

# Cheltenham Borough Council

Council – 24 June 2012

## Review of the council's performance at end of 2012-13

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Councillor Jon Walklett, Cabinet Member Corporate Services</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager</b>
<b>Accountable scrutiny committee</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Key Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	The report takes information and data from our performance management system to enable Council to review the corporate performance of the organisation at the end of the financial year 2012-13.
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Council to approve the review of performance in 2012-13.</b>

<b>Financial implications</b>	None as a result of this report
<b>Legal implications</b>	None as the result of this report
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	None as the result of this report
<b>Key risks</b>	<p>The business planning process helps the council manage risk in a number of areas, but particularly through creating a strategic framework for the management of projects and initiatives.</p> <p>If we do not respond to performance information, then we may not direct change and improvement in a positive direction.</p>
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	This report sets out performance information relating to the delivery of corporate priorities in 2012-13.
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	None identified as a result of this report

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The council agreed its corporate strategy action plan 2012-13 in March 2012. The action plan set out our 5 objectives and 10 outcomes and a range of milestones and indicators to measure performance in 2012-13.
- 1.2 The performance report takes information and data from our performance management system to provide Cabinet with an overview of how the council performed last year. There are three performance appendices – Appendix 2 is an overview of performance against the 10 outcomes in terms of what went well and what didn't go so well. Appendix 3 provides a more detailed picture of the progress made against the corporate strategy milestones and indicators. Appendix 4 lists out how Cheltenham Borough Homes has contributed to the delivery of the council's outcomes.

## 2. 2012-13 Performance Overview

### 2.1 Corporate Strategy milestones

2.2 In the 2012-13 action plan, we identified 78 milestones to track our progress. Out of these:

- 56 (72%) of milestones were completed at the end of the year.
- 16 milestones are classed as being amber as there are plans for their completion within a reasonable timeframe.
- 6 milestones are red and will not be achieved within a reasonable timeframe.



The six red milestones are:

Milestones	owner	Progress
Completion of Joint Core Strategy (JCS) public consultation on preferred option.	Mike Redman	Further work is currently being undertaken by consultants Cambridge Centre for Planning and Research to be reported to Member Steering Group in May 2013. This will assist in reviewing the Objectively Assessed Need in light of projections arising from 2011 Census.  To ignore the release of this data could make the JCS unsound. This additional work has impacted upon the JCS programme, pushing the public consultation back to September 2013. This delay has been agreed by JCS Cross-Boundary Programme Board.
Consideration of JCS preferred option by Council for purposes of public consultation.	Mike Redman	The preferred option will not now be considered by the partner councils until September 2013, following additional evidential work commissioned by the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research looking at economic requirements. This process will need to agree both the objectively assessed need for development (including that required to support the economy) and the strategic locations for growth within the JCS area.
Consideration of revisions to JCS in light of 2011/12 public consultation by CBC planning working group	Mike Redman	A timetable for the Cheltenham Plan has now been established, together with revised milestones for the JCS which will reach the preferred option stage in September 2013, with planned adoption after public examination following sequentially in 2014.

Community governance review of parish council boundaries – agree terms of reference	Richard Gibson	A decision was made by council to not proceed with the review as planned - will now be postponed to tie in with parish elections in 2018
Community governance review – Undertake consultation	Richard Gibson	as above
Community governance review – Report to council recommending future parish council boundaries	Richard Gibson	as above

### 2.3 Performance indicators



In the 2012-13 action plan, we identified 52 key indicators to track our progress. Out of these:


- 32 were indicators which CBC is directly accountable for and targets have been set.
- 12 were indicators which CBC is directly accountable for and no targets have been set
- 8 were community-based indicators for economic development and community safety

Out of the 32 CBC indicators with targets:

- 26 (81%) were met;
- 3 (9%) are currently red, meaning that they did not meet targets;
- 3 (9%) have not yet been updated;

The three red indicators are:

Indicator	Status	end of year target	Actual	Commentary
Amount of household waste reused, recycled and composted (quarterly)		48%	45.14%	<p>Whilst the total amount of waste recycled improved by 100 tonnes during 2012/13, the amounts of garden waste collected were below that estimated, which is assumed to be because of the wet summer. This shortfall together with an increase of 1,000 tonnes of general waste collected compared to the previous year as a result of the continued collection of side waste in a number of areas within Cheltenham and the large amounts of waste produced after the snowfall, has impacted on the total percentage calculations and associated measured performance.</p> <p>The 'no side waste' and 'closed bin lid' policy enforcement began being introduced on a phased approach in July 2012 and had a positive effect in reducing the total amounts of general waste collected. Whilst it is not possible to provide an accurate estimation, the total increase in general waste would have undoubtedly been higher if this initiative hadn't been launched, which would have had more of a negative impact on performance.</p>
Attendance on the Re-Active programme (quarterly & cumulative)		12000	9,417	<p>Attendances registered through the reactive concessions schemes were affected by reduced referral numbers from health partners and changes in pricing which had caused some confusion for some of the clients and a degree of migration onto other concession schemes.</p>

				<p>The shortfalls seen in the first part of the year were not mirrored in second half of the year and low initial numbers skewed the result across the year. The year closed with 9417 attendance recorded against a target of 10350.</p> <p>It is noteworthy that the attendances at the centre generally were ahead on previous years and against target achieving 304,000 versus a target of 302,000.</p> <p>In summary trends and actual attendances show a strong growth and uptake in the concession schemes on offer despite the small changes in one of two products.</p>
Number of reactive concession referrals (quarterly & cumulative)		350	281	<p>These link directly to the indicator above (attendances on the Reactive programme). Significant shortfalls in the first 6 months of the year ensured that the target would not be met. Reduced NHS services linked to mental health and alternative schemes in combination with lower referrals, pricing changes resulted in a 33% shortfall Apr - Sep. Actions over pricing, product and work with remaining NHS partners saw recovery in the second part of the year with referrals returning to target levels. Sadly the cold weather in March saw the numbers in that single month fall very short skewing the 2nd half of the year. Overall the year saw 281 referrals to reactive concession cards against a target of 383.</p> <p>All concessions registered started in March 2012 at 3003 and by March 2013 had grown to 3100.</p> <p>Wider membership also grew from 1189 to 1621 members - a growth of over 36%.</p>

### 3. Consultation and feedback

- 3.1** The draft performance report was presented to the council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2013. Matters of interest included the Joint Core Strategy and the Parish Council boundary review where milestones were not met and the waste and recycling performance indicator which was below target. The committee was satisfied that appropriate mechanisms were in place to enable the effective scrutiny of future performance on these three matters.
- 3.2** Other performance matters raised included progress on meeting the carbon emissions reduction target, provision of activities for young people and the future approach to neighbourhood management. Again the committee was satisfied that elected members had opportunities to contribute to the council's approach to the first two matters and would consider looking at neighbourhood management at a future meeting.

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact officer:</b> Richard Gibson, Strategy and Engagement Manager. 01242 235 354 richard.gibson@cheltenham.gov.uk
<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk Assessment</li> <li>2. Review of outcomes 2012-13</li> <li>3. Corporate Performance 2012-13</li> <li>4. CBH contributions to CBC Corporate Plan 2012-13</li> </ol>
<b>Background information</b>	2012-13 Corporate Strategy action plan, Report to Council, 28 <sup>th</sup> March 2012

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
CD5a	If the division does not use performance information and feedback from customers, communities and elected members to effectively monitor the delivery of commissioned services in stage 4 of the commissioning cycle, then we will not be able to use this information to inform future commissioning exercises.	Jane Griffiths	March 2013	2	3	6	reduce	Development of consistent performance management reporting for commissioned services  Build into the Futures Council programme	31-Mar-14	Rachel McKinnon	on commissioning division risk register
<p><b>Explanatory notes</b></p> <p><b>Impact</b> – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)</p> <p><b>Likelihood</b> – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)</p> <p><b>Control</b> - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close</p>											