

Corporate performance indicators and targets for 2016/17 through 2018/19

Appendix II

Reference	Description	Unit	It's better to be...	Target 2015/16	Current performance	Fixed Target 2016/17	Indicative Target 2017/18	Indicative Target 2018/19	Benchmark comparison source or note on Swale's past performance
BV 10	Proportion of non-domestic rates collected	%	High	97.5	On target	97.6	97.7	97.8	LGInform (All England District Councils 2014/15)
BV 78a	Speed of processing new HB/CT support claims	Days	Low	17	On target	17	16	15	LGInform (All England District Councils 2012/13)
BV 78b	Speed of processing changes in circumstances for HB/CT support claims	Days	Low	7.0	On target	7.0	6.5	6.0	LGInform (All England District Councils 2015 Q1)
BV 9	Proportion of council tax collected in the year	%	High	97.30	On target	97.35	97.40	97.45	LGInform (All England District Councils 2014/15)
NI 156	Number of households living in temporary accommodation	Number	Low	80	On target	85	80	75	LGInform (2015 Q1)
BV79b(i)	Proportion of recoverable benefit overpayments recovered during period	%	High	67	On target	70	75	80	2013/14 = 77.56% ave. 2014/15 = 66.6% ave.
LI/HS/001	Number of long-term empty homes brought back into use	Number	High	70	Not meeting target	75	80	85	2013/14 = 84 2014/15 = 86
NI 155	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	Number	High	60	On target	75	85	100	LGInform (2013/14)
LI/ICT/06	Website availability	%	High	99	Not meeting target	99	99	99	2013/14 = 99 2014/15 = 99
LI/CCC/01	Missed bin collections	Number per annum	Low	2,650	Better than target	2,650	2,650	2,650	This is a contractual target
LI/CSC/02	Proportion of abandoned calls	%	Low	5.0	Better than target	4.6	4.3	4.0	2013/14 = 3.8% 2014/15 = 3.8%
LI/CSC/04	Proportion of calls answered in 20 seconds	%	High	83	On target	83	84	85	2013/14 = 80.2% 2014/15 = 83.0%
LI/PS/03	Parking penalty charge notice recovery rate	%	High	65	On target	65	65	65	2013/14 = 68.88% 2014/15 = 68.95%
NI 14	Avoidable contact within the CSC: the proportion of customer contact that is of low or no value to the customer	%	Low	5	Better than target	4	3	2	2013/14 = 1.5% 2014/15 = 1.8%
NI 191	Residual household waste	kg	Low	500	Better than target	480	460	440	LGInform 31 March 2014
NI 192	Proportion of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	%	High	44	On target	44	45	48	LGInform 31 March 2014
LI/CSC/03	Proportion of complaints responded to in 10 working days	%	High	90	On target	90	90	90	2013/14 = 89.9% 2014/15 = 87.5%
LI/CSC/06	Proportion of complaints escalating from Stage 1 to Stage 2	%	Low	7	On target	7	6	5	2013/14 = 10.25% ave./qtr. 2014/15 = 4.5% ave./qtr.
NI 195i	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of litter)	%	Low	5	On target	4	3	3	CIPFA VFM Toolkit (Dec 2012)
NI 195ii	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of detritus)	%	Low	8	Better than target	7	6	5	CIPFA VFM Toolkit (Dec 2012)
NI 195iii	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of graffiti)	%	Low	1	Better than target	1	1	1	CIPFA VFM Toolkit (Dec 2012)
NI 195iv	Improved street and environmental cleanliness (levels of fly-posting)	%	Low	1	Better than target	1	1	1	CIPFA VFM Toolkit (Dec 2012)
NI 188	Planning to adapt to climate change	Level	High	3	On target	3	3	3	Audit Commission (All England 2008/09)
BV 12a	Long-term sickness absence	Days	Low	4.3	Better than target	4.2	4.2	4.2	LG Inform Benchmarking Club (2015 Q2 Report)
BV 12b	Short-term sickness absence	Days	Low	3.2	On target	3.2	3.2	3.2	2013/14 = 3.53% 2014/15 = 3.11%
BV218a	Proportion of new reports of abandoned vehicles investigated within 24 hours	%	High	99.75	Better than target	99.75	99.75	99.75	Audit Commission (All England 2007/08)
CSP/0001	All crime per 1,000 population	Number	Low	60.7	Not meeting target	61.7	62.7	63.7	Ssentif (All crime, all England Forces, Mar 14)
LI/PRO/03	Proportion of spend with businesses whose HQ is in Swale or which is a significant local employer	%	High	63	Better than target	75	78	80	NA
LI/DC/DCE/04	Proportion of planning decisions delegated to officers	%	High	88.0	Not meeting target	86.5	86.5	86.5	CLG (PSF Return) Table P132 All England (Year-ending June 2015)
LI/DC/DCE/06	Proportion of planning applications refused	%	Low	15	Not meeting target	15	15	15	2013/14 = 17.07% 2014/15 = 13.2%
LI/DC/DCE/07	Proportion of planning enforcement responses to complainant within 21 days	%	High	80.0	On target	82.0	83.5	85.0	NA
LI/LS/LCCO 1	Proportion of all land searches completed in five working days	%	High	74	On target	95	95	95	2012/13 = 94.80% 2013/14 = 97.70%

Reference	Description	Unit	It's better to be...	Target 2015/16	Current performance	Fixed Target 2016/17	Indicative Target 2017/18	Indicative Target 2018/19	Benchmark comparison source or note on Swale's past performance
LI/TBC/02	Proportion of major planning applications overturned at appeal	%	Low	10	Better than target	10	10	10	2013/14 = 0% 2014/15 = < 1%
NI 157a	Proportion of major planning applications determined within 13 wks	%	High	83	On target	84	89	89	CLG (PSF Return) Table P132 All England (Year-ending June 2015)
NI 157b	Proportion of minor planning applications determined within 8 wks	%	High	75	On target	78	82	82	CLG (PSF Return) Table P132 All England (Year-ending June 2015)
NI 157c	Proportion of other planning applications determined within 8 wks	%	High	88	On target	89	91	91	CLG (PSF Return) Table P132 All England (Year-ending June 2015)
BV 8	Proportion of invoices for commercial goods and services paid within 30 days of receipt or within agreed terms	%	High	97	Better than target	97	97	97	Audit Commission (All England 2007/08)
LI/IA/005	Percentage of Audit recommendations implemented	%	High	95	Better than target	95	95	95	NA
LI/EH/001	Percentage of planning consultations responded to in 21 days (Environmental Health)	%	High	85	Better than target	85	86	87	NA
LI/EH/002	The percentage of food hygiene inspections completed that were due	%	High	90	Not meeting target	90	90	90	NA

Colour coding of targets relates to comparative performance.

	Best quartile. Performance at this level would place Swale among the best 25% of councils in the comparison group.
	Better than median. Performance at this level would place Swale among the best 50% of councils in the comparison group.
	Worse than median. Performance at this level would place Swale among the worst 50% of councils in the comparison group.
	Worst quartile. Performance at this level would place Swale among the worst 25% of councils in the comparison group.
	No comparison data is available for these indicators.