

# Report

6

Report to:	<b>Enterprise Services Committee</b>
Date of Meeting:	<b>4 February 2014</b>
Report by:	<b>Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Resources) Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)</b>

Subject:	<b>Statutory Performance Indicators 2012/2013</b>
----------	---

## 1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ♦ provide the Enterprise Services Committee with an analysis of the performance and ranking results relating to audited Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs) for 2012/13
- ♦ inform of improvement actions confirmed by Enterprise Services
- ♦ confirm implications arising from the transition from SPIs to those measures included within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework

## 2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Committee is asked to approve the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that summary information in respect of performance and ranking is noted both in respect of all SPIs and also those which are noted as being of high importance;
- (2) that the one measures which is confirmed as being of high importance, has shown improved performance in 2012/13 whilst it remains in quartile 3;
- (3) that the range of improvement actions identified by Enterprise Services is noted; and
- (4) that consideration of the results is given in terms of the transition from SPIs to measures contained within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework, and account should continue to be taken of those measures identified as being of high importance.

## 3. Background

3.1. The Local Government Act 1992 saw the formal introduction of SPIs into local authorities. Each year, the Accounts Commission publish a Direction relating to SPIs which require to be reported on by the Council. The Direction relating to 2012/13 continued with the same suite of SPIs used in 2011/12, and noted only a minor change to SPI 13a/b relating to planning applications. This is now split into two measures, ie major developments and local developments rather than three as previously (householder, non-householder and all applications). The Commission notes that these indicators do not cover all the services and functions against which councils are required to report and are seen as only one element of performance monitoring.

- 3.2. As a result of the work in respect of the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (SOLACE benchmarking indicators), the specified SPIs are being replaced from 2013/14. However, many of these existing measures will continue to be monitored and reported on, either locally or in an updated format under the new benchmarking framework.
- 3.3. The information included in this report focuses on the SPI results for 2012/13. It should be noted that the figures have been audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), submitted to Audit Scotland and published on the Council's website within the statutory timescales. As in previous years, the full list of the Council's SPIs for 2012/13 has been published in the Annual Report and Accounts.
- 3.4. In order to provide Committee with the necessary level of detail, Resource officers have provided information in terms of explanations of variances year-on-year, and more specifically, where performance has declined. Details of improvement actions which have been put in place are also provided. Resources have also taken the opportunity to comment on areas of improved performance and explain how they aim to maintain this trend into 2013/14. This is all detailed at Appendix A.
- 3.5. For 2012/13 there are still two indicators, however these are now broken down into three measures for comparison purposes instead of the four measures in 2011/12, due to the minor change to Indicator 13 relating to Planning Applications. Because of the changes, there is no comparable data for previous years for this indicator (of medium importance).
- 3.6. Committee will recall the SPI prioritisation exercise carried out on 2009/10 SPIs, which confirmed their relevance to Connect and Resource priorities referencing them as being of high, medium or low importance. From this exercise, it was agreed that Executive Directors would use the data and analysis behind the measures to help inform their improvement planning process. This prioritisation exercise was revisited during 2012/13 to take account of Connect 2012-2017.
- 3.7. Comparisons included within this report provide a year-on-year analysis for Enterprise Services. Information relating to Enterprise Services' national ranking of its SPIs and quartile positions is also provided. This information has been analysed from Audit Scotland's 2012/13 SPI compendium which is a compilation of the results for all Scottish local authorities. This allows the Council's performance relative to other local authorities to be considered and analysed.
- 3.8. No one element of SPI information should be considered in isolation. It is important to take account of operational performance, including percentage improvement or decline as relevant; ranking and movements within and across quartiles; and assessment of relevant importance of the measure to the Council.

- 3.9. Appendix A details the performance results for the Enterprise Services' measures in 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13, where available. It also identifies if they have improved, declined or not changed when comparing 2011/12 with 2012/13, together with an explanation of performance and proposals for improvement during 2013/14 as appropriate. Appendix A also includes ranking information. The SPI results for all Scottish local authorities are collated and listed in order from the highest performing (ranked 1) to the lowest performing authority (ranked 32). This provides the opportunity to consider movements in the ranking position in comparison with all the other local authorities.

#### 4. Summary analysis - performance and ranking

- 4.1. There are three measures (four in 2011/12) relating to the two Enterprise Services' SPIs. As the two measures relating to planning applications have changed since last year, they are not comparable and are excluded from this analysis. While the relative timescales for planning decisions and the reasons for this are noted in Appendix A, it is worth recognising that 97% of all applications are approved and this approval rate is well above the Scottish average of 92%.
- 4.2. Table 1 below details the only High importance measure. Although performance has improved, the ranking position against other councils has declined marginally during 2012/13, but remained in Quartile 3.

**Table 1 – High importance measure – ranking has declined**

High Importance Measures		Ranking/Quartile					Performance
		2011/12		2012/13		Quartile Up/down	Up/down
		Rank	Quartile	Rank	Quartile		
CER 22	Carriageway condition – % roads to be considered for maintenance treatment	18	3	19	3	NC	↑

- 4.3. Committee is asked to note the results from the analysis of the 2012/13 SPIs. In recent years the outcome of this exercise was to assist Resources in informing their improvement planning process and to give due consideration to those measures deemed of high importance to the Council. Committee is advised that 2012/13 is the final year that SPIs will be in use and that from 2013/14 the focus transfers to the measures within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF).
- 4.4. In this period of transition (ie 2012/13 to 2013/14), each Executive Director is asked to continue to take particular account of the results of high Importance measures in the Resource improvement planning process.
- 4.5. While measures will no longer be formally reported in their current format, it is acknowledged that they will continue to be used internally as local performance indicators. On that basis, the Executive Director is asked to consider those results also as part of improvement planning, and this will provide a focus for monitoring at Senior Management Team level.
- 4.6. Following consultation with councils over the autumn of 2013, the Improvement Service has announced its finalised set of benchmarking indicators for 2012/13. It plans to publish these in March 2014.

## **5. Next steps**

- 5.1. In line with the SPI Direction 2012, the focus of future years will move from SPIs to LGBF measures.

## **6. Employee Implications**

- 6.1. There are no employee implications.

## **7. Financial Implications**

- 7.1. There are no financial implications.

## **8. Other Implications**

- 8.1. The management of risk in relation to SPIs is addressed by Resources in the identification and progression of Improvement Measures for all declining SPIs. For those SPIs which have not declined, Resources have considered their approach to maintaining continued performance.
- 8.2. There are no sustainable development implications.

## **9. Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements**

- 9.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore no impact assessment is required.
- 9.2. There was also no requirement to undertake any consultation in terms of the information contained in this report.

**Paul Manning**

**Executive Director (Finance and Corporate Resources)**

**Colin McDowall**

**Executive Director (Community and Enterprise Resources)**

31 December 2013

### **Link(s) to Council Objectives/Values**

- ♦ Promote performance management and improvement

### **Previous References**

- ♦ Enterprise Services Committee 22 January 2013 – Statutory Performance Indicators 2011/12

### **List of Background Papers**

- ♦ Audit Scotland SPI Direction

### **Contact for Further Information**

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Ian Murray, Policy Manager

Ext: 5297 (Tel: 01698 455297)

E-mail: [ian.murray@southlanarkshire.gov.uk](mailto:ian.murray@southlanarkshire.gov.uk)

## Enterprise Services

Priority	Ref	Planning	Comments	2012/13		2011/12		2010/11	
				SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC	SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC	SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC
Med	13  (a)	<b>Planning Applications</b> (changed indicator hence no comparable figures) <b>Processing Time</b> The average time (weeks) to deal with major and local planning applications determined during the year:  Major developments	<b>2012/13 Performance</b> The average processing time for major planning applications is based on only 23 applications and is significantly skewed by the time taken for three of these applications (due to developers delaying signing Section 75 agreements). If we exclude these three applications, the average processing time is reduced to 47.3 weeks. Whilst still lengthy, this includes applications which require legal agreements covering financial contributions and which can be delayed whilst awaiting additional necessary supporting information from the applicant.	98.3 wks NA	23 NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Priority	Ref	Planning	Comments	2012/13		2011/12		2010/11	
				SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC	SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC	SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC
Med	(b)	Local developments	<p><b>2012/13 Performance</b>  The average processing time for local planning applications is affected by the need to determine a significant number of individual wind turbine applications and small scale wind farms. These require legal agreements and require the consideration of complex landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>Results: for both major and local developments - It would appear that some councils (eight known at present) have used data provided by Scottish Government in relation to the Planning Performance Framework, using the 'stop the clock' discounted data for complex applications. This is not the methodology used by SLC as detailed in the Audit Scotland Direction 2011. Under this alternative calculation method, SLC would have taken an average time of: 86.5 weeks for major and 12.8 weeks for local developments. This may affect Ranking.</p> <p><b>Improvement Measure for 2013/14 (for both major and local developments)</b>  The following improvement measures will be implemented in 2013/14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• guidance and advice for developers will be reviewed and placed on the Council's website. This guidance and advice aims to ensure that</li> <li>• planning applications are accompanied by the appropriate information to allow them to be validated and progressed promptly</li> <li>• guidance will be provided on topics such as the Rural Design Guide and financial contributions, providing greater certainty to planning applicants on what is required from them in their submissions.</li> </ul>	12.5 wks NA	20 NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Priority	Ref	Planning	Comments	2012/13		2011/12		2010/11	
				SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC	SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC	SPI I/D/NC	Rank I/D/NC
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>business processes and procedures will be reviewed and adapted during 2013/14 in line with the ongoing review and development of M3 and EDM systems throughout 2013/14, the Planning and Building Standards Service will encourage greater use of processing agreement</li> </ul>						
		<b>Roads</b>							
High	22	<b>Carriageway Condition</b> The percentage of road network that should be considered for maintenance treatment	<b>2012/13 Performance and Improvement Measure for 2013/14</b> Over the last two years, the percentage of the overall road network requiring maintenance treatment has reduced.  This improvement in the road network resulted from the implementation of the Roads and Footway Investment Plan. The Plan sets out our investment in road maintenance over the period 2008 and 2019 and will see £126million invested in road improvements, on top of the Service's existing base annual maintenance budget. In the first five years of the Plan, we have resurfaced just over one third of the road network. Annual SPI figures presented in this SPI are an average of the percentages over a four year period. The rate of improvement therefore can be expected to be gradual.  We will continue to implement the Roads and Footway Investment Plan and through this substantial investment, we will continue to aim for a year on year improvement and overall reduction in the percentage of the road network still requiring maintenance treatment.	36.8% I	19 D	37.5% I	18 D	38.0% D	17 D

**Key:**

I = Improve

D = Decline

NC = No Change

NA = Not applicable