

Committee	Dated:
Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee – For Information	27 January 2015
Subject: Performance Monitoring: London-wide Performance Indicators	Public
Report of: Deputy Town Clerk	For Information

Summary

This report presents the most recent results from the dashboard of service Performance Indicators monitored and reported quarterly by London Councils, known as LAPS (London Authorities Performance Solution). These cover the period July to September 2014, and are attached as Appendix 1.

This shows that the City continues to perform well in comparison with London Boroughs, with 74% of the indicators for which the City reports data being in the top quartile of London performance. Where the City's performance is in the bottom quartile, or where performance has deteriorated, this is followed-up with departments, and this report comments in more detail on those indicators.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. Members will recall from previous meetings that London Councils maintains a dashboard of thirty-six service Performance Indicators which are reported quarterly. This dashboard, known as LAPS (London Authorities Performance Solution) is reviewed by the Chief Officers Summit Group before being reported to the Sub Committee.
2. The latest dashboard covers the period from 1st July to 30th September 2014, and is attached as Appendix 1.
3. On the dashboard, the City's performance is shown in the column headed 'value', and by the black diamond (◆) in the column headed 'better performance →'. The 'group average' is calculated from those boroughs that submitted data. The number of boroughs submitting data for each indicator is shown in the 'group average' column.

Current Position

4. The table below summarises the City's performance for Q1 (April-June) and Q2 (July-September) of 2014/15, showing the number of performance indicators (PIs) in each quartile:

	Top quartile	2 nd quartile	3 rd quartile	Bottom quartile	n/a *	Total
Q1: Number of PIs	14	2	2	1	17	36
Q2: Number of PIs	17	3	2	1	13	36
Change in numbers Q1 to Q2	+3	+1	-	-	-4	-

* The n/a indicators generally relate to Community and Children's Services indicators where the raw data value is <10.

* The indicators for Council Tax and non-domestic rates collection are n/a because the City chooses to submit data only at year end.

Movement between quartiles

5. Four indicators have moved from n/a to the top quartile as a result of the national data sets becoming available for the second quarter:

- DB11: Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in Reading, Writing and Maths at Key Stage 2
- DB23: Percentage of working age people on out of work benefits
- DB24: Number of households living in temporary accommodation *
- DB25: Number of homeless applications accepted as being in priority need *

* These indicators are reported as numbers, so the City will generally appear at the extreme end of better performance.

6. One indicator has moved from top quartile to second quartile - DB28: Land assessed as having unacceptable levels of litter. This indicator, along with DB29, DB30, and DB31, is derived from a voluntary independent inspection. The department has commented that the latest inspection was conducted during half term when there was a significant increase in footfall in the City. However, scores for the other three indicators covered by this inspection remain low, which indicate that the overall standard of cleansing was still good.

Bottom quartile indicator

7. One indicator remains in the bottom quartile – DB36: Percentage of 'other' planning applications determined within 8 weeks. This is despite the City's performance improving from 70.3% to 71%. More recent information from the department reports performance running at 78%.
8. A detailed review of planning performance was reported by the Director to the Summit Group in October 2014. This covered both 'other' and 'minor' applications (reported on LAPS as DB35), and compared the City's performance to London Boroughs. The report noted that the City's way of working is appreciated by users who regularly comment that the City is the best planning authority to deal with in London, and does not give rise to complaints
9. The report made the following key points in relation to the City's performance:
 - i. Negotiations with applicants The City Corporation has always negotiated with applicants to deliver a planning approval and this takes longer than issuing a refusal when applications are unacceptable. The City has the

- highest approval rates and consequently fewer appeals than all London Boroughs which leads to a high level of customer satisfaction. This approach is considered more important than strict adherence to time limits.
- ii. Delays in determination due to both internal and external consultations
The City takes account of consultees' submissions. This can be internal teams such as the cleansing division or externally with groups such as English Heritage or Thames Water. It is common practise in London Boroughs to give strict deadlines to consultees and proceed with the decision regardless of whether the consultees have responded. However the City uses best endeavours to obtain their views as decisions impact on consultees and the City seeks to negotiate to ensure a result which is acceptable to all parties
 - iii. The City's performance is skewed by low volumes In 2013/14, the City processed 343 'other' planning applications. The volume of 'other' applications in London Boroughs ranged from 425 (Barking and Dagenham) to 4,607 (Westminster City Council). In the same year, the City processed 1779 'minor' planning applications. The volume of 'minor' applications in London Boroughs ranged from 119 (Barking and Dagenham – the only borough with fewer 'minor' applications than the City) to 2,873 (Westminster City Council)
 - iv. Delays due to process Where the City does refuse planning permission, the decision needs to be taken by the Planning and Transportation Committee. Although they are few in number, such applications will always go beyond eight weeks because of publicity and committee agenda timescales. Listed Building Consent applications in the 'other' applications category are sometimes linked to 'major' applications and are not determined until the related 'major' application is determined. These normally take longer than eight weeks (formally 13 weeks or 16 weeks for an Environmental Impact Assessment case) and there is a consequent delay with the Listed Building Consent decision.

Conclusion

10. The City continues to perform well against the London Dashboard, with minor fluctuations from quarter to quarter. Those indicators where the City's performance is in the bottom quartile, or where performance has deteriorated are followed-up with departments, and the results reported to the Performance and Strategy Summit Group of Chief Officers.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – LAPS Dashboard for Q2 of 2014/15

Neil Davies

Head of Corporate Performance and Development

T: 020 7332 3327

E: neil.davies@cityof.ondon.gov.uk