



Performance Indicator Updates to the end of March 2007-08

PI S	Status	perf	g Term Trends (This years formance against all vious years)		rt Term Trends (This years ormance against last year)
•	This PI is significantly below target.	•	Our performance against this PI has improved in the long term.	•	Our performance against this PI has improved in the short term.
	This PI is slightly below target.	•	Our performance against this PI has worsened in the long term.	1	Our performance against this PI has worsened in the short term.
②	This PI hit the target.		Our performance against this PI has not changed in the long term.		Our performance against this PI has not changed in the short term.
?	This PI cannot be calculated.	PI = i	Performance Indicator		

All BVPIs now have a 'polarity' statement. This shows whether authorities should be aiming for a high or low outturn figure.

Indicates HIGH is good Indicates LOW is good

This PI is a data-only PI. N/A = Not applicable

Indicates polarity is dependent on other factors

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
	Corporate Health												
2(a)	Equality Standard for Local Government.	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	2	•	1	•
2(b)	Duty to Promote Race Equality : Percentage	73%	90%	79%	\checkmark				84%	79%			1
3	Satisfaction with the Local Authority	N/A	N/A	58%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
4	Satisfied with Complaint Handling	N/A	N/A	32%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
8	Invoices Paid on Time	89.7%	89.9%	96.6%		\checkmark			97%	96.72%	<u> </u>	•	•
9	Council Tax Collected	98.2%	98.4%	98.6%	\checkmark				98.7%	98.70%	S	•	1
10	NNDR Collected	98.5%	98.3%	99.3%		\checkmark			99.3%	99.10%		•	•
11a	Percentage of top 5% of earners that are women	26.67%	33%	33%			\checkmark		35%	28.60%	•	•	•
11b	Percentage of top 5% of earners from black and minority ethnic communities	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%				$\sqrt{}$	0.45%	0.00%	_		
11c	Top 5% of earners that have disability	N/A	0.00%	0.00%				√	0.45%	7.0%	Ø	1	1
12	Days Sick per Member of Staff	9.74	10.34	9.67			√		8.5	8.84	_	•	•
14	Early Retirements / Staff	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	√				0.45%	0.00%	②		
15	III Health Retirements / Staff	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	V				0.45%	0.00%	<u> </u>		

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
16A	Staff with Disabilities	4.13%	5.45%	7.52%	$\sqrt{}$				9%	9.21%	9	•	1
16B	Percentage of economically disabled active people in population	11.9%	11.9%	11.9%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.9%	11.90%	S		
17A	Staff from Minority Ethnic communities	6.4%	8.2%	8.85%	$\sqrt{}$				10%	8.3%	•	•	1
156	Authority buildings open to the public accessible by people with disabilities	68%	80%	85%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	85%	•		•
63	Housing Average SAP Rating of Council dwellings	62.0	62.0	70.0		\checkmark			70	72	>	•	•
64	Private empty dwellings – returned to occupation or demolished	5	4	3				$\sqrt{}$	5	1	•	1	•
66a	Rent Collection	95.45%	97.12%	95.51%				$\sqrt{}$	98%	96.32%	•	•	•
66b	No. of LA tenants with > 7 wks of (gross) rent arrears as % of the total No. of the tenants	N/A	23.73%	23.38%				√	18%	28.39%	•	1	•
66c	Percentage of tenants in arrears who have had notices seeking possession served	N/A	37.99%	24.72%		√			24%	29.29%		1	•
66d	% Local Authority tenants evicted as a result of rent arrears	N/A	0.39%	0.18%		\checkmark			0.3%	0.00%	>	•	•

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
74	Tenant Satisfaction – Overall Service by Landlord												
	(a) % very/fairly satisfied	N/A	N/A	87%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
	(b) Black and minority ethnic	N/A	N/A	88%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
	(c) Non-black and minority ethnic	N/A	N/A	87%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	•		
75 (a)	Tenant satisfaction with opportunities for participation % fairly/very satisfied	N/A	N/A	74%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
75(b)	Satisfaction of Tenants with opportunities for participation in management and decision making – black and ethnic community	N/A	N/A	67%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
75(c)	Satisfaction with opportunities for participation in management and decision making non black and ethnic minority	N/A	N/A	74%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
184	(a) Proportion of local authority homes non-decent at the beginning of the year	Stock condition survey found that 8% of properties	8%	7%	√				3%	5%	•	•	•
	(b) Percentage change in proportion of non- decent homes between the start and the end of the financial year	did not meet the standard	0.0	28.6%		V			50%	20%	•	•	•
212	Average time taken to re-let local authority housing (days).	20	20	17	V				14	17	•		•

BVPI No:	<u>Description</u>	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
	<u>Homelessness</u>												
183	Average length of stays in												
	(a) Bed & Breakfast (weeks)	2.0 *	1.0	3.0					N/A	N/A	?		•
	(b) Hostel Accommodation of families which include dependent children/pregnant women and unintentional hardship and priority need (weeks)	10.0 *	13.67	10.0		$\sqrt{}$			10	22	•	1	•
202	No people sleeping rough within the area of the Local Authority	0	1	0	V				0	0	Ø		•
213	No. homelessness cases prevented	0	1	2.27			√		2	2	©	1	•
76b	Benefits Number of fraud investigators in post per 1,000 caseload	0.40	0.4	0.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.4	0.4	Ø		•
76c	Number of fraud investigations per 1,000 caseload	38.00	33.00	22.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	36.00	23.00	•	1	•
76d	Number of prosecutions/sanctions per 1,000 caseload	2.90	4.80	3.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.00	3.40	_	1	•
78a	Average Time New Claims (days)	29.2	51.1	39.8				√	35	31.1	②	•	•
78b	Average Time Change in Circumstances (days)	7.4	15	12.3			√		9	11.1	•	1	1

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
79b(i)	Recovery of Overpaid Benefit within financial year	55.3%	60.05%	60.3%				\checkmark	64%	80%	S	•	•
79b(ii)	HB payments recovered for all financial years	N/A	39.33%	36.40%		V			44%	32.10%	•	<u>J</u>	•
79b(iii)	HB overpayments written off	N/A	3.94%	13.70%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	2.80%	②	1	•
80	User Satisfaction Surveys												
80 (a)	Contact/Access Facilities @ Benefit Office %strongly agree/agree – all Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim successful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim unsuccessful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	83%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
80(b)	Service in Benefit Office % Strongly agree/agree – all Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim successful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim unsuccessful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	72%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
80(c)	Telephone Service % Strongly agree/agree – all Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim successful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim unsuccessful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	74%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
80(d)	Staff in Benefit Offices % Strongly agree/agree – all Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim successful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim unsuccessful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	77%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
80(e)	Clarity of Forms % Strongly agree/agree – all Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim successful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim unsuccessful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	64%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?	•	

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
80(f)	Time Taken for a Decision % Strongly agree/agree – all Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim successful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X% % Strongly agree/agree – claim unsuccessful Base Number Confidence Interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	63%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	•		
80(g)	Overall Satisfaction with the Benefits Service	N/A	N/A	74%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
	Waste and Cleanliness												
82a (i)	Recycling %	20.31%	21.44%	22.74%		\checkmark			23%	26.08%	9	•	1
82a(ii)	Recycling tonnage	N/A	3782	4153				\checkmark	4200	4754.57	S	•	1
82b(i)	Percentage Composting (or anaerobic digestion)	6.3%	16.19%	17.69%		$\sqrt{}$			18%	17.21%	A	•	1
82b(ii)	Tonnage composting	N/A	2856	3230			$\sqrt{}$		3250	3137.44		1	1
84(a)	Household Waste Collected Kg per head	304.4	314.4	326.10	$\sqrt{}$				310	322.6	•	•	•
84(b)	Percentage Change in 84(a) from previous financial year	N/A	3.4%	3.7%				√	-4.9%	2.03%		•	•
86	Cost of Waste Collection per household (£)	52.32	55.37	55.43				√	57	60.20	•	•	•

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
89	Satisfaction Survey – Cleanliness of Streets /Relevant Land % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	71%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
90a	Satisfaction Survey – Waste Collection % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	68%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		•
90b	Satisfaction Survey – Recycling Facilities % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	74%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
91	Percentage of households resident in area served by kerbside collection of recyclables From 05/6	100%	100%	100%					100%	100%	>		
	(a) 1 recyclable	N/A	100%	100%					100%	100%	Ø		
	(b) 2 recyclables	N/A	100%	100%	V				100%	100%	Š		
199	Proportion of relevant land having combined deposits of (a) litter	4%	2%	2%	√				2%	4%	•	•	(=
	(b) graffiti	N/A	4%	9%				√	3%	14%	•	1	•
	(c) fly posting	N/A	0%	0%	V				0%	0%	>		
	(d) fly tipping	N/A	3 GOOD	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	3 GOOD	TBC	?		

Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets												
(a) Major applications in 13 weeks	100%	50%	82%			1		60%	57%		1	•
(b) Minor applications in 8 weeks	78.87%*	71.91%	76%			V		70%	89%	②	1	
(c) Other applications in 8 weeks	90.24%*	94.53%	95%					90%	90%	②	•	•
Satisfaction Survey – Processing Planning Applications % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	66%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
Did the LA submit LDS by 28.3.05?	YES	YES	YES	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES	YES	•		
Has LA met milestones	N/A	YES	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES	NO	•		
Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications	50%	57%	24%	√				45%	24%	8		•
Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist	77.7%*	83.3%	77.7%				V	85%	77.7%	•		•
Environment and Environmental Health Score against best practice checklist	73%	85%	90%				V	100%	100%	•	•	•
	Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets (a) Major applications in 13 weeks (b) Minor applications in 8 weeks (c) Other applications in 8 weeks Satisfaction Survey – Processing Planning Applications % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% Did the LA submit LDS by 28.3.05? Has LA met milestones Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist Environment and Environmental Health	Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets (a) Major applications in 13 weeks (b) Minor applications in 8 weeks (c) Other applications in 8 weeks Satisfaction Survey – Processing Planning Applications % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% Did the LA submit LDS by 28.3.05? Has LA met milestones N/A Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist Environment and Environmental Health	Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets (a) Major applications in 13 weeks (b) Minor applications in 8 weeks (c) Other applications in 8 weeks Satisfaction Survey – Processing Planning Applications % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist Pervironment and Environmental Health	Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets (a) Major applications in 13 weeks (b) Minor applications in 8 weeks (c) Other applications in 8 weeks Satisfaction Survey – Processing Planning Applications % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% Has LA met milestones Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist Environment and Environmental Health	Description 2004/5 Actual 2005/6 Actual 2006/07 Actual quartile 2006/7 Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets 100% 50% 82% √ √ (a) Major applications in 13 weeks 100% 50% 82% √ √ (b) Minor applications in 8 weeks 78.87%* 71.91% 76% √ (c) Other applications in 8 weeks 90.24%* 94.53% 95% √ √ Satisfaction Survey − Processing Planning Applications % very/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% N/A N/A N/A N/A Did the LA submit LDS by 28.3.05? YES YES YES N/A Has LA met milestones N/A YES NO N/A Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications 50% 57% 24% √ √ Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist 77.7%* 83.3% 77.7% 83.3% 77.7%	Percentage of Planning Applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets (a) Major applications in 13 weeks (b) Minor applications in 8 weeks (c) Other applications in 8 weeks Satisfaction Survey − Processing Planning Applications weeks Percentage of Planning Applications in 8 weeks T8.87%* 71.91% Actual 2006/7 2006/7 Percentage of Planning Applications in 13 weeks 100% 50% 82% √ 78.87%* 71.91% 76% 94.53% 95% ✓ Satisfaction Survey − Processing Planning Applications Weary/fairly satisfied Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% Did the LA submit LDS by 28.3.05? YES YES YES N/A N/A N/A Percentage of appeals allowed against the Authority's decision to refuse applications Percentage score against a quality of planning services checklist Environment and Environmental Health	Description 2004/5 Actual 2005/6 Actual 2006/7 Quartile 2006/7 2006/7 2006/7	Description 2004/5 Actual 2006/6 Actual 2006/7 2006/7 2006/7 2006/7 2006/7 2006/7 2006/7	Description	Description	Description	Description 2004/5 Actual 2005/6 2006/07 2006/07 2006/07 2006/07 2006/7

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
216	Contaminated land												
	(a) Number of sites of potential concern	N/A	453	453	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	452	453			
	(b) Number of sites with sufficient information to decide if remediation is necessary as a percentage of all sites of potential concern	N/A	1%	0.66%				√	0.8%	1%	②	•	•
217	Pollution control improvements	N/A	100%	100%	√				100%	100%	•		•
218(a)	Abandoned vehicles investigated in 24 hours	N/A	100%	87%		√			90%	98%	S	1	•
218(b)	Abandoned vehicles removed in 24 hours	N/A	33%	94%		V			95%	100%	>	1	•
	<u>Culture and Related Services</u>												
170a	Visits to / use of museums per 1000 population	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
170b	Visits in person per 1000 population	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
170(c)	The number of pupils visiting Museums and Galleries in organised School trips	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?		
219(b)	Percentage of conservation areas with up to date character assessment	N/A	90%	90%	\checkmark				90%	90%	②		

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
119(a)	Satisfaction with Sports and Leisure facilities % very/fairly satisfied all Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% % very/fairly satisfied users Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X% % very/fairly satisfied non – users Base Number Confidence interval -+/-X%	N/A	N/A	51%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	•		
119(c)	Percentage satisfied with Museums	N/A	N/A	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	?.		
119(d)	Percentage satisfied with arts activities and venues	N/A	N/A	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	•		
119(e)	Percentage satisfied with Parks and Open Spaces	N/A	N/A	73%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	••		
126	Community Safety and Well-Being Domestic burglaries per 1000 households	10.3	8.3	5.2		V			4.8	5.7	•	•	•
127(a)	Violent crimes per 1,000 population	N/A	18.30	17.2			$\sqrt{}$		16.3	14.2	②		•
	a) VC by stranger per 1,000 population	7.3	TBC						TBC	TBC			
	b) VC in public place per 1,000 population	6.2	TBC						TBC	TBC			
	c) VC re licensed premises per 1,000 population	0.9	TBC						TBC	TBC			
	d) VC under influence per 1,000 population	-	TBC						TBC	TBC			
127(b)	Robberies per 1,000 population	0.32	0.7	0.5		\checkmark			0.50	0.60		•	•

BVPI No:	Description	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Actual	2006/07 Actual	Top quartile 2006/7	Above average 2006/7	Below average 2006/7	Bottom Quartile 2006/7	Target 2007/08	Actual 2007/08	Traffic light status	Short term trend	Long term trend
174	Number of Racial Incidents Recorded by the Authority per 100,000 population	17.82	1.8	1.78	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.5	3.57	•	1	•
175	Racial Incidents Resulting in Further Action	100%	100%	100%	V				100%	100%	>		
225	Actions against domestic violence	N/A	NOT AVAILABLE	36.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	40.0	45.4	3	•	•
226 (a)	Total amount spent by LA on advice and guidance provided by external organisations	N/A	£50,000	£63,247	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	£65,000	£73,979	G	•	•
226(b)	Percentage of monies spent on advice and guidance given to organisations holding the CLS quality mark	N/A	79.00%	79.00%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85%	81.52%	•	•	•
226(c)	Total amount spent on advice and guidance on areas of housing welfare and benefits directly by LA	N/A	£49,227	£38,81 8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	£40,000	£46,969	©	•	•

STATEMENT ON CONTRACTS AWARDED DURING THE PAST YEAR INVOLVING A TRANSFER OF STAFF

During the	year :	2007/08,	no	contracts	were	awarded	that	involv	ed a	trans	fer o	f staf	f out	of (Council
employme	nt into	the priva	ate s	sector.											