveys since March 2008. Responses to the June survey have been analysed, the following being highlights:

- 81% of respondents were very or fairly satisfied with the service they received and 16% were very or fairly dissatisfied
- 66% agreed their issue had been dealt with, 3% felt it had been only partially dealt with and 16% considered the issue had not been dealt with
- 59% got the outcome they wanted, 19% did not and 6% considered they only partly received the outcome they wanted.
- Particularly high levels of satisfaction were noted for staff politeness and courtesy (94%), ease of finding how to contact us (93%), opening hours (93%) and staff helpfulness (91%).

- High levels of satisfaction were also noted for speed of response (87%), the ease of finding the right person to deal with the enquiry or request (83%), and whether the respondent felt that they had been listened to and understood (84%).
  - The lowest levels of satisfaction, although still in excess of 70%, related to the clarity of our stated intent (74%), whether we did what we said we would do (73%), the number of times the requester had to call (73%), the speed of resolution of the enquiry or request (71%), and the effectiveness of our actions (76%).
10. The survey is currently limited to requests for services which are received either through Info by Phone or through the highways inspection system. June was the first month in which data based on the restructured Environment and Culture Directorate was available, so there is no direct comparison with the data collected in previous months.

**Improvement**

11. In addition to those indicators which the council measures itself against through its Corporate Plan, the Council is likely to be externally judged, particularly for the Comprehensive Area Assessment, on its improved performance against those indicators which are in the National Indicator set. Performance and comparative performance by the Environment Directorate against relevant indicators is shown in **Appendix A**.
12. Of those indicators where in-year data is currently available and there is comparative data for 2007-08, the current direction of travel shows that 8 of indicators are on course to improve on last year, but 3 of the indicators are currently showing performance that is worse than for the same period last year.

**Progress against the Council’s Corporate Plan Priorities –Regeneration Directorate (see Appendix B)**

13. Analysis of Performance Against Target:

| No. of Indicators | Judgement |   |   |
|-------------------|-----------|---|---|
|                   | R         | A | G |
| 17                | 0         | 9 | 8 |

14. Details of the performance indicators for the Regeneration Directorate are in **Appendix B**.

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- None identified.