

## Key Performance Indicators 2015/16 - Targets

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
Governance	GOV001	How satisfied with their experience were visitors to the Council's website?	3 stars	2.4	N/A	N/A	<p><b>Indicator to be deleted:</b> It is considered that this Indicator should not be retained. This indicator was implemented for 2014/15 following a previous unsuccessful attempt to measure customer satisfaction with the Council's website. This measurement involves the website user selecting a happy, neutral or sad face and leaving comments linked to the page. However the extremely low number of replies (60 for the 9 months from April – December 2014 out of 2,756,291 million website hits) has resulted in those expressing any satisfaction representing a miniscule sample (approximately 0.002%) of user views. This number is not a statistically viable sample. <b>The Website Development Board favours a move to the three new satisfaction measures outlined below.</b></p>
		<p><b>Corporate Comment:</b> KPI not to be retained. To be deleted following previous discussions at Management Board and Website Development Board, and F&amp;PM Scrutiny Panel.</p>			No amber tolerance appropriate		
	New KPI	Are customer needs being met by the Corporate Website being available?			99.6%	N/A	<p><b>New Indicators:</b> This indicator and the two below, measure aspects of website functionality which will affect user experience. The amount of time the website is available, the absence of broken links, and ease of navigation all impact on the successful provision of Council information and a positive website user experience. These indicators provide technical information (availability, or 'uptime' ) and quality information (broken links, and navigation) against which customer satisfaction can be inferred. Data is collated automatically from the SiteImprove dashboard. The targets are set at the level of current performance, and the focus will be on maintaining this level before improvement is sought.</p>
		<p><b>New KPI</b> Performance to be reviewed quarterly.</p>			Amber tolerance = 0.6% below target		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance	
Governance	<b>New KPI</b>	Are customer needs being met by the Corporate Website not having broken links?			94.1%	N/A	<b>New Indicator</b> - see above.	
		<b>New KPI</b> Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target			
	<b>New KPI</b>	Are customer needs being met by the main Corporate Website having effective navigation?			79.9%	N/A		
		<b>New KPI</b> Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 0.9% below target			
	<b>GOV004</b>	What percentage of major planning applications were processed within 13 weeks?	75.00%	94.40%	<b>75.00%</b>	No		From 2014 the CLG definition for processing planning applications changed for the measure of Majors, so that where the applicant had agreed an extension of time, this would be deemed to have been dealt with in time for the purposes of GOV004 so long as the application was dealt with by the new extended date. The Government have now extended this measure to include Minor and Other category applications. GOV004 is already calculated in this way and it is proposed to bring GOV005 and GOV006 in line with GOV004 and the CLG definition from 2015/16. This will apply to all planning applications decisions. With the upturn in work this is an appropriately challenging target.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 2% below target			

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance	
Governance	<b>GOV005</b>	What percentage of minor planning applications were processed within 8 weeks?	90.00%	93.46%	<b>90.00%</b>	N/A New Def.	See GOV004 above for comment relating to GOV004 - GOV006 With the upturn in work these are appropriately challenging targets.	
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 2% below target			
	<b>GOV006</b>	What percentage of other planning applications were processed within 8 weeks?	94.00%	94.78%	<b>94.00%</b>	N/A New Def.		
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 2% below target			
	<b>GOV007</b>	What percentage of planning applications recommended for refusal were overturned and granted permission following an appeal?	19.00%	20.59%	<b>19.00%</b>	No		No suggested change at present - but need to assess the impact of the status of the Local Plan on decision.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 2% above target			

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
Governance	GOV008	What percentage of planning applications, refused by members against a recommendation, were granted permission following an appeal?	50.00%	62.50%	50.00%	No	Members appear satisfied with this target.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 5% above target		
N-hoods	NEI001	How much non-recycled waste was collected for every household in the district?	400kg	294kg	400kg	No	The first 3 Quarters of 2014/15 are showing compliance with the Indicator, it is feared that Quarter 4 figure will not be so. There is a general trend of increase in tonnage of non-recyclable materials (attributable to a variety of reasons: food waste being disposed incorrectly, weight of packaging being reduced by manufacturers and lack of full use of recycling services available to residents). It is proposed that the target be kept the same as last year and efforts made to publicise the full extend of recycling services offered by the Council.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 5.0% below target		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
N-hoods	<b>NEI002</b>	What percentage of all household waste was sent to be recycled, reused or composted?	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	No	The target was missed by 1% in 2013/14 however the target was not revised down. In the first three Quarters of 2014/15 the target has been missed in two Quarters. It is considered that not all recyclable materials are being presented for collection, these include food waste which appears in the residual waste stream. A number of strategies are being implemented: review of larger residual waste bins, publicity campaign highlighting the opportunities available for recycling, better labeling on clear sacks to include the full range of recycling materials that can be collected, collection of new recycling materials like small electrical equipment, batteries and textiles). It is felt that the above measures should help in achieving the 60% recycling target.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 2.0% below target		
	<b>NEI003</b>	What percentage of our district had unacceptable levels of litter?	8.00%	12.00%	8.00%	No	Following a number of years of exceeding the target the performance against this target failed in Quarter 3 of 2014/15. Quarter 3 saw the transition of the street cleansing service from Sita to Biffa. It is possible that the transition arrangements and changes in supervision and management arrangements by the contractor could have contributed to the poor performance. Having said that the target was failed by 4% and all efforts are being made by Officers of the Council and Biffa colleagues to ensure that the standards are improved.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			No amber tolerance		
	<b>NEI004</b>	What percentage of our district had unacceptable levels of detritus (dust, mud, stones, rotted leaves, glass, plastic etc.)?	10.00%	9.00%	10.00%	No	The target for 2014/15 appears to be on track however Quarter 3 outturn was only 1% below target. Closer monitoring is being carried out to ensure year end target is achieved. Similar to NEI103 it is proposed to carry out close monitoring and ensure compliance rather than increase the target.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			No amber tolerance		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
N-hoods	<b>NEI005</b>	What percentage of the issues and complaints received by the Environment & Neighbourhoods Team received an initial response within 3 days?	95.00%	97.56%	95.00%	No	No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (95%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error and some incidents that do not meet the target but are justified non-compliance for some other reason e.g. prioritising cases in particularly busy periods.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target		
	<b>NEI006</b>	What percentage of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping are investigated within 3 working days of the fly-tip being recorded where the fly-tip is on public or privately owned land?	90.00%	93.00%	90.00%	No	No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error and some incidents that do not meet the target but are justified non-compliance for some other reason e.g. prioritising cases in particularly busy periods
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
N-hoods	<b>NEI007</b>	What percentage of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping (contract cleared) are removed within 5 working days of being recorded?	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	No	No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error and some incidents that do not meet the target but are justified non-compliance for some other reason e.g. clearance delayed whilst we encourage the perpetrator to clear.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target		
	<b>NEI008</b>	What percentage of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping (variation order / non-contract) are removed within 10 working days of being recorded?	90.00%	91.00%	90.00%	No	No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error, some delays in identifying who owns the land and clearance delays whilst we encourage the perpetrator to clear.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
N-hoods	<b>NEI009</b>	<p>What percentage of out of hours noise complaints that are passed through to the duty noise officer are responded to within 15 minutes</p> <p><b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.</p>	90.00%	91.00%	90.00%	No	No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error/failure, recorded in minutes e.g 1 minute over the target time would be recorded as a failure.
					Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target		



Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
N-hoods	<b>NEI010</b>	<p>What was the net increase or decrease in the number of homes in the district?</p> <p><b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.</p>	230	163	230	No	<p>It is difficult to set a target for this indicator as the council does not have much control over the outcome, as it does not have control over how many housing units are built in the district. Obviously the Council can encourage more building of dwellings by granting planning permission, making strategic housing site allocations through the Local Plan etc., but it doesn't actually build the houses (apart from a small proportion of Council homes more recently), so we cannot control if and when they are completed. Even if a site is given planning permission, the state of the housing market can mean that at times, house builders will not complete units they have permission to build, as if they can't sell them then they will wait to complete them later on. This means that even if we grant enough permissions, we can't guarantee a completion rate. Since the East of England Plan (regional Plan which set our housing targets) figure was revoked, the Council has been working towards identifying its own housing target through work on population projections and a joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment with 3 adjacent local authorities. The eventual SHMA will help guide the identification of a new housing target through the Local Plan process. As this process is not yet complete there is no current housing target, and so there is no adopted figure on which to base a target for NEI010. A sensible target for NEI010 in the meantime would be to use an average of the actual completions in the district for the last 6 financial years. This period would include the recession but also the start of recovery recently. The average of actual completions for the last 6 financial years (2008/09 to 2013/14) is 229.5 net dwellings, so 230 is the annual figure for the target.</p>
					Amber tolerance = within 5% below target		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
N-hoods	<b>NEI011</b>	What percentage of the rent we were due to be paid for our commercial premises was not paid?	3.00%	5.17%	3.00%	No	(Former GOV002. Indicator transferred to Neighbourhoods Directorate). This target was not met in 2013/14 and is unlikely to be met for 2014/15. Whilst the reasons for not meeting the target are partly attributable to the economic situation generally, 3% remains a realistic target to strive for and therefore should remain for 2015/16.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 0.5% below target		
	<b>NEI012</b>	What percentage of our commercial premises was let to tenants?	98.00%	98.37%	98.00%	No	(Former GOV003. Indicator transferred to Neighbourhoods Directorate). This target was met in 2013/14 and is likely to be met in 2014/15. However it dropped below target slightly during quarters 1 and 2 of 2014/15, and whilst a single vacant property can make the difference between whether the target is met or not, it would not be unreasonable to retain the target for 2015/16.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target		
Communities	<b>COM001</b>	What percentage of the rent due from our council home tenants was paid?	96.00%	96.21%	98.00%	N/A New Def.	It is proposed that the <b>Definition</b> for the rent collection rate is amended for 2015/16 to the standard definition used by the Housemark Benchmarking Club for Councils and Housing Associations, of which EFDC is a member. The Council's definition is currently based on the Government's old National Indicator (NI) definition which, amongst other factors, includes current rent arrears brought forward, whereas the Housemark definition does not. The Housemark definition is much more relevant, since it enables EFDC to compare its performance with other landlords. Also, EFDC's quarterly Performance Returns to Housemark are based on EFDC's definition, resulting in EFDC consistently (and erroneously) being shown as performing poorly. The proposed target is based on the current target, but applying the new definition.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 0.5% point below target		

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance		
Communities	<b>COM002</b>	On average, how many days did it take us to re-let a Council property?	37 days	35 days	37 days	No	As has been seen throughout the year, the current target has not been achieved each quarter, due to it already being challenging. It is therefore proposed that there is no change to the target.		
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.5 days above target				
	<b>COM003</b>	How satisfied were our tenants with the standard of the repairs service they received?	98.00%	100.00%	98.00%	No		The current target is already very high and well into the Top Quartile in the country. In view of the exceptional, ongoing levels of satisfaction, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to reduce the Council's aspirations for performance against this indicator.	
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			No amber tolerance appropriate				
	<b>COM004</b>	How many households were housed in temporary accommodation?	65	60	65	No			Although the target was achieved in Q3, there is an upward trend in the no. of households in temporary accommodation. Indeed, the nos. increased by <u>28%</u> in the last Quarter (between Q2 and Q3) alone. Concerns also remain over the long-term effects of the welfare reforms on homelessness and the associated need for temporary accommodation for homeless households. Therefore, it is considered that the existing target will already be challenging in 2015/16, and it is proposed that it remains the same.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 3 days above target				

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
Communities	<b>COM005</b>	What percentage of our council homes were not in a decent condition?	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	No.	It is not possible to make the target any more challenging. Although the Council achieved its target of having no non-decent homes a number of years ago a significant proportion of all Council homes nationally still do not meet the Decent Homes Standard. It is therefore essential to ensure that properties that may fail the standard in the near future are identified, and appropriate programmes of work continue to be put into place, to ensure that the Council continues to have no non-decent homes at any time. This KPI ensures that this position is properly monitored on a quarterly basis.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2014/15. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			No amber tolerance appropriate		
	<b>COM006</b>	KPI 49 - How many of the key building components required to achieve the Modern Homes Standard were renewed?	3300	2861 (Cumulative figure Q3 target is 2475)	3300	No	
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 2% below target		
	<b>COM007</b>	What percentage of all emergency repairs (including out of hours emergencies) are attended to within 4 working hours?	99%	99%	99%	No	
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1% below target		
In view of the existing challenging target and the fact that it reflects the KPI within the Repairs Management Contract with Mears, it is proposed that the current target for this KPI should continue for 2015/16.							

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
Communities	<b>COM008</b>	What is the average overall time to complete all responsive repairs, from the time the request is made to the time the job is completed?	7 working days	6.67 working days	7 working days%	No	In view of the existing challenging target and the fact that it reflects the KPI within the Repairs Management Contract with Mears, it is suggested that the current target for this KPI should continue for 2015/16. Moreover, as has been seen throughout the year, this current target has not been achieved each quarter during 2014/15.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1 day above target		
	<b>COM009</b>	What percentage of appointments for repairs are both made and kept?	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	No	
<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.	Amber tolerance = 1% below target						
<b>COM010</b>	What percentage of calls are answered by the Council's Careline Service within 60 seconds?	97.50%	99.78%	97.50%	No	This KPI was introduced in response to the National Audit Office's suggestion that the Council should have more qualitative KPIs. It is therefore suggested that it should continue into 2015/16. The indicator is a national requirement and target set by the Telecare Services Association (TSA) for all control centres that meet the TSA's stringent accreditation requirements. The target is very challenging and it is proposed that it continues for 2015/16.	
<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.	Amber tolerance = 1% below target						

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance
Resources	RES001	How many working days did we lose due to sickness absence?	7 days	6.5 days	7 days	No	It is evident that following several years of reducing the target number of days we have reached a level that cannot be achieved for 2014/15.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 7.01 days - 7.24 days		
	RES002	What percentage of the invoices we received were paid within 30 days?	97.00%	95.00%	97.00%	No	
<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target				
RES003	What percentage of the district's annual Council Tax was collected?	97.00%	77.63%	97.00%	No	Performance is running close to the 2014/15 target and while we have Local Council Tax Support it is unlikely that this can be improved on.	
<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 0.5% below target				

Directorate	KPI Ref 2015/16	Description	Target 2014/15	Q3 2014/15	Proposed Target 2015/16	Target Changed Yes/No	Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance	
Resources	RES004	What percentage of the district's annual business rates was collected?	97.70%	78.72%	97.70%	No	The reprofiling of many accounts from 10 to 12 months in 2014/15 has made accurate performance measurement relative to previous years difficult. This situation will flush through in February and March to establish the true performance. At this stage it is felt prudent to maintain the 2014/15 target.	
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 0.5% below target			
	RES005	On average, how many days did it take us to process new benefit claims?	25 days	21.63 days	22	Yes		
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.5 days above target			
	RES006	On average, how many days did it take us to process notices of a change in a benefit claimant's circumstances?	6 days	8 days	6 days	No		Target to be maintained at current level. Changes in circumstances will be actioned on average in under 1 week from the notification of the change.
		<b>Corporate Comment:</b> Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly.			Amber tolerance = 1.0 days above target			