

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL  
CABINET – 6 SEPTEMBER 2016  
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR (FINANCE AND OPERATIONS)**

**PERFORMANCE EXCEPTION REPORT – AUGUST 2016**

**1 Summary**

- 1.1 This report summarises our strategic performance data on an exception basis following the monitoring of performance reports by Executive Members, Directors and Heads of Service.
- 1.2 Performance Clinics are held quarterly to review our progress towards business plan targets, performance indicator targets, financial performance, complaints and reports on our current strategic and operational risks. The most recent Clinic meeting was on Thursday 4 August 2016.
- 1.3 Performance reported as ‘not completed’ or ‘not improved’, is exception reported in the appendices to this report.

**2 Recommendation(s)**

- 2.1 That Cabinet note the contents of this report and approve any proposed actions highlighted in the appendices.

**3. Explanation**

- 3.1 A performance exception report is presented to Cabinet on a quarterly basis as part of our current performance management framework.
- 3.2 By working with Heads of Service in the production of the Clinic reports, we further embed accountability for performance and risk within our Officer structure. This allows for a flow of more detailed information to the Leadership.

**Implications**

**4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 There are no direct legal implications arising from the contents of this report.

**5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications associated with the production of Clinic reports. It is the responsibility of the Policy and Communications team which is resourced to do so.

**6. Risk Management Implications**

- 6.1 A risk assessment of our performance management framework is reviewed in April and October on the council’s strategic Risk Register.

**7. Security and Terrorism Implications**

7.1 There are no security and terrorism implications directly arising from the contents of this report.

**8. Procurement Implications**

8.1 There are no procurement implications directly arising from the contents of this report.

**9. Climate Change Implications**

9.1 There are no direct climate change implications arising from the contents of this report.

**10. Link to Corporate Priorities**

10.1 This report is linked to all the council's current Corporate Priorities as it shows the status of all business, finance and performance targets associated within each priority.

**11. Equality and Diversity**

11.1 Performance Clinic reports have no direct impact on our residents or community partners. As such, there has been no Equalities Impact Assessment completed on them.

**Name of Author**                      **Paul Underwood (01707) 357220**  
**Title**                                        **Head of Policy and Culture**

**Date**                                        **August 2016**

Background Papers:

- Appendix One            -            Business Plan Targets
- Appendix Two           -            Performance Indicators
- Appendix Three        -            Strategic Risks
- Appendix Four         -            Operational Risks

**Business Plan Targets – Quarter 1**

All Business Plan targets for 2016-17 are scheduled to be achieved by the end of March 2017.

Progress for all targets under our five Corporate Priorities is summarised here.

<b>Corporate Priority</b>	<b>Green (completed)</b>	<b>Amber (on schedule)</b>	<b>Red (not completed)</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1 – Maintain a safe and healthy community</b>	<b>3</b> (11%)	<b>23</b> (85%)	<b>1</b> (4%)	<b>27</b> (100%)
<b>2 – Protect and enhance the environment</b>	<b>1</b> (6%)	<b>17</b> (94%)	<b>0</b> (0%)	<b>18</b> (100%)
<b>3 – Meet the borough’s housing needs</b>	<b>3</b> (17%)	<b>15</b> (83%)	<b>0</b> (0%)	<b>18</b> (100%)
<b>4 – Help build a strong local economy</b>	<b>1</b> (7%)	<b>13</b> (93%)	<b>0</b> (0%)	<b>14</b> (100%)
<b>5 – Engage with our communities and provide value for money</b>	<b>4</b> (17%)	<b>20</b> (83%)	<b>0</b> (0%)	<b>24</b> (100%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b> (12%)	<b>88</b> (87%)	<b>1</b> (1%)	<b>101</b> (100%)

One target was not completed in Quarter 1 and this is exception reported below.

**Business Plan target reported as 'red' (not completed)**

<b>Business Plan Ref</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>By When</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Nature of Problem / Proposed Remedial Action / Other Comments</b>
<b>1.1.2</b>	Assist in the delivery and coordination of the first Hertfordshire Community Safety Conference	November 2016	Head of Housing & Community	<p>Due to staff changes at Hertfordshire County Council and within other Community Safety Partnerships across the county, this will not be taking place in 2016-17.</p> <p>It is hoped that a county conference will be held over 2017-18.</p>

Performance Indicators – Quarter 1 (2015-16 & 2016-17)

A summary of our core Performance Indicators collected over a two year period is shown here.

Total Number of Performance Indicators	Number of PI's – improved	Number of PI's - not improved	Number of PI's - remained the same
40 (100%)	29 (73%)	6 (15%)	5 (12%)

Six Performance Indicators did not report an improvement and are exception reported below.

Brief Description of Indicator	Q1 2015-16 Performance		Q1 2016-17 Performance		Service Comments
	Target	Outturn	Target	Outturn	
<p><b>PI 9</b> - Percentage of residents 'satisfied' with the way the Council manages its services</p> <p><i>Head of Policy &amp; Culture</i></p>	67.00%	72.00%	68.00%	67.00%	This outturn is provided by Serco who ask this question as part of their customer satisfaction survey of local residents. Performance almost matched the quarterly target but is lower than the 2015-16 outturn for the same period.
<p><b>PI 10</b> - Percentage of residents who feel 'well informed' about council services</p> <p><i>Head of Policy &amp; Culture</i></p>	71.00%	71.00%	72.00%	69.00%	This outturn is provided by Serco who ask this question as part of their customer satisfaction survey of local residents. Performance fell just short of the quarterly target and the outturn for the same period last year.
<p><b>PI 13</b> - School group visits to, and use of, museums and galleries</p> <p><i>Head of Policy &amp; Culture</i></p>	800	1,212	600	509	<p>The service has felt the impact of the loss of the Study Room in this quarter. Schools are offered a taught session in the main galleries but are reluctant to book because the only place for lunches is under the external marquees. The weather in Quarter 1 was unseasonably wet and cold.</p> <p>No schools booked at all during April because of the weather but this was partly due to Easter falling late and school terms adjusting to this.</p> <p>An options report on bringing the Study Room back into use is due at the end of August, including the expected cost of remedial works to do so.</p>

Brief Description of Indicator	Q1 2015-16 Performance		Q1 2016-17 Performance		Service Comments
	Target	Outturn	Target	Outturn	
<p><b>PI 18</b> - The percentage of residents either 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with street cleansing (e.g. litter and sweeping services)</p> <p><i>Head of Environment</i></p>	75.00%	73.80%	75.00%	68.10%	<p>This outturn is provided by Serco who ask this question as part of their customer satisfaction survey of local residents. Satisfaction was of a similar percentage last quarter. The majority view for 'unsatisfied' was visible litter and dirty roads.</p> <p>This perceived view was contrary to the prescribed DEFRA performance measurement for litter where measurement of the visible litter and dirty roads was assessed as 'unacceptable' in 5% of locations inspected.</p>
<p><b>PI 25</b> - Planning enforcement investigations completed within the stated timescale</p> <p><i>Head of Planning</i></p>	87.00%	88.00%	87.00%	75.00%	<p>Four cases were received so it was more challenging to meet the target. One case was dealt with just outside of the target time.</p>

Brief Description of Indicator	Q1 2015-16 Performance		Q1 2016-17 Performance		Service Comments
	Target	Outturn	Target	Outturn	
<p><b>PI 35</b> - Maximum number of households living in temporary accommodation in the borough</p> <p><i>Head of Housing &amp; Community</i></p>	55	67	55	63	<p>The number of households living in temporary accommodation is influenced by a number of factors, in particular the number of approaches made to the Housing Needs Team by homeless households, the time taken to assess homeless applications and, where the homeless duty is accepted, the availability of suitable move-on accommodation. A priority for the Housing Needs Team is to help prevent homelessness, thereby removing the need to provide temporary accommodation.</p> <p>The number of households approaching the Housing Needs Team in June increased by 19 from the previous month - although this does not translate into an increase in homelessness acceptances, rather it shows a positive trend in terms of our ability to prevent homelessness. The increase in approaches has resulted in advice on housing benefit and DHP, requests for night shelters, advice on the Housing Needs Register and advice on private rented.</p> <p>The main reason for approaches continues to be loss of private rented accommodation and parental eviction. Close controls are in place to ensure that decision making times are kept to a minimum when assessing whether the applicant meets the criteria for a duty to re-house. With regards to our private rented scheme, on average we are securing 2 properties per month for homeless families to move into.</p> <p>There are challenges around:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Local Housing Allowance rate is below market rate by £250.00+ (so landlords will seek a market rent where possible).</li> <li>2. Not all buy to let mortgages (the norm for most small landlords) will allow the landlord to let to people in receipt of benefit.</li> <li>3. Some landlords have rent guarantee insurance, meaning that they cannot accept households in receipt of benefit or low income without a guarantor.</li> <li>4. Some people have negative credit, this means that they cannot be put forward to letting agents as they would fail the credit checks. This also applies to people who solely rely on housing benefit.</li> </ol>

**Strategic Risks**

Our Risk Register enables the reporting of all strategic risks using a traffic light system to determine both their impact and likelihood of occurrence. Strategic risks are assessed by the responsible Executive Director and their Executive Member based on current circumstances and are reviewed and updated every six months in April and October.

All strategic risks are summarised here:

<b>Current Strategic Risks</b>		
<b>Red</b>	<b>Amber</b>	<b>Green</b>
<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>6 (40%)</b>	<b>9 (60%)</b>

Amber strategic risks were reported in: Local Plan, Governance, Communications, Engagement, Performance Management and Finance.

Mitigation plans and other risk controls are in place for all of our current strategic risks.

**Operational Risks**

Operational risks are assessed by each of our services on the Risk Register. This is done in the same way as strategic risks but they are unique to individual services. There are currently seven operational risks reported as 'Red' across our services. These are in the following services:

**Governance & Public Health**

- Hackney Carriages – Occupational stress.
- Hackney Carriages – Deliberate damage to Hackney Carriage staff's personal property.
- Public Health – Out of hours noise monitoring for breach of notice.

**Planning, Housing & Community**

- Planning - IT failure or inappropriate / inadequate IT systems.
- Planning - Inadequate professional resource.
- Strategic Housing – Non delivery on Section 106 sites.

**Environment**

- Environment Services – Recycling Finances / Markets.

'Red' risks can be re-assessed by the Head of Service or Executive Director at any time, which may lead to them reducing to either 'Amber' or 'Green'. Risk owners are also prompted by the council's Risk and Resilience Manager to review them every April and October.