Key Performance Indicators 2015/16 - Targets

| Directorate | KPI Ref 2015/16 | Description | Target 2014/15 | Q3 2014/15 | Proposed Target 2015/16 | Increased Target Yes/No | Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance |
|----------------|--------------------|--|-------------------|------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Neighbourhoods | NEI01 | How much non-recycled waste was collected for every household in the district? | 400kg | 294kg | 400kg | no (same) | The first 3 Quarters of 2014/15 are showing compliance with the Indicator, it is feared that Quarter 4 figure will not be so. There is a general trend of increase in tonnage of non-recyclable materials (attributable to a variety of reasons: food waste being disposed incorrectly, weight of packaging being reduced by manufacturers and lack of full use of recycling services available to residents). It is proposed that the target be kept the same as last year and efforts made to publicise the full extend of recycling services offered by the Council. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 5.0% below target | | |
| | NEI02 | What percentage of all household waste was sent to be recycled, reused or composted? | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | no (same) | The target was missed by 1% in 2013/14 however the target was not revised down. In the first three Quarters of 2014/15 the target has been missed in two Quarters. It is considered that not all recyclable materials are being presented for collection, these include food waste which appears in the residual waste stream. A number of strategies are being implemented: review of larger residual waste bins, publicity campaign highlighting the opportunities available for recycling, better labeling on clear sacks to include the full range of recycling materials that can be collected, collection of new recycling materials like small electrical equipment, batteries and textiles). It is felt that the above measures should help in achieving the 60% recycling target. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 2.0% below target | | |
| | NEI03 | What percentage of our district had unacceptable levels of litter? | 8.00% | 12.00% | 8.00% | no (same) | Following a number of years of exceeding the target the performance against this target failed in Quarter 3 of 2014/15. Quarter 3 saw the transition of the street cleansing service from Sita to Biffa. It is possible that the transition arrangements and changes in supervision and management arrangements by the contractor could have contributed to the poor performance. having said that the target was failed by 4% and all efforts are being made by Officers of the Council and Biffa colleagues to ensure that the standards are improved. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | No amber tolerance | | |

Key Performance Indicators 2015/16 - Targets

| Directorate | KPI Ref 2015/16 | Description | Target 2014/15 | Q3 2014/15 | Proposed Target 2015/16 | Increased Target Yes/No | Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance |
|----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Neighbourhoods | NEI04 | What percentage of our district had unacceptable levels of detritus (dust, mud, stones, rotted leaves, glass, plastic etc.)? | 10.00% | 9.00% | 10.00% | no (same) | The target for 204/15 appears to be on track however Quarter 3 outturn was only 1% below target. Closer monitoring is being carried out to ensure year end target is achieved. Similar to NEI03 it is proposed to carry out close monitoring and ensure compliance rather than increase the target. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | No amber tolerance | | |
| | NEI05 | What percentage of the issues and complaints received by the Environment & Neighbourhoods Team received an initial response within 3 days? | 95.00% | 97.56% | 95.00% | | No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (95%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error and some incidents that do not meet the target but are justified non-compliance for some other reason e.g. prioritising cases in particularly busy periods. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target | | |
| | NEI06 | What percentage of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping are investigated within 3 working days of the fly-tip being recorded where the fly-tip is on public or privately owned land?; | 90.00% | 93.00% | 90.00% | no (same) | No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error and some incidents that do not meet the target but are justified non-compliance for some other reason e.g. priorirtising cases in particualry busy periods |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target | | |

Key Performance Indicators 2015/16 - Targets

| Directorate | KPI Ref 2015/16 | Description | Target 2014/15 | Q3 2014/15 | Proposed Target 2015/16 | Increased Target Yes/No | Comments/justification for proposed target for 2015/16 and reasons for targeted reductions in performance |
|----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Neighbourhoods | NEI07 | KPI 27a - What percentage of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping (contract cleared) are removed within 5 working days of being recorded? | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | no (same) | No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error and some incidents that do not meet the target but are justified non-compliance for some other reason e.g. clearance delayed whilst we encourage the perpetrator to clear. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target | | |
| | NEI08 | KPI 27b - What percentage of the recorded incidences of fly-tipping (variation order / noncontract) are removed within 10 working days of being recorded? | | 91.00% | 90.00% | | No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error, some delays in identifying who owns the land and clearance delays whilst we encourage the perpetrator to clear. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target | | |
| | NEI09 | What percentage of out of hours noise complaints that are passed through to the duty noise officer are responded to within 15 minutes | 90.00% | 91.00% | 90.00% | no (same) | No change in proposed target 2015/16. The target (90%) is already at a very high level, with only a small margin built in for error/failure, recorded in minutes e.g 1 minute over the target time would be recorded as a failure. |
| | | Corporate Comment: Indicator to be retained for 2015/16. Performance to be reviewed quarterly. | | | Amber tolerance = 1.0% below target | | |