

# Environment & Sustainable Communities Overview & Scrutiny Committee

23 January 2018

## Quarter Two 2017/18 Performance Management Report



---

### Report of Corporate Management Team Lorraine O'Donnell, Director of Transformation and Partnerships Councillor Simon Henig, Leader of the Council

---

#### Purpose of the Report

- 1 To present progress against the council's corporate performance framework for the Altogether Greener priority theme for the second quarter of the 2017/18 financial year.

#### Background

- 2 This year, the Sustainable Community Strategy, setting out the vision for the county, and supporting Council Plan and service plans are due for review. With a strong commitment to progressing the council's transformation programme, driven by a focus on delivering the best possible outcomes within available resources, Cabinet agreed that an outcome based approach to planning is adopted. 2017/18 is a transition year as we review our vision, planning framework and associated performance management arrangements to ensure that they operate efficiently and are fit for purpose in the current climate.

#### Performance Reporting Arrangements for 2017/18

- 3 Our performance reporting arrangements have been developed around a series of key performance questions aligned to the Altogether framework of six priority themes, and are designed to facilitate greater scrutiny of performance. The set of performance measures provides an indication to help answer these questions for those with corporate governance responsibilities. Development of performance reporting will continue throughout the year in particular to enhance reporting of qualitative aspects of performance as highlighted by the 2016 Ofsted inspection.
- 4 There are other areas of performance that are measured through more detailed monitoring across service groupings and if performance issues arise, these will be escalated for consideration by including them in the corporate report on an exception basis.
- 5 The performance indicators are still reported against two indicator types which comprise of:

- (a) key target indicators – targets are set for indicators where improvements can be measured regularly and where improvement can be actively influenced by the council and its partners; and
  - (b) key tracker indicators – performance is tracked but no targets are set for indicators which are long-term and/or which the council and its partners only partially influence.
- 6 This report sets out our key performance messages from data released this quarter. A visual summary per Altogether priority theme presents key data messages from the new performance framework showing the latest position in trends and how we compare with others. A comprehensive table of key performance questions and performance data is presented in Appendix 3. An explanation of symbols used and the groups we use to compare ourselves is in Appendix 2.
- 7 To support the complete indicator set, a guide is available which provides full details of indicator definitions and data sources for the 2017/18 corporate indicator set. This is available to view and can be requested from the Corporate Planning and Performance Team at [performance@durham.gov.uk](mailto:performance@durham.gov.uk).

### **Key Performance Messages from Data Released this Quarter**

- 8 We have maintained good levels of street and environmental cleanliness across the county with low levels of litter, detritus and dog fouling<sup>1</sup>. Fly-tipping incidents have seen a 4% increase on last quarter (298 more incidents) (see appendix 4, chart 1). The greatest increase in incidents has been white goods, which rose 29%, and other household waste, rising 25%. Enforcement action has seen more CCTV cameras deployed and incidents caught on camera as well as an increase in stop and search operations and over £5,000 awarded in fines. Nationally, fly-tipping incidents handled by councils across England rose 7% on last year, the fourth year in a row that incidents increased, with two-thirds of fly-tips being household waste.
- 9 Our collection and disposal of waste shows we continue to divert more than 95% of our municipal waste from landfill, although our household reuse, recycling and composting rate has remained static since 2015/16 and below the national average. There has been a slight decrease (0.5%) in the number of properties joining the garden waste collection scheme compared to the same period last year although more kilograms of garden waste have been collected per household.
- 10 CO2 emissions in County Durham have reduced from 1990 levels and already achieved the 2020 reduction target set by government. This includes curbing emissions from heat, buildings, industry, transport, and agriculture. Durham County Council operations have emitted less CO2 during 2016/17 and are on course to achieve the 2020 target reduction. The replacement of streetlights with LED and intensity of grid-supplied electricity produced through renewable

---

<sup>1</sup> Methodology for measuring street cleanliness is available for Members from the link: [Environmental Cleanliness definitions](#)

natural resources, are major factors in the reduction, also rationalisation of buildings has made an impact.

### **Risk Management**

- 11 Effective risk management is a vital component of the council's agenda. The council's risk management process sits alongside our change programme and is incorporated into all significant change and improvement projects.
- 12 There are no key risks in delivering the objectives of this theme.

### **Key Data Messages by Altogether Theme**

- 13 The next section provides a summary per Altogether theme of key data messages. The format of the Altogether themes provides a snap shot overview aimed to ensure that key performance messages are easy to identify<sup>2</sup>. The Altogether themes are supplemented by information and data relating to the complete indicator set, provided at Appendix 3.

---

<sup>2</sup> Images designed by Freepik from Flaticon,

## Altogether Greener

### Clean and attractive environment

#### Environmental cleanliness

Good levels of environmental cleanliness continue in County Durham (Apr to Jul 2017)

 **3.6%** litter, a reduction from last reported (5.8%)

 **12.1%** detritus, an increase from last reported (9.8%)

 **1%** dog fouling. The level continues to remain low.

#### Fly-tipping

##### Oct 2016 - Sep 2017

**4%** increase in fly-tipping incidents recorded compared to last quarter

**7,805** incidents recorded, 298 more than last quarter (7,507)

**150** incidents on average per week (21 on average each day)

**29%** increase in white goods compared to same period last year

Actions to date: 2017/18

Cameras deployed to 29 locations	18 incidents caught on CCTV
115 stop and search operations	11 duty of care warning letters 8 fixed penalty notices issued
860 further investigations	6 prosecutions £5,783 awarded in fines, compensation, costs and surcharges

### Collection and disposal of waste

#### Refuse and recycling

##### Aug 2016 - Jul 2017

 **96.3%** municipal waste diverted from landfill, in line with target (95%)

 **39.9%** household waste re-used, recycled or composted. The level has remained static since 2015/16 and below national average

 **69,933** properties had joined the 2017 recycle garden waste scheme at Aug 2017, 381 less than at Aug 2016

 **167 kgs** garden waste collected per household at Aug 2017, compared to 160kgs collected at Aug 2016

#### Carbon emissions



**14%** less CO2 was emitted during 2016/17 as a result of Durham County Council's operations and we are on course to achieve our 2020 target reduction of 40%.

The replacement of streetlights with LED and intensity of grid-supplied electricity produced through renewable natural resources, are major factors in the reduction, also rationalisation of buildings has made an impact.

**49.9%** reduction in CO2 emissions in County Durham.

The target of achieving a 40% reduction (against 2008/09 baseline) by 2020 has already been achieved.

This includes curbing emissions from heat, buildings, industry, transport, and agriculture.

## **Recommendations and reasons**

- 14 That the Environment and Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee receive the report and consider any performance issues arising therein.

---

**Contact: Jenny Haworth Tel: 03000 268071**

---

Appendix 1: Implications

Appendix 2: Report Key

Appendix 3: Summary of key performance indicators

Appendix 4: Volume measures

---

## **Appendix 1: Implications**

---

**Finance** - Latest performance information is being used to inform corporate, service and financial planning.

**Staffing** - Performance against a number of relevant corporate health Performance Indicators (PIs) has been included to monitor staffing issues.

**Risk** - Reporting of significant risks and their interaction with performance is integrated into the quarterly monitoring report.

**Equality and Diversity / Public Sector Equality Duty** - Corporate health PIs are monitored as part of the performance monitoring process.

**Accommodation** - Not applicable

**Crime and Disorder** - A number of PIs and key actions relating to crime and disorder are continually monitored in partnership with Durham Constabulary.

**Human Rights** - Not applicable

**Consultation** - Not applicable

**Procurement** - Not applicable

**Disability Issues** - Employees with a disability are monitored as part of the performance monitoring process.

**Legal Implications** - Not applicable

---

## Appendix 2: Report key

---

### Performance Indicators:

#### Direction of travel/benchmarking

Same or better than comparable period/comparator group

**GREEN**

Worse than comparable period / comparator group (within 2% tolerance)

**AMBER**

Worse than comparable period / comparator group (greater than 2%)

**RED**

#### Performance against target

Meeting/Exceeding target

Getting there - performance approaching target (within 2%)

Performance >2% behind target

- ✓ Performance is good or better than comparable period/benchmark
- ✗ Performance is poor or worse than comparable period/benchmark
- ↔ Performance has remained static or is in line with comparable period/benchmark

### National Benchmarking

We compare our performance to all English authorities. The number of authorities varies according to the performance indicator and functions of councils, for example educational attainment is compared to county and unitary councils however waste disposal is compared to district and unitary councils.

### North East Benchmarking

The North East figure is the average performance from the authorities within the North East region, i.e. County Durham, Darlington, Gateshead, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Newcastle upon Tyne, North Tyneside, Northumberland, Redcar and Cleveland, Stockton-On-Tees, South Tyneside, Sunderland. The number of authorities also varies according to the performance indicator and functions of councils.

### Nearest Neighbour Benchmarking:

The nearest neighbour model was developed by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA), one of the professional accountancy bodies in the UK. CIPFA has produced a list of 15 local authorities which Durham is statistically close to when you look at a number of characteristics. The 15 authorities that are in the nearest statistical neighbours group for Durham using the CIPFA model are: Barnsley, Wakefield, Doncaster, Rotherham, Wigan, Kirklees, St Helens, Calderdale, Dudley, Northumberland, Tameside, Sheffield, Gateshead, Stockton-On-Tees and Stoke-on-Trent.

We also use other neighbour groups to compare our performance. More detail of these can be requested from the Corporate Planning and Performance Team at [performance@durham.gov.uk](mailto:performance@durham.gov.uk).

### Appendix 3: Summary of Key Performance Indicators

Ref	PI ref	Description	Latest data	Period covered	Period target	Data 12 months earlier	Performance compared to 12 months earlier	Performance compared to National figure	Performance compared to *North East or **Nearest statistical neighbour figure	Period covered
<b>Altogether Greener</b>										
<b>1. How clean and tidy is my local environment?</b>										
102	NS14a	Percentage of relevant land and highways assessed (LEQSPRO survey) as having deposits of litter that fall below an acceptable level	3.56	Apr - Jul 2017	Tracker	5.94	GREEN	10	GREEN	2014/15
103	NS 14b	Percentage of relevant land and highways assessed (LEQSPRO survey) as having deposits of detritus that fall below an acceptable level	12.12	Apr - Jul 2017	Tracker	9.34	RED	27	GREEN	2014/15
104	NS 14c	Percentage of relevant land and highways assessed as having deposits of dog fouling that fall below an acceptable level	0.67	Apr - Jul 2017	Tracker	0.56	RED	7	GREEN	2014/15
<b>2 Are we reducing carbon emissions and adapting to climate change?</b>										
105	RED PI46	Percentage reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in County Durham (by 40% by 2020 and 55% by March 2031)	49.9	2015	Tracker	48.00	GREEN			

Ref	PI ref	Description	Latest data	Period covered	Period target	Data 12 months earlier	Performance compared to 12 months earlier	Performance compared to National figure		Performance compared to *North East or **Nearest statistical neighbour figure		Period covered
106	RED PI48	Percentage change in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from local authority operations	-14	2016/17	Tracker	-6.00	GREEN					
<b>3. How effective and sustainable is our collection and disposal of waste?</b>												
107	NS10	Percentage of municipal waste diverted from landfill	96.3	Aug 2016 - Jul 2017		95.3	GREEN					
108	NS19	Percentage of household waste that is re-used, recycled or composted	39.9	Aug 2016 - Jul 2017	Tracker	39.0	GREEN	43.0	RED	35.3*	GREEN	2015/16
109	NS15	Number of fly-tipping incidents	7,805	Oct 2016 - Sep 2017	Tracker	7,998	GREEN					

**Table 2: Other additional relevant indicators**

Ref	PI ref	Description	Latest data	Period covered	Period target	Data 12 months earlier	Performance compared to 12 months earlier	Performance compared to National figure		Performance compared to *North East or **Nearest statistical neighbour figure		Period covered
<b>Altogether Wealthier</b>												
<b>4. Is it easy to travel around the county?</b>												

Ref	PI ref	Description	Latest data	Period covered	Period target	Data 12 months earlier	Performance compared to 12 months earlier	Performance compared to National figure		Performance compared to *North East or **Nearest statistical neighbour figure		Period covered
15	NS0 6a	Percentage of A roads where maintenance is recommended (scanner survey)	3	2016/17	Tracker	4	GREEN	3	GREEN	3*	GREEN	2015/16
16	NS0 6bc	Percentage of B and C roads where maintenance is recommended (scanner survey)	3	2016/17	Tracker	4	GREEN	6	GREEN	6*	GREEN	2015/16
17	NS0 6d	Percentage of unclassified roads where maintenance is recommended (scanner survey)	20	2015/16	Tracker	19	RED	17	RED	14*	RED	2015/16

## Appendix 4: Volume Measures

### Chart 1. Fly-tipping incidents

