

## **Best Value Performance Plan** **Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

This is the eighth Performance Plan published by Havant Borough Council under the Local Government Act 1999. As a Local Authority assessed as "Good" under the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) the requirements on the Council as to what has to be included in this Plan have been greatly reduced compared to previous years. We are required to publish the data relating to all national and local performance indicators (PIs) for the past year (2006/07) and targets for three future years (2007/08 to 2009/10). In addition to the PI data we have to publish a statement confirming that we are adopting the Code of Practice in our approach to workforce matters and contracting (see below).

In the column headed "2006/07 Actual", the colours green and red have been used to indicate how the Council performed. If we take the performance of all authorities and ranked them from best performer to worst performer and divided them into quarters we have identified where the Council performed at a level equivalent to the top 25% (green) or the bottom 25% (red). The amber colour has been used to indicate performance falling between top and bottom quarters.

In the columns headed "2006/07 Variance (Actual 2006/07 v Actual 2005/06)" & "2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)" we have highlighted whether performance has improved or deteriorated by use of arrows. An upward pointing arrow indicates performance is better than the previous year or better than the target. A downward pointing arrow indicates a poorer performance than the previous year or targets not met. Where appropriate an explanation on performance has been included.

The Council regularly reviews the local PIs it reports which has resulted in some being removed from this Plan for 2006/07. Where this is the case an explanation has been included. This does not necessarily mean that the data is no longer being collected but that the information is being reported to managers and being acted upon in the day to day management of a service.

### **Future Priorities**

A revised Corporate Strategy was published in August 2005 reflecting not only our commitment to the **Community Strategy - Stronger, Together** theme but also focusing on the Council's new priorities. The Council's Executive indicated that the Council should look to reduce expenditure by about 10% in the period 2005 to 2008 and focus on priorities outlined in the Community Strategy. This consisted of a three-pronged approach to achieving our objectives within the financial constraints facing the Council:

1. A programme of reviews of all services covering areas identified for the realisation of efficiencies.
2. Further partnership working with the private and public sector to bring added skills and investment potential to the Council's services and the economy of the Borough.

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

3. Income generating initiatives, which will increase the Council's assets and non-grant income, including an ongoing programme to attract cost-effective grant funding to help deliver our regeneration aims.

The strategy is currently being reviewed with the aim of publishing a new strategy by March 2008.

The Corporate Strategy is monitored on a quarterly basis both internally by managers and elected members and externally by our auditors (Mazars and the Audit Commission)

The Council's services are delivered via three Groups:

- Corporate Group
- Community Group
- Planning Policy & Urban Design Group

**The Corporate Group** (represented by yellow colouring in the column headed – PI Ref.)

**Customer and Support Services**

- Customer Service Centre
- Property/Estates Services
- Democratic Services
- Legal and Elections
- Corporate Support Services

**Organisational Development**

- Corporate Strategy
- Strategic Partnerships & Procurement
- Performance, Policy & Project Management
- ICT Strategy
- Personnel/HR
- People Development
- Marketing & Communications

**Resources**

- Finance
- Purchasing & Supplies
- Audit Partnership
- Revenues & Benefits Contract Management
- Section 151 Responsibilities

**The Community Group** (represented by green colouring in the column headed – PI Ref.)

**Development Services**

- Lead for MDA
- Development Control
- Building Control
- Conservation

**Environmental Services**

- Waste & Resources
- Environmental Quality
- Environmental Health:
- Corporate Health & Safety

**Regeneration Services**

- Community Regeneration
- Business Development:
- Housing
- Regeneration & Cultural Strategies

## **Best Value Performance Plan** **Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

- Land Charges
- Parking
- Traffic & Transportation
- Engineering

**The Planning Policy & Urban Design Group** (represented by blue colouring in the column headed – PI Ref.)

- Regional & Sub Regional Planning
- Local Development Framework
- Major Development Projects
- Planning Policy
- Sustainability Policy
- Urban Design
- Environmental Enhancements

Havant Borough Council is responsible for the preparation of this Performance Plan and for the information set out within it. The Council is also responsible for setting in place appropriate performance management and internal control systems from which the information in the Plan has been derived. The Council is satisfied that the information included in the Plan is in all material respects accurate and complete and that the Plan is realistic and achievable.

**The Council has adopted The Code of Practice on Workforce Matters relating to Local Authority Service Contracts.**

If you require any further information on the data included in the Plan please contact Andy Rudd at [andy.rudd@havant.gov.uk](mailto:andy.rudd@havant.gov.uk) or telephone him on 023 9244 6323

Copies of this Plan are also available in the libraries across the Borough and also at main reception at the Civic Offices, Civic Centre Road, Havant

**NB.** The quartile data for BVPIs 3, 4 & 119 is based on the 2006/07 data available from the Audit Commission. The quartiles used for BVPIs 80 and 111 are based on the previous survey undertaken in 2003/04 as up to date quartiles have not yet been published by the Audit Commission.

## Best Value Performance Plan Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
<b>NATIONAL INDICATORS</b>												
The level (if any) of the Equality Standard for Local Government to which the authority conforms.	<b>2a</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	↔	2	↓	2	2	3
<b>Explanation:</b> In June 2006 the Local Government Equality Standard was revised. It was therefore evident that a deferral of the Level 2 target to 2007/08 was necessary. The Senior Management Team agreed in June 2007 to aim for Level 3 Standard during 2008/09 with full external assessment and accreditation in 2009/10.												
The duty to promote race equality	<b>2b</b>	73.00%	58.00%	42.00%	42.11%	57.89%	↑	57.89%	↔	57.89%	68.42%	78.95%
Citizen satisfied with the overall service provided by the Council	<b>3</b>	60%	55%	50%	58% (2003/04)	48%	↓	61.00%	↓			58%
Complainants satisfied with the handling of their complaint	<b>4</b>	38%	34%	32%	32% (2003/04)	32%	↔	37.00%	↓			34%
% of undisputed invoices paid in 30 days	<b>8</b>	97.30%	95.00%	92.20%	98.54%	98.87%	↑	99.25%	↓	99.25%	99.50%	99.50%
% of Council Tax collected	<b>9</b>	98.53%	98.11%	97.40%	96.94%	96.85%	↓	96.90%	↓	97.10%	97.20%	97.30%
<b>Explanation:</b> Deprivation levels within some of the Borough's wards are similar to some inner cities. It is therefore unrealistic to aspire to reach the district average for this particular performance indicator.												
% of business rates collected	<b>10</b>	99.30%	99.00%	98.40%	99.15%	99.13%	↓	99.20%	↓	99.18%	99.20%	99.25%
The percentage of top 5 % of earners that are women.	<b>11a</b>	31.25%	25.00%	18.79%	38.10%	33.33%	↓	38%	↓	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%

## Best Value Performance Plan

### Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
The percentage of top 5 % of earners from black and minority ethnic communities.	<b>11b</b>	3.37%	0.00%	0.00%	6.25%	7.69%	↑	6%	↑	7.69%	7.69%	7.69%
Percentage of the top paid 5% of staff who have a disability (excluding those in maintained schools).	<b>11c</b>	5.91%	2.09%	0.00%	0.08	14.28%	↑	8%	↑	14%	14%	14%
Number of working days lost to sickness	<b>12</b>	8.29	9.54	10.92	13.60	10.85	↑	11.10	↓	9.50	9.00	8.29
<b>Explanation:</b> The reduction in the staff absence figure has come about as a result of a significant reduction in long term sickness.												
Early retirements as a % of the total workforce	<b>14</b>	0.00%	0.40%	0.83%	0.26%	0.28%	↓	0.26%	↓	0%	0%	0%
Ill-health retirements as a % of the total workforce	<b>15</b>	0.00%	0.25%	0.42%	0.53%	0.00%	↑	0.26%	↑	0%	0%	0%
The percentage of local authority employees with a disability	<b>16a</b>	4.37%	3.11%	2.13%	6.96%	8.21%	↑	6.96%	↑	8%	8%	8%
% of economically active disabled people in local authority area	<b>16b</b>				14%	14%	↔					
The percentage of local authority employees from ethnic minority communities	<b>17a</b>	2.70%	1.40%	0.80%	0.60%	0.70%	↑	1.10%	↓	1%	1%	1%
% of economically active people from ethnic minorities in local authority area	<b>17b</b>				1.50%	1.50%	↔			PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted

## Best Value Performance Plan

### Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	2005/06 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
The number of private sector vacant dwellings that are returned into occupation or demolished as a direct result of action by the local authority	<b>64</b>	38.00	13.00	4.00	8	5	↓	10	↓	10	10	10
The number of benefits claimants visited, per 1,000 caseload.	<b>76(a)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	247.08	191.04	↓	250	↓	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted
The number of fraud investigators employed, per 1,000 benefits caseload.	<b>76(b)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.32	0.31	↓	0.41	↓	0.32	0.32	0.32
The number of fraud investigations, per 1,000 benefits caseload.	<b>76l</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.71	28.65	↓	53	↓	36	37	37
The number of prosecutions and sanctions, per 1,000 benefits caseload.	<b>76(d)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.51	4.39	↓	5.20	↓	5.5	6.25	6.25
Speed of processing: av. time for processing new claims (in days) of benefits claimants	<b>78a</b>	25.50	31.00	37.80	34.48	29.7	↑	30	↑	28	27	25
Speed of processing: av. time for processing changes of circumstance (in days)	<b>78b</b>	8.50	11.90	16.70	18.63	6.54	↑	10	↑	9	8	8
Explanation: The Council's contractor (Capita) has put new procedures in place which have turned round performance on this performance indicator. Performance in the period October to December was an average of 10 days and this reduced to 8.53 days in the quarter January to March '07.												

## Best Value Performance Plan Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	2005/06 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Accuracy of processing: % of benefits cases calculated correctly	<b>79a</b>	99.00%	98.20%	96.80%	95.60%	96.20%	↑	98.00%	↓	98.20%	98.00%	98.00%
<p><b>Explanation:</b> The Government changed the rules in respect of reviewing benefit claims, moving from a review every 12 months to what is known as open ended reviews i.e. only reviewed following a change in circumstances. This lower than expected performance was brought about by a reduced performance in the second quarter of the year. The housing benefit and council tax benefit operations are contracted to a company called Capita and HBC believes it has a diligent client function to oversee this contract. To this end, following the renegotiation of the contract in October 2006, a new proactive quality scheme has been agreed between the two partner organisations and implemented as part of the contract. This requires the contractor to focus on accuracy and enhance the way in which customers are dealt with. It also includes a far more robust financial incentive scheme using both sanctions for poor performance and rewards for performance above contractual requirements. It is therefore expected that performance in respect of this PI will improve as a result.</p>												
The amount of Housing Benefit overpayments (HB) recovered during the period being reported on as a percentage of all HB overpayments during that period.	<b>79b(i)</b>	79.46%	70.35%	59.37%	66.80%	91.17%	↑	67.00%	↑	92%	92%	93%
% of HB overpayments recovered expressed as a % of total debt outstanding	<b>79b(ii)</b>	41.22%	34.11%	28.35%	29.06%	34.37%	↑	31.00%	↑	34%	38%	39%
% of HB overpayments written off expressed as a % of total debt outstanding	<b>79b(iii)</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.55%	7.42%	↑	8.00%	↑	7.50%	7.00%	6.50%
<p><b>Explanation:</b> In respect of all the BVPI 76 to 79 indicators – the Council awarded a new contract to Capita in October 2006 which includes a high focus on quality with a proactive quality scheme designed to maintain a continuous improvement of service. The focus for 2007/08 will reflect this approach.</p>												
Contact/access facilities @ benefit office	<b>80a</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	85.80% (2003/04)	71.00%	↓	88.00%	↓			75%
Service in benefit office	<b>80b</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	88.90% (2003/04)	75.00%	↓	91.00%	↓			77%

## Best Value Performance Plan

### Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	2005/06 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Telephone service in benefit office	80c	N/A	N/A	N/A	78.20% (2003/04)	59.00%	↓	80.00%	↓			75%
Staff in benefit office	80d	N/A	N/A	N/A	90.20% (2003/04)	77.00%	↓	92.00%	↓			84%
Clarity etc. of forms & leaflets in benefit office	80e	N/A	N/A	N/A	66.50% (2003/04)	58.00%	↓	68.00%	↓			70%
Time taken for a decision in benefit office	80f	N/A	N/A	N/A	79.60% (2003/04)	64.00%	↓	82.00%	↓			75%
Overall satisfaction with benefit office	80g	N/A	N/A	N/A	88.00% (2003/04)	74.00%	↓	90.00%	↓			80%

**Explanation: The BVPI 80 series of performance indicators are based on a survey of customers conducted every three years. The figures indicate a reduced level of satisfaction with the various areas of the service when compared to the 2003/04 survey. This survey is undertaken in two tranches, June/July and November/December and it is encouraging to note that for some of the performance indicators there was a marked improvement in satisfaction levels over the two surveys. However, until the national figures are available it may be premature to make judgement on these figures. It may also be the case that the public now have higher expectations and are more critical in their survey responses.**

Household waste – percentage recycled	82a(i)	21.72%	18.15%	14.79%	24%	30%	↑	30%	↔	33%	34%	35%
Total tonnage of household waste arisings sent for recycling	82a(ii)	9082.98	6839.79	5279.84	10052.98	11669.23	↑	11000	↑	12500	12750	13000
Household waste – percentage composted	82b(i)	14.67%	8.29%	2.68%	0%	0.50%	↑	1%	↓	1%	2%	3%
Total tonnage of household waste arisings sent for composting	82b(ii)	6048.83	3157.91	933.96	0	144.97	↑	500	↓	300	500	500

**Explanation: The focus of the composting service is primarily to assist those residents who cannot access the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) run by Hampshire County Council. 2006/07 was the first year the Council operated a separate green waste collection service. Those residents not able to reach the HWRC are able to purchase plastic sacks which are then collected by the Council and delivered to a central composting facility.**

## Best Value Performance Plan

### Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Kg of household waste collected per head	<b>84a</b>	381.00	409.60	442.70	359	333	↑	353	↑	330	330	330
% change from previous year in Kg of household waste collected per head	<b>84b</b>	-3.29%	-0.50%	2.43%	-6%	-7.80%	↑	-1.67%	↑	-1.50%	-1.50%	-1.50%
Cost of waste collection per household	<b>86</b>	40.28	46.25	52.88	£48.52	£46.67	↑	£50.38	↑	£43.82	£43.82	£43.82
People satisfied with cleanliness standard in their area	<b>89</b>	74%	71%	65%	66% (2003/04)	61%	↓	75%	↓			75%
People satisfied with household waste collection	<b>90a</b>	86%	81%	73%	84% (2003/04)	67%	↓	90%	↓			75%
People satisfied with waste recycling	<b>90b</b>	76%	72%	68%	75% (2003/04)	71%	↓	80%	↓			76%
Percentage of population resident in the authority's area served by a kerbside collection of recyclables.	<b>91a</b>	100.00%	99.40%	94.00%	94%	94%	↔	95%	↓	96%	97%	98%
<b>Explanation:</b> The main focus in 2006/07 was the roll-out of Alternate Weekly Collection (AWC) across the Borough. It is acknowledged there are still flats that need to be targeted. Some of these sites were addressed last year and we will be working with Portsmouth City Council in order to focus on the remaining areas with the aim of achieving our 2007/08 target.												
Percentage of population resident in the authority's area served by a kerbside collection of at least two recyclables.	<b>91b</b>	100.00%	98.80%	92.30%	94%	94%	↔	95%	↓	96%	97%	98%
Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land	<b>106</b>	89.67%	75.67%	57.36%	84%	100%	↑	80%	↑	80%	80%	80%

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Percentage of planning applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets to determine:												
60% of major applications in 13 weeks	<b>109a</b>	74.75%	66.67%	58.05%	65%	77%	↑	65%	↑	75%	78%	80%
65% of minor applications in 8 weeks	<b>109b</b>	80.39%	74.01%	68.60%	70%	76%	↑	65%	↑	77%	80%	85%
80% of other applications in 8 weeks	<b>109c</b>	91.61%	88.23%	83.85%	85%	90%	↑	82%	↑	90%	92%	92%
The % of applicants satisfied with the planning service received	<b>111</b>	72%	65%	52%	75% (2003/04)	68%	↓	80%	↓			75%
Satisfaction with – sports/leisure facilities	<b>119a</b>	65%	60%	55%	51% (2003/04)	56%	↓	70%	↓			60%
Satisfaction with – museums/galleries	<b>119c</b>	50%	38%	26%	31% (2003/04)	36%	↑	35%	↑			40%
Satisfaction with – theatres/concert halls	<b>119d</b>	52%	37%	26%	27% (2003/04)	23%	↓	50%	↓			28%
Satisfaction with – parks & open spaces	<b>119e</b>	78%	74%	68%	63% (2003/04)	64%	↓	70%	↓			70%
Burglaries No. per 1000 households	<b>126</b>	5.70	7.40	9.60	No data from Constab.	5.55	N/A	No target	N/A	5	4.50	4
Violent crimes committed per 1,000 population;	<b>127a</b>	11.10	14.50	18.60	No data from Constab.	29.91	N/A	No target	N/A	29	29	29

## Best Value Performance Plan Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	2005/06 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
<b>Explanation:</b> There has been discussion within the Police as to the categorisation of violent crimes, particularly assault, and they are currently reviewing how they are recording this data (and this may impact on figures in the future). See also comment at BVPI 128 below.												
Robberies committed per 1,000 population;	<b>127b</b>	0.20	0.30	0.70	No data from Constab.	0.536	N/A	No target	N/A	0.50	0.50	0.45
Vehicle crimes No. per 1000 pop	<b>128</b>	6.40	8.30	10.50	No data from Constab.	10.56	N/A	No target	N/A	10	9.50	9
<b>Explanation:</b> The Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) have established two working groups (focusing on violent and vehicle crime) to develop action plans to target activities to improve performance in these two areas. This, coupled with existing work (such as the Prolific Offender programme) should result in improvements in this area. The recently established Community Tasking Group is also tasking agencies with work to address these two categories.												
% of local authority buildings suitable for and accessible by disabled people	<b>156</b>	87.50%	72.87%	53.81%	71%	72.97%	↑	72.97%	↔	73.68%	73.68%	73.68%
Score against a checklist of enforcement best practice for environmental health/trading standards	<b>166</b>	98.70%	90.00%	80.00%	92%	95.17%	↑	93%	↑	95%	95%	95%
Number of visits to/usages of museums per 1000 population	<b>170a</b>	861	312	77	47	130	↑	47	↑	95	95	95
Number of those visits in person per 1000 population	<b>170b</b>	460	178	53	47	128	↑	47	↑	95	95	95
The number of pupils visiting museums and galleries in organised school groups.	<b>170c</b>	3302	1279	260	151	314	↑	95	↑	350	350	350

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	2005/06 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Number of recorded racial incidents per 100,000 population	174	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	↔	0	↔	0	0	0
% of racial incidents that resulted in further action	175	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0%	0%	↔	0%	↔	0	0	0
The average length of stay in bed and breakfast accommodation of households which include dependent children or a pregnant woman and which are unintentionally homeless and in priority need.	183 (a)	1.35	3.00	4.95	0	6	↓	6	↔	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted
<b>Explanation:</b> This indicator records occupation of bed & breakfast accommodation and households who leave temporary accommodation during the year. In this data sample only one household was recorded and they spent 42 nights in bed & breakfast accommodation. No other households were included.												
The average length of stay in hostel accommodation of households which include dependent children or a pregnant woman and which are unintentionally homeless and in priority need.	183 (b)	0.00	6.84	18.48	0	0	↔	0	↔	N/A	N/A	N/A
The proportion of relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) that is assessed as having	199a	8.00%	12.00%	19.00%	28%	10%	↑	19%	↑	12%	10%	8%

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
combined deposits of litter and detritus that fall below an acceptable level												
The proportion of relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of graffiti are visible	<b>199b</b>	0.00%	1.00%	4.00%	1%	2%	↓	1%	↔	1%	1%	0%
The proportion of relevant land and highways (expressed as a percentage) from which unacceptable levels of fly-posting are visible	<b>199c</b>	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	1%	0%	↑	1%	↑	1%	0%	0%
The year-on-year reduction in total number of incidents and increase in total number of enforcement actions taken to deal with 'fly-tipping'.	<b>199d</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3 (Good)	↔	3	↔	2	1	1
Plan-making												
Did the local planning authority submit the Local Development Scheme (LDS) by 28th March 2005	<b>200a</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	↔	Yes	↔	Yes	Yes	Yes

## Best Value Performance Plan Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
and thereafter maintain a 3-year rolling programme?												
Has the local planning authority met the milestones which the current Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out?	<b>200b</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	↔	Yes	↓	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did the Local Planning Authority publish an annual report by 31st December of each year?	<b>200c</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	↔	Yes	↔	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted
The number of people sleeping rough	<b>202</b>	0.00	1.00	4.00	0	0	↔	0	↔	0	0	0
The % change in the average number of families placed in temporary accommodation	<b>203</b>	-17.82%	1.05%	22.22%	-1.41%	-10.44%	↑	-5.00%	↑	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted
The percentage of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse on planning applications	<b>204</b>	25.00%	30.00%	36.10%	26%	31%	↓	25%	↓	25%	25%	25%
Score against a quality of service checklist. The score will reflect the quality of planning service as at 31 March 2005	<b>205</b>	94.40	94.00	83.30	94%	94%	↔	100%	↓	100%	100%	100%

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Number of households who considered themselves as homeless but LA housing advice resolved their situation	<b>213</b>	5.00	2.00	1.00	4	6.5	↑	4	↑	4	4	4
Proportion of households accepted as statutorily homeless within last two years	<b>214</b>	0.00	1.82	4.19	0	0	↔	Less than 5	↔	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted
Number of sites of potential concern with respect to land contamination	<b>216a</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,623	3,187	↓	2120	↓	1920	1900	1800
Number of sites for which sufficient information is available to decide whether remediation is necessary as a percentage all sites of potential concern	<b>216b</b>	8.00%	3.00%	1.00%	1.03%	7.03%	↑	2%	↑	3%	4%	5%
Percentage of pollution control improvements to existing installations completed on time	<b>217</b>	100.00%	94.00%	85.00%	93.10%	100.00%	↑	90%	↑	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Percentage of new reports of abandoned vehicles investigated within 24hrs of notification	<b>218a</b>	96.12%	87.00%	71.58%	87.90%	86.00%	↓	90%	↓	90%	90%	90%
Percentage of abandoned vehicles removed within 24hrs from the point at	<b>218b</b>	93.95%	77.50%	56.53%	95.30%	89.00%	↓	96%	↓	95%	95%	95%

## Best Value Performance Plan Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
which the authority is legally entitled to remove the vehicle												
Total number of conservation areas within the local authority area	<b>219a</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	14	14	↔	14	↔	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted	PI to be deleted
Percentage of conservation areas in the local authority area with an up to date character appraisal	<b>219b</b>	26.00	7.69	0.00	0%	0%	↔	21%	↓	21%	42%	64%
Percentage of conservation areas with published management proposals	<b>219c</b>	5.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0%	0%	↔	21%	↓	PI deleted	PI deleted	PI deleted
<b>Explanation:</b> Failure to meet targets arises from delays in filling a vacant post of Conservation Planner until January 2007. Two reviews were in progress at May 2007.												
Actions against domestic violence: The number (%) of questions (out of 11) to which the local authority can answer "yes".	<b>225</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	63.63%	63.63%	↔	63.63%	↔	63.63%	63.63%	63.63%
Amount spent by the authority on Advice & Guidance services provided by external organisations	<b>226a</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	£162,300	£158,200	↓	£150,000	↑	£150,000	To be reviewed	
% of monies spent on advice and guidance services provision given to organisations holding the	<b>226b</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	88.42%	90.70%	↑	80%	↑	85%	85%	85%

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
CLS Quality Mark												
Amount spent on advice and guidance in the areas of housing, welfare benefits and consumer matters provided directly by the authority to the public	226c	N/A	N/A	N/A	£287,000	£289,500	↑	£287,000	↑	£287,000	£287,000	£287,000
<b>Local indicators</b>												
<b>Customer Service Centre (CSC)</b>												
Customer Enquiries dealt with within the contact centre	COR 1				82%	86%	↑	84%	↑	86%	87%	87%
<b>Meeting Customer Charter Response Times</b>												
Telephone Calls answered within 20 seconds	COR 2				82%	79%	↓	81%	↓	85%	86%	87%
Correspondence (acknowledgements 3 working days/response 10 working days)	COR 4				66%	85%	↑	91%	↑	90%	90%	90%
Face to Face (contact with an officer within 10 minutes)	COR 5				98%	99%	↑	98%	↑	99%	99%	99%
Average waiting time for callers using the CSC	COR 7				20	22	↓	Less than 20 seconds	↓	Less than 17 seconds	Less than 16 seconds	Less than 15 seconds

## Best Value Performance Plan

### Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
% of calls to the CSC which are abandoned	<b>COR 8</b>				14.98%	17.00%	↓	Less than 14%	↓	Less than 12%	Less than 11%	Less than 10%
Average handling time for all calls to the CSC	<b>COR 9</b>				2 mins 27 secs	2 mins 22 seconds	↑	2 mins 15 secs	↓	2 mins 12 secs	2 mins 10 secs	2 mins 05 secs
% of customers satisfied with the service provided by the CSC	<b>COR 10</b>				96%	97%	↑	95%	↑	96%	97%	98%
% of customers satisfied with the outcome of their telephone request	<b>COR 12</b>				86%	90%	↑	80%	↑	90%	91%	92%
<b>Reception</b>												
% of customers satisfied with the service provided by Reception	<b>COR 13</b>				96%	95%	↓	95%	↔	96%	97%	98%
% of customers satisfied with the outcome of their visit to HBC	<b>COR 14</b>				92%	93%	↑	81%	↑	90%	91%	92%
Number of formal complaints received by HBC	<b>COR 15</b>				371	229	↑	Less than 220	↓	Less than 220	Less than 200	Less than 190
% of complaints responded to within 10 working days	<b>COR 16</b>				89%	85%	↓	81%	↑	82%	82%	82%
% of total minor complaints compared to the total volume of enquiries	<b>COR 17</b>				17%	10%	↑	20%	↑	Less than 10%	Less than 9%	Less than 8%
<b>Council-wide</b>												
% of telephone calls answered within 15	<b>COR 18</b>				88%	86%	↓	90%	↓	90%	90%	90%

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
seconds for callers not ringing through the CSC												
<b>Coastal Protection</b>												
Score against 16 key performance criteria for the service.	<b>COM 45</b>				83%	83%	↔	89%	↓	89%	89%	89%
<b>Parking</b>												
Percentage of appeals responded to within 5 working days.	<b>COM 8</b>				99.76%	98.81%	↓	99%	↓	99%	99%	99%
Number of Penalty Charge Notices cancelled	<b>COM 46</b>				15.28%	11.99%	↑	15%	↑	15%	15%	15%
<b>Public Conveniences</b>												
Satisfaction levels with the provision of public conveniences. (Survey every 3 years)	<b>COM 27</b>				36%	N/A		N/A			50%	
<b>Waste Collection</b>												
No. of collections missed per 100,000 collections of household waste	<b>COM 20</b>				68	61	↑	60	↓	55	50	50
<b>Building Control</b>												
Percentage of Building Regulation Plans checked within 3 weeks of deposit	<b>COM 47</b>				60%	81%	↑	70%	↑	83%	85%	85%

## Best Value Performance Plan

### Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	2005/06 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
<b>Community Safety</b>												
Percentage of time CCTV cameras are working	COM 3				98.83%	99.00%	↔	99%	↔	99%	99%	99%
<b>Regeneration</b>												
Number of new jobs created in the Borough (Target is 1715 by 2008/09)	COM 49				263	763	↑	450	↑	600	627	To be reviewed
<b>Explanation:</b> The data for 2006/07 has been gathered via a telephone survey and site visits but this has been limited due to staff shortage. The Council will be appointing a Research & Information Officer in summer 2007 which will enable a more extensive survey to be undertaken in the future.												
<b>Council Buildings</b>												
Property Performance Indicator measuring the condition of HBC buildings for their current use. % in category A	COR 3				80%	81%	↑	80%	↑	80%	80%	80%
<b>Allotments</b>												
Percentage of allotments occupied within the Borough	COM 31				93%	97%	↑	88%	↑	90%	93%	94%
<b>Cemeteries</b>												
Percentage of the public satisfied with the service provision within our cemeteries. (Targeted survey)										To be reviewed.		
<b>Coastal Recreation</b>												

**Best Value Performance Plan**  
**Performance Indicators – 2006/07 Outturns & Future Targets**

Note: In the table below there are a number of cells "greyed out" and containing no data. This is because the information was not or is not required.	PI Ref.	2005/06 Top Quartile	2005/06 Median	200/506 Bottom Quartile	2005/06 Actual	2006/07 Actual	2006/07 Variance (Actual 2005/06 v Actual 2004/05)	2006/07 Target	2006/07 Variance (Actual v Target)	2007/08 Target	2008/09 Target	2009/010 Target
Blue Flag and Rural Resort Status maintained for specific beaches on Hayling Island	<b>COM 50</b>				Yes	Yes	↔	Yes	↔	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Housing Partnerships</b>												
Number of households in B&B accommodation (families and single people)	<b>COM 1</b>				0	0	↔	0	↔	1	0	0
Number of households waiting more than 2 years in temporary accommodation	<b>COM 2</b>				177	182	↓	150	↓	150	140	130
Number of new homes in social housing sector completed.	<b>COM 51</b>				109	106	↓	100	↑	120	120	100
<b>Parks &amp; Recreation Grounds</b>												
Percentage of play equipment available for use	<b>COM 31</b>				92%	94%	↑	95%	↓	95%	95%	95%