

Item No. 2.	Classification: Open	Date: 21/09/05	MEETING NAME Environment & Community Support Scrutiny sub-committee
Report title:		Performance indicators	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All	
From:		Gill Davies/Sean Connolly	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That Members note the explanations set out in section 4

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. At the Environment & Community Safety sub-committee of 22nd June 2005 Members requested information on the following performance indicators. Members wanted both information on how the indicator was measured and of course an update on actual performance.
3. The indicators were
 - **BV 127** - explanation of the figures for robberies
 - **BV176/BV225** - target for domestic violence places refuge not provided or supported seemed low, how does this compare with other boroughs?
 - **LE12** - information about noise complaints
 - **BV166** - Members would like to be provided with the checklist of enforcement best practice for environmental health/trading standards
 - **LW11** - why was the cleanliness Index Housing Estates indicator deleted?
 - **LW21** - what is 'fixed penalty notices' referring to?
 - **LP02** - explanation about the figures for time taken to remove an abandoned vehicle - is it hours/days/weeks etc
 - **LP10** - further discussion about the CCTV e.g. what it involves, the effectiveness, plans for investment
 - **LL01** - further information about visits to leisure centres -
 - **BV223 and 187a** - explanation about the situation with principal roads and footways
 - **LH20/BV98** - information about street lights not working as planned
 - **BV99** - explanation of change to the indicator about road accidents for 2005/06 from previous years
 - Whether there were any indicators in regard to the performance of community wardens.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. This section sets out the answers to the questions above..

- **BV 127 – Robberies per 1,000 population**

Quarter 1 saw an increase in robberies per 1,000 population from 2.4 to 2.9. This is a London wide trend although the increase is higher in Southwark than across London.

During 2004/05 robberies increased by 4.8% (2,295 incidents to 2,727 incidents) according to the SSP report to the scrutiny committee. 95% of robbery is personal robbery, which has increased by 50% in April and May compared to the same period last year. The main hotspot is Elephant & Castle. Possible reasons are:

- Numerous transport links bringing a large number of potential victims and offenders together
- Increasing number of late night pubs and clubs
- Student population at South Bank University (accounts for 24% of victims)

Work to tackle **violent crime** continued on track in quarter 1, and includes:

- Targeted effort in Peckham, Bermondsey and Elephant and Castle to address the impact that gangs associated with violence have on the communities. There are 3 established groups working in this area – a gangs sub group, a multi agency gangs intelligence group and a gang intervention group.
- The development of a **youth inclusion project** in Peckham, as an expansion of the youth inclusion project at Elephant and Castle. £50k of funding from the Positive Futures for Sports programme in Peckham was secured, which will support diversion work. However, we are awaiting confirmation from the Youth Justice Board of future funding into 2006/07.
- Work to increase the numbers of early interventions and diversion work to reduce the numbers of **young people entering the criminal justice system** is on track. The number of young people being referred to YOT is increasing. The number taking part in restorative justice schemes via the YOT is also increasing.
- Work to enhance **support for victims and witnesses** and those most vulnerable. SSP has established a strategic group. A project plan is scheduled to be drafted in quarter 2, identifying resources and staff. In addition, in line with the vulnerable young adults programme, Victim Support has appointed a caseworker to deal specifically with 18-28 year old male victims.
- A violent crime strategy for Southwark has been developed, and will be published in September 2005.
- A Safer Southwark Partnership performance group, which includes the police, will be meeting in September to analyse the violent crime figures in detail. A particular focus will be on geography and crime type.

- **BV176/BV225 – Domestic Violence**

BV225 is a new indicator – Actions Against Domestic Violence. This incorporates indicator BV176 – Domestic Refuge Places, and targets are in development. There is not yet comparative data available for BV225 as this is newly introduced but comparative data will be available in 2006.

BV176 – Domestic Refuge Places – some comparative data is available for inner London 2004/05.

Domestic violence refuge places per 10,000 population (minimum 1):

- Tower Hamlets 1.93
- Lewisham 1.6
- Haringey 1.38
- Greenwich 1.3
- Hammersmith & Fulham 1.01
- Southwark 0.95
- Wandsworth 0.6
- Westminster 0.06

The recent guidance for the ODPM “Supporting People” programme advises that Southwark should have between 29 and 150 units as domestic violence refuge places.

Southwark has had 24 places for some time and we working towards the ODPM targets. The first milestone will therefore be to reach 29 places.

There is a significant variance between the 2004/05 target and outturn (-20%) This position relies on the acquisition of new refuge places that at present are just below the recommended and target level.

The Council, through Supporting People, is funding additional spaces (8), ready in 2005. We are also providing additional support through a new floating support scheme. The additional bed spaces will mean that we meet the minimum ODPM “Supporting People” programme requirements.

Work to addressing specifically domestic violence has continued in quarter 1 2005/06. There are action plans taking this work forward particularly in relation to:

- Strengthening the role of the domestic violence forum and widening the network of voluntary and community agencies engaged in tackling this issue.

A new sanctuary scheme became operational in quarter 1 and as at 13th July, 3 victims have accessed the sanctuary scheme, which enables them to remain at home.

- **LE12** - information about noise complaints –

This local indicator measures noise complaints responded to within 45 minutes. The performance for 2004/05 was 78.4%, which was above target (77%). It is expected that performance within this area will be raised with 1% per year until 80% is reached. This is a realistic ceiling given present resources.

- **BV166** – Environmental Health & Trading Standards Checklist Authorities are judged against a range of criteria know as the checklist which are set out in appendix 1. Essentially the service completes a self

assessment against a range of criteria governing compliance with legislation and good practice; consultation; working with other agencies where appropriate and benchmarking. This assessment is scored out of ten, and then subject to external verification through District Audit. Currently the EH&TS service scores 10/10 and only narrowly missed being awarded beacon status earlier this year.

- **LW11** - Housing Estates Cleanliness Index

This indicator is now included in the revised BVPI 199 and the parameters have changed making it a tougher standard to reach. BV199a – Percentage of land and highways with unacceptable levels of litter and detritus. This survey is undertaken by ENCAMS during 3 periods each year, who monitor progress for 25 London authorities. The annual outturn for BV199a for 2004/05 was 20%, which was better than target (33%).

Some comparative data is available for inner London 2004/05:

- Westminster 8%
- Wandsworth 9%
- Southwark 20%
- Lewisham 21%
- Tower Hamlets 22%
- Greenwich 27%
- Hammersmith & Fulham 30%

- **LW21** – Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs)

LW21 refers to fixed penalty notices for littering. The Environmental Protection Act gives Local Authorities the power to issue fixed penalty notices for littering. When this was set as a local PI, only enforcement officers were issuing FPNs. During the course of last year, the council's wardens and some housing officers were given powers to issue FPNs. During the year, out enforcement team issued 1557 FPNs, other officers issued a further 22. Discussions lead by the corporate planning & performance team are underway how to define and collect an indicator capturing all FPNs across the council, ideally on a quarterly basis.

- **LP02** – Abandoned Vehicles

The average time to remove abandoned vehicles is measured in days. The outturn for year end 2004/05 was 3.06 days (target 3 days). Please note that a new national indicator (BV218) is being introduced from 2005/06. This has a slightly different definition and will replace this local indicator. Comparative data for other local authorities will be available from 2006.

Technological advances and following improvements in accessibility of reporting is impacting on the outturn. Abandoned vehicles can now be reported to the council 24hours a day but only be removed during normal working hours.

- **LP10 - CCTV**

LP10 is a local indicator measuring the percentage of CCTV cameras which fall under the council's responsibility that are working. The outturn for 2004/05 was 90.81% which was slightly below target (93%). This is based on a 'Camera Status Report' which is sent from the CCTV Manager to the Performance Commissioning Officer weekly. First quarterly outturn for 2005/06 was 88.6% of CCTV cameras working (target of 89%). A capital program is in place for 2005/06 to renew the majority of CCTV cameras, therefore 2005/06 malfunction will stabilize over the period.

- **LL01 – Leisure Centres**

Above target performance for 2004/05 which represents a genuine increase in performance in attendance at leisure centers. The target was set at a low level, which would take into account the increasingly dilapidated condition of many of the centers. Realistic and conservative estimates for expansion was made and the provider succeeded in substantially increasing attendance during 2004/05.

Annual outturn 2004/05 1,092,291 against a target of 877,800. Target for 2005/06 is 886578.

The recent events and repair work, particularly the closure of Peckham Pulse will impact on attendance during 2005/06.

There have been recent concerns about cleanliness and general standards of customer care, particularly at the Peckham Pulse. The management agreement with Fusion (which was concluded in 2000) does not include provision for enforcement on these indicators, however officers are working to see how this can be improved. A voluntary agreement has led to the introduction of a regular and comprehensive monitoring system. This can produce indicators on these matters and these will and can be regularly reported to members. These will make explicit whether continuous improvement in the areas of concern is being achieved or not

- **BV223 and 187a – Principal Roads & Footways**

BV187 gives an indication of the percentage length of the category 1, 1a and 2 footway network that might require structural maintenance. This indicator is based on the collection and analysis of Detailed Visual Inspection (DVI measurements).

As a result of a recent exercise of reviewing and updating our road classification and footway hierarchy, a considerable length of un-classified road has been classified as class 'c' road. In addition, some length of category 2 footways were de-classified to category 3. The review in combination with a change in the rule set in the program software used to calculate the PI values for 2004/05 impacted the performance outcome for the year, which was 37.41% (target 58.99%). The target for 2005/06 has been set to 37.03%.

BV223 Condition of principal roads – percentage of the local authority principal road network where structural maintenance should be considered. This figure is derived from Scanner surveys. This is a new indicator which is

based on the old indicator BV96, where the methodology has been amended. The target for BV223 for 2005/06 is 59.78%. The methodology for BV96 changed during 2004/05, from the FWD methodology to TTS in accordance to new guidance. The outturn with the new survey methodology was 60.03%. (FWD target for 2004/06 was 7.61%, but is not comparable to the outcome).

- **LH20/BV98** – Street Lights

LH20 – This local indicator was introduced when the BVPI was deleted from 2003/04. The definition used now is the last BVPI definition but deleting the negative calculation i.e. 'not working as planned' and substituting with a positive calculation 'working as planned'. The source of the information is a database of highway assets, calculated from the Confirm data base.

It is expected that the total number of lamp columns will increase with 5% with new adaptations and upgraded roads.

It is expected that the current investment program the number of faults will reduce by 5%.

Through service efficiencies it is expected that the turnaround time for completions will reduce by 0.5 days per order.

Based on this, the target for 2005/06 has been set as 99.59% of streetlights working as planned. It is anticipated that the new definition of this local indicator will be reported on from quarter 2, 2005/06. Quarter 1 outturn for the previous definition 'not working as planned' was 0.43% (target 0.41%).

- **BV99** – Road Accident Casualties

The previous definition of this indicator divided the number of road accidents by type of road user (two wheeled motor vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians et. al) and injury type (killed or seriously injured, slightly injured). The new definition varies in that rather than type of road user, it specifies number of children killed or seriously injured as well as all people killed or seriously injured, and the percentage change since the 1994-98 average. (KSI – killed or seriously injured)

- BV99a (i) Road Accident Casualties: Number of KSI all people
- BV99a (ii) Road Accident Casualties: Percentage change from previous year, KSI all people,
- BV99a (iii) Road Accident Casualties: Percentage change since the 1994-98 average, KSI all people
- BV99b (i) Road Accident Casualties: Number of KSI children
- BV99b (ii) Road Accident Casualties: Percentage change from previous year, KSI children
- BV99b (iii) Road Accident Casualties: Percentage change since the 1994-98 average, KSI children

- BV99c (i) Road Accident Casualties: Number of people slightly injured
- BV99c (ii) Road Accident Casualties: Percentage change in slightly injured since previous year
- BV99c (iii) Road Accident Casualties: Percentage change in slightly injured since the 1994-98 average

- **Community Wardens Indicators**

As at 30th June 2005, 105 community wardens were in post, following a large recruitment drive. Looking ahead, the service is being reorganised with a view to achieving a more flexible and borough wide coverage. The warden satisfaction survey, which was completed in May 2005, highlighted some key improvements on the baseline survey. Overall satisfaction with the area as a place to live has improved significantly from the Baseline survey (October 2003 to April 2004) and satisfaction levels with all fourteen Street Scene measures covered in the study have increased as a result of Community Warden presence. The Scheme has had a particularly positive impact on environmental management and crime prevention. There have been impressive rises in satisfaction with the 'overall appearance of the area,' and 'reducing fear of crime.' Particular headlines include

- Around two thirds are now aware of the Scheme (from 44% in the Baseline survey).
- Satisfaction amongst those who have met a warden is high – 81% were very or fairly satisfied with the experience.
- Overall satisfaction with the area as a place to live has increased significantly (by 10%) since the Baseline survey.
- 74% of visitors – polled in Bankside and Elephant & Castle - agree that wardens improve the image of the area.
- Satisfaction ratings with 'reducing fear of crime' have significantly increased from the Baseline survey – 38% are very or fairly satisfied from 28%.
- The Scheme is widely perceived to have helped with 'reducing crime' (60% agree) and 'reducing anti-social behaviour' (64% agree).
- Community Wardens have had a significant impact on satisfaction levels at a range of environmental management issues, including 'overall appearance of the area' – 56% are now very or fairly satisfied (from 42%), the largest increase of fourteen measures

The Street Scene Team has also developed a number of local indicators for measuring the Warden Service.

- LCW01: Percentage of residents within the scheme area who feel safe during the day in the scheme areas
- LCW02: Satisfaction with local environmental priorities in all warden scheme areas
- LCW03: Total number of intelligence reports – from April to July 05 wardens have compiled a total of 6239 reports
- LCW08: Number of FPNs issued – a total of 17 from April
- LCW09: Number of environmental hazards reported; 6431 from April 05 to July 05
- LCW11: Percentage of people who are aware that there is a warden scheme operating in their area
- LCW12: Percentage of people in the warden scheme who say that they feel safer knowing the wardens are patrolling

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
<i>Title of document(s)</i>	<i>Title of department / unit Address</i>	<i>Name Phone number</i>
<i>Quarterly performance report</i>	<i>Corporate Policy</i>	<i>Sara Kelly 57495</i>

APPENDIX A

Audit Trail

32. *This section must be included in all reports.*

Lead Officer	<i>Gill Davies</i>	
Report Author	<i>Sean Connolly</i>	
Version	<i>1st Draft</i>	
Dated	<i>15/09/2005</i>	
Key Decision?	<i>No</i>	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	No	No
Chief Finance Officer	No	No
<i>Sarah Newton – Community Safety</i>	Yes	Yes
Executive Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services		

Appendix 1

Environmental Health & Trading Standards Checklist

1a) Does the authority have written and published enforcement policy/ policies, formally endorsed by its Members that cover all aspects of environmental health and trading standards enforcement?

1b) Is non-compliance with statutory requirements followed up in accordance with the enforcement policy/policies?

1c) Do the policy/policies confirm that the authority has signed the Enforcement Concordat?

1d) Do the policy/policies take into account the guidance set out in 'The Code for Crown Prosecutors'?

1e) Do the policy/policies include the criteria to be met before formal enforcement by the authority? The general criteria needs to be set out in the policy to demonstrate when and why 'formal enforcement' will occur. Formal action includes issue of statutory notices, home office cautions and prosecutions/injunctions. Enforcement staff need guidance on what level of enforcement is appropriate under differing circumstances. Local authority guidance should address these issues in line with its enforcement policy.

1f) Do the policy/policies make provision for situations where there is a shared enforcement role? Policy/policies will need to allow in general terms for situations where there is a shared or complementary enforcement role with other agencies, such as the Police, HSE, or OFT for example, Trading Standards services and the Housing service in the same authority working together on letting agents.

1g) Do the policy/policies make provision for the particular interests of consumers within the authority's area including business owners, employees and the public?

1h) Are the policy/policies mentioned above followed, monitored, and reported on, and any variations addressed within a service plan or BVPP?

2. Does the authority have risk-based inspection programmes, and sampling and surveillance regimes for regulatory services that:

2a) meet legal requirements?

2b) otherwise have regard to official guidance?

2c) otherwise have regard to other appropriate professional guidance and standards? Each time new guidance is given counts as regular reviews.

3. Are the programmes and regimes mentioned in question 2 followed, monitored, and reported on, and any variations addressed within a service plan or BVPP?

4. Does the authority have targeted educational and information programmes?

Authorities need to have identified local needs for consumer and business education and information, developed relevant programmes and promoted them. Programmes may be run in partnership with *for example* businesses, employer and employer representatives, education, consumer professionals, OFT, Police, other services within a local authority, and community groups. Programmes may *for example* involve distribution of leaflets, making leaflets available in libraries, holding workshops and seminars, poster campaigns, advertisements, use of the media (local newspapers), training, award schemes, newsletters, promoting compliance and awareness, advice surgeries/workshops, health promotion, and the national curriculum.

5. Are the programmes mentioned in question 4 followed, monitored, and reported on, and any deviations from the planned programmes addressed within a service plan or BVPP?

6. Does the authority have and implement policies, procedures and standards for:

6a) responding to and dealing with complaints made to the local authority about a third party and requests for services regarding statutory enforcement functions?

6b) supporting the provision of consumer advice, including on participation in Consumer Direct within your region or in a Consumer Support Network? Where an authority considers that it is giving active consideration to a CSN, these elements of the framework would need to be under consideration as a minimum.

7. Does the authority have and implement policies, procedures and standards for responding to and dealing with:

7a) statutory notifications (E.g. RIDDOR reports of accidents, occupational diseases and dangerous occurrence)?

7b) the referral to other regulators of relevant information received where there is wider regulatory interest?

8. Are the policies, procedures and standards mentioned above in questions 6 and 7 followed, monitored, and reported on, and any variations addressed within a service plan or BVPP?

9. Has the authority within the last .five years benchmarked its resources for relevant services against similar local authorities or comparable service providers including private and voluntary? To be able to answer 'Yes' to this question, the authority must have

benchmarked its resources for relevant functions against;

similar local authorities, e.g.;

in benchmarking clubs or by means of published data;

or with local authorities with similar population size or urban/ rural mix;

comparable service providers including private and voluntary.

The benchmarking exercise must have occurred in the last .five years.

10a) Does the authority have a range of mechanisms in place to consult stakeholders affected by their service regarding the development of the enforcement policy?

10b) Does the authority have a range of mechanisms in place to consult stakeholders affected by their service regarding satisfaction levels?

10c) And are the consultation responses considered and acted upon?