

Public Document Pack

CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 28 April 2004

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Year End Report 2003/04 (Pages 1 - 7)
- report of Performance and Development Officer

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1. **Meeting** CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

2. **Date of Meeting** 28 April 2004

3. **Title** Year End Report, 2003/4

4. **Originating Officer** John Mansergh
Performance and Development Officer
Tel Ext 2220

5. **Issue**

The report details the Housing and Environmental Services Programme Area performance set against relevant performance indicators during the third quarter of this financial year.

6. **Summary**

At the end of the year, 77% of the indicators have achieved or exceeded the year end target. Action is in place to ensure that we learn from our experiences with the other indicators, so that we achieve further progress next year. This is a substantial improvement from the previous year where 50% of our indicators met the outturn targets. These results signify a “sea change” in performance management within the programme area as 43 (84%) of our KPI’s have improved over the last twelve months.

When compared to the All England figures published in December 2003, we have 87.5% of our indicators in the top and upper middle quartiles. This compares to 57.5% of our indicators in the higher quartiles in 2002/3. Since the end of 2003/4, 3 indicators have moved up 2 quartile places, 4 have moved up one and 9 have remained static. During 2003/4 none of our indicators dropped a quartile place.

In addition, following a request from Environmental Scrutiny Panel we now report performance in relation to CPA indicators. 75% of the CPA indicators achieved the year-end targets. We have already identified the need to take action to improve CPA and LPSA indicators so that we improve our performance on corporate priority “**a safe place, a place to live and to be a progressive, responsive, accessible and quality service provider**”.

Our improvement in performance management has been recognised by two different inspections during 2003/4. The Regular Performance Assessment on waste management commented “an increase in customer satisfaction with refuse collection”.

7. **Clearance/Consultation**

The report will be discussed with Service Managers and Performance Indicator Managers and will be presented to the Audit Commission for the Indicative ALMO Inspection on 7 June 2004 and the Waste Management Inspection in 26 July 2004.

8. **Timing**

Information will be presented to Cabinet Member on a quarterly basis.

9. **Background**

The programme area’s comprehensive Performance Management Framework has enabled a regular update on where we are and the actions needed to rectify poor performance. This

report follows previous reports on last year's performance presented to Cabinet Member on 29 September 2003, 1 December 2003 and 15 March 2004.

10. **Argument**

Our KPI suite for 2004/5 has been altered to reflect a better balance between customer focus and performance. Local Government is at its best when we are in touch with our customers and we firmly believe that we will achieve our goals by using this approach to performance management.

Our performance results have improved from 50% in 2002/3 to 77% in 2003/4. Our approach to performance management has been to focus on people rather than systems. Excellent managers bring performance management processes alive and they remain a critical component of a successful Housing and Environmental Services.

Our Performance Management Framework has been commended by the Audit Commission in the Repairs and Maintenance Re-Inspection in February 2003 but we have since put measures in place so that we have a framework that delivers even better results for the year ahead.

11. **Risks and Uncertainties**

Failure to perform to the standards of top quartile authorities will mean that we will not achieve our aims this year of "improving our CPA scores" and a "3 star housing management service". The impact of not achieving this will be damaging to our aspiration to deliver improvements in key strategic areas such as planning and investment. This will have a "knock on" effect on our reputation, service delivery, compliance and performance. These risks are being managed through a whole range of measures such as our Performance Management Framework, service business plans, financial management and service improvement plans.

12. **Finance**

There is an administration cost to producing the reports.

13. **Sustainability**

A rigorous performance management culture within Housing & Environmental Services will increase our capacity to deliver our mission of 'building sustainable neighbourhoods'.

14. **Wards Affected**

All

15. **References**

www.audit-commission.gov.uk
www.housemark.co.uk

16. **Presentation**

The KPI March Report is attached.

17. **Recommendations**

THAT CABINET MEMBER IS ASKED TO NOTE THE REPORT AND THE PROGRESS MADE.



KPI Monthly Summary

— March 2004

**Housing &
Environmental Services**

HES KPI Performance Summary – March 2004

The purpose of this report is to show the current performance against our Programme Areas KPI's. In total 53 HES KPI's are monitored throughout the year against agreed control targets. This information was used to identify whether KPI's are on target to meet the 2003/04 target, identify good and poor performance. It highlighted areas for further analysis and early recovery action. This year-end report analyses the success of each KPI, a comparison from 2002/3 and identifies the movement of quartile positions made throughout the year. Data contained in this year-end report will be used to inform and support the year-end Performance Clinic regime.

Performance against Control Targets

In March, 41 (77%) KPI's are on target and have achieved the year-end target that was negotiated by the PI Manager. 12 (23%) have not achieved their stretching targets. These include 1 KPI which is included in the Mission Possible suite of indicators. These results represent a "sea change" in performance within the programme area as 42 (84%) of our KPI's have improved since the start of the year. In 2002/3, 18 (50%) KPI's achieved the year-end target and 18 (50%) KPI's did not achieve their targets.

The KPI's not achieving the year-end targets in 2003/4 are:

Housing Services

- BV 183 – Average stay in bed & breakfast (Angela Smith)
- BV 66a – Rent collection (Dave Abbott)
- BV 74 – Satisfaction with landlord services (Dave Abbott)
- BV 75 – Satisfaction with decision making (Dave Abbott)
- HES 69 – Rent loss through voids (Dave Abbott)
- HES 13b - % of stock which is void (Dave Abbott)
- HES 14 – Average void time from termination to start (Dave Abbott)
- **HES 72 – Urgent repairs time limits (Gary Whitaker) – Mission Possible**
- BV 185 – Repairs by appointment (Gary Whitaker)
- HES 8 – Repairs completed on first visit (Gary Whitaker)

Environmental Health

- BV 86 – Cost of waste collection per household (Adrian Gabriel)
- BV 90b – Satisfaction with local recycling facilities (Adrian Gabriel)

LPSA Performance

Of the 6 KPI's that are covered by HES in the Local Public Sector Agreement, 3 appear to be on target and 3 have not achieved year-end targets. Efforts will be intensified to ensure that the LPSA targets are achieved for 2004/5 and ultimately 2005/6.

PI Ref.	Description	2003/4 Actual	2003/4 Target	2004/5 Target	2005/6 Target
BV 82a	% of waste recycled	10.6%	10.2%	12.5%	14%
BV 82b	% of waste composted	4.2%	2.8%	5.5%	7%
HES 68	Average void relet time.	22.84 Days	29 Days	20 Days	15 Days
HES 69	Rent loss through voids.	1.58%	1.3%	1.25%	1.24%
HES 72	Urgent repairs completed in time.	94.1%	96%	97%	98%
BV 185	Repairs appointments made and kept.	66.21%	75%	77%	80%

CPA KPI Performance

Of the 12 PI's that are covered by HES in the CPA (Comprehensive Performance Assessment), 9 achieved the year-end target and 3 have been unable to achieve the targets.

PI Ref.	Description	2003/4 Actual	2003/4 Target	2004/5 Target	2005/6 Target
BV 82a	% of waste recycled	10.6%	10.2%	12.5%	14%
BV 82b	% of waste composted	4.2%	2.8%	5.5%	7%
BV 84	Kg's of waste per head	478	500	526	541
BV 91	% served by kerbside collection of recyclables	96.4%	96.4%	96.4%	96.4%
BV 62	Unfit private dwellings made fit/demolished.	3.21%	3.2%	2.9%	2.6%
BV 183	The average length of stay in b&b accomm.	0.67 Days	0.43 Days	0.29 Days	0.14 Days
BV 63	Energy Efficiency SAP rating.	58	58	59	60
HES 68	Average void relet time.	22.84 Days	29 Days	20 Days	15 Days
HES 72	Urgent repairs completed in time.	94.1%	96%	97%	98%
HES 73	Average time to complete non-urgent repairs.	14.85 days	15 Days	14 Days	10 Days
BV 184	Change in non-decent homes.	19.05%	16.08%	10.82%	9.33%
BV 185	Repairs appointments made and kept.	66.21%	75%	77%	80%

Performance Direction

40 KPI's (87%) have shown improvement or have positively remained static since February 2004. Other than 1 of the indicators named above (HES 8), 5 KPI's have worsened but hit the year-end target, these are:

- BV 82b - % of waste composted (Adrian Gabriel)
- HES 5 – New tenancies lasting more than 12 months (Dave Abbott)
- HES 3a,b - % of anti social behaviour complaints dealt within target time (Dave Abbott)
- HES 6a – Time taken to process adaptations (Chris Wade)

Comparing performance against 2002/3 Outturn

Indicator	Description	Manager	Outturn 2002/03	Outturn 2003/04	%age improvement
BV 185	Repairs appointments	Gary Whitaker	10.21%	66.21%	548.48%
BV 82b	Waste composted	Adrian Gabriel	1.80%	4.20%	133.33%
HES 88	Missed bin collections	Adrian Gabriel	138	25	81.88%
BV 82a	Waste recycled	Adrian Gabriel	6.20%	10.60%	70.97%
HES 68	Average relet times	Dave Abbott	49.06	22.84	53.44%
HES 73	Non-urgent times	Gary Whitaker	29.66	14.85	49.33%
BV 184 a	Decent homes	Dave Middleton	12.94%	19.05%	47.22%
HES 67	Homelessness decisions	Angela Smith	75%	100%	33.33%
HES 19	Consumer protection visits	Craig Fisher	62%	77%	24.19%
HES D8	Non-decent houses	Dave Middleton	11,668	9435	19.14%
BV 90b	Recycling satisfaction	Adrian Gabriel	53%	71%	18%
HES 72	Urgent repair times	Gary Whitaker	82.37%	94.10%	14.24%
BV 166a	Enforcement score	Bob Crosby	88%	100%	13.64%
BV 166b	Enforcement score	Bob Crosby	88%	100%	13.64%
BV 90c	Waste disposal satisfaction	Adrian Gabriel	69%	81%	12%
BV 90a	Waste collection satisfaction	Adrian Gabriel	82%	91%	9%
BV 87	Cost of waste disposal	Adrian Gabriel	£27.94	£25.83	7.55%
BV 82d	Waste landfilled	Adrian Gabriel	92.00%	85.20%	7.39%
HES 17	Response times	Bob Crosby	97.70%	100%	2.35%
BV 91	Kerbside recyclable collections	Adrian Gabriel	94.40%	96.40%	2.12%
BV 63	Energy efficiency rating	Brian Marsh	57	58	1.75%
BV 84	Kg's waste per head	Adrian Gabriel	486	478	1.65%
BV 164	Race equality in housing	Dave Abbott	Yes	Yes	0.00%
BV 82c	Waste for heat and power	Adrian Gabriel	0%	0%	0.00%
HES 18	Food inspections	Jan Manning	100%	99.80%	-0.20%
BV 66a	Rent collected	Dave Abbott	98.08%	97.72%	-0.37%
HES 66b	Rent arrears of current tenants	Dave Abbott	1.72%	1.75%	-1.74%
BV 62	Private dwellings made fit/demolished	Brian Marsh	3.64%	3.21%	-11.81%
HES 69	Rent loss through voids	Dave Abbott	1.39%	1.58%	-13.67%
BV 64	Private dwellings occupied/demolished	Brian Marsh	110	92	-16.36%
BV 86	Cost of waste collection	Adrian Gabriel	£39.99	£46.57	-16.45%
BV 183	Use of B&B accommodation	Angela Smith	0.43	0.67	-55.81%

Of the 8 (25%) KPI's that have not improved since 2002/3, we predicted that 5 of these would not improve on the outturn for 2003/4. This is due to a number of reasons:

- HES 18 – Change to PI description so SMART target of 90% introduced.
- BV 62 – PI based on demolition programmes over a 5 year period. There has been less demolition in 2003/4.
- BV 64 – Less programmed demolition in 2003/4.
- BV 86 – Our kerbside recycling commitment leads to increase collection costs.
- BV 183 – Historic B&B performance affecting the indicator.

In addition, the remaining 3 indicators are still performing to high standards when compared to 2001/2 quartile data:

- HES 66b – Top Quartile All England and Metropolitan Authorities.
- HES 69 – Upper middle (All England) and Top Quartile (Metropolitan Authorities).
- HES 18 - Top Quartile All England and Metropolitan Authorities.

Comparing Performance of the “new” Local Performance Indicators

In April 2003 we introduced 19 new Local Performance Indicators to our KPI suite. This was to ensure that we measured the things which mattered most to our customers. We developed these through consultation with customers at focus groups and as a result of customer opinion surveys.

Since our baseline position in April 2003, 18 (95%) of these indicators have improved.

Indicator	Description	Manager	April 2003	Outturn 2003/04	Traffic Light
HES 1	Syringes removed in target time	Mark Ford	90%	100%	
HES 2	Prosecutions for dog fouling	Mark Ford	0.12	4.24	
HES 3 a,b,c	% of anti-social complaints dealt within target	Dave Abbott	75/95/100	97/98/100	
HES 4	Prosecutions for littering	Mark Ford	0.16	11.72	
HES 5	% of new tenancies that last more than 12 months	Dave Abbott	87.4%	97.5%	
HES 6 a,b	Time taken to process adaptations	Chris Wade	496/253	291/183	
HES 7	% of properties gas serviced	Paul Ruston	23.4%	98.11%	
HES 8	Repairs completed on first visit	Gary Whitaker	70%	75.83%	
HES 9	Budget Spend Ratio (60/40) Programmed	Dave Middleton	49/51	51/49	
HES 10	% of repairs completed in 20 working days	Gary Whitaker	95.2%	96%	
HES 11	% of recouped rechargeable repairs	Simon Bell	15%	27.7%	
HES 12	Performance of spend on Capital Programmes	Dave Middleton	0%	100%	
HES 13 a,b	% of stock which void	Dave Abbott	1.84/0.52	1.55/0.60	
HES 14	Average void time from Termination to Start	Dave Abbott	21.9	23.15	
HES 16	% compliance visits carried out in comparison with the industrial process emission control programme	Craig Fisher	2.34%	100%	

Comparing Performance with other authorities

The “sea change” in performance is evidenced by the way we compare with other authorities on our Best Value Performance Indicators.

Since the end of 2003/4:

- 3 (BV 82a, BV 82b, BV 82d) have moved up two quartile places.

Performance against Programme Area Priorities – March 2004

 Deleted: 1
 1

PI Ref.	Description	March 04 Actual	↑↓ Since Feb 04	2003/4 Target	2004/5 Target	2005/6 Target
Delivering a clear achievable housing strategy						
BV 62	Unfit private dwellings made fit/demolished.	3.21%	↑	3.2%	2.9%	2.6%
BV 64	Private vacant dwellings occupied/demolished	92	↑	65	40	40
BV 164	Following the Racial Equality's code of practice	Full	Same	Yes	Yes	Yes
BV 183	The average length of stay in b&b accomm.	0.67	↑	0.43 Days	0.29 Days	0.14 Days
HES 67	Homeless applications – decides/notifies in 33 days.	100%	Same	97%	98%	99%
HES 5	% of new tenancies that last more than 12 months	97.5%	↑	80%		
Achieving Decent Homes Targets						
BV 63	Energy Efficiency SAP rating.	58	Same	58	59	60
BV 184	Change in non-decent homes.	19.05%	↑	16.08%	10.82%	9.33%
HES D8	No. of non-decent council houses	9435	↑	9,793	8,318	7,068
Ensuring a step change in the %of household waste we recycle and/or compost by 31/03/06						
BV 82a	% of waste recycled	10.6%	↑	10.2%	12.5%	14%
BV 82b	% of waste composted	4.2%	↓	2.8%	5.5%	7%
BV 82c	% of waste used for heat and power	0%	Same	0%	0%	0%
BV 82d	% of waste landfilled	85.2%	Same	87%	82%	79%
BV 84	Kg's of waste per head	478	↑	500	526	541
BV 86	Cost of waste collection per household.	£46.57	↑	£44.83	-	-
BV 87	Cost of waste disposal per tonne	£25.83	↓	£28.89	-	-
HES 88	Number of collections missed per 100,000	25	↑	53	48	43
BV 91	% served by kerbside collection of recyclables	96.4%	Same	96.4%	96.4%	96.4%
Develop a comprehensive Enforcement function						
BV 166	Enforcement Best Practice Score	100%100%	↑	100%	100%	100%
HES 18	% of food inspections – High Risk	99.8%		90%	-	-
HES 19	% of consumer protection visits – High Risk	77%	↑	70%	100%	100%
HES 1	% of visits to collect syringes in target time	100%	Same	90%	-	-
HES 4	Prosecutions for littering	11.72	↑	6	-	-
HES 2	Prosecutions for dog fouling	4.24	↑	2.4	-	-
HES 16	% compliance visits carried out in comparison with the industrial process emission control programme	100%	↑	90%	-	-
Improving our performance as a landlord						
BV 66a	Rent collected.	97.72%	↑	98.2%	98.2%	98.2%
HES 66b	Rent arrears of current tenants.	1.75%	↑	1.8%	1.75%	1.73%
BV 74	Satisfaction with the landlord	tbc	n/a	80%	-	-
BV 75	Satisfaction with decision making opportunities	tbc	n/a	66%	-	-
HES 3	% of anti-social complaints dealt within target	97 98 100	↓	90/ 90/100		
HES 11	% of recouped rechargeable repairs	27.7%	↑	12%		
Improving Void turnaround times and optimising income						
HES 68	Average void relet time.	22.84 days	↑	29 Days	20 Days	15 Days
HES 69	Rent loss through voids.	1.58%	Same	1.3%	1.25%	1.24%
HES 13	% of stock which void	1.55 0.60	↑/↑	1.75/0.45%	-	-
HES 14	Average void time from Termination to Start	23.15	↑	21 Days		
Driving up the performance of the repairs and maintenance service						
HES 72	Urgent repairs completed in time.	94.1%	↑	96%	97%	98%
HES 73	Average time to complete non-urgent repairs.	14.85 days	↑	15 Days	14 Days	10 Days
BV 185	Repairs appointments made and kept.	66.21%	↓	75%	77%	80%
HES 6	Time taken to process adaptations	291/183	↓/↑	350/225		
HES 7	% of properties gas serviced	98.11%	↑	98%	-	-
HES 8	Repairs completed on first visit	75.83%	↓	80%		
HES 10	% of repairs completed in 20 working days	96%	↑	96%		
HES 9	Budget Spend Ratio (60/40) Programmed	51/49%	↑	49/51	-	-
HES 12	Performance of spend on Capital Programmes	100%	↑	100%	-	-

NB – Local Public Service Agreement KPI's are highlighted in Yellow, Mission Possible KPI's are highlighted in blue. Green – KPI Achieving monthly control target, Red – KPI Failing.