KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: 2017/18

MONTHLY INDICATORS: SEPTEMBER 2017 / QUARTERLY INDICATORS: QUARTER 2

I. CUSTOMER FIRST INDICATORS

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency		I	Results (Quarter 2)	Comments & Benchmarking (where available)
	PLANNING:	I	I	1				
1.	Processing of planning applications: 'major' applications - % determined within 13	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	RESUL	T: 100% Major appl	ications determined	in 13 weeks	Above target: Target for Q2: 90% Target for 2017/18: 90%
	weeks	Nick Fenwick		100%	100%		100% TARGET: 90%	There were 3 applications in this category with all 3 determined within 13 weeks.
	A high result is good for this indicator			80%		67%		Benchmarking: Herts, England & Shire Districts
				40%				performance: Q1 2017/18
				20%				
				0%	Q2 16/17	Q1 17/18	Q2 17/18	

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency	Results (Quarter	(2)	Comments & Benchmarking	(where available)
			пециенсу		;	100%	
2.	Process of planning applications: 'minor' applications - % determined within 8 weeks A high result is good for this indicator	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance Nick Fenwick	Quarterly	Minor applications determine 97% 92% 80% 40% Q2 16/17 Q1 17/2	96% TARGET: 90%	Above target: Target for Q2: 90% There were 70 applications i determined within 8 weeks. Benchmarking: Herts, England performance: Q1 2017/18	

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency		R	esults (Q	uarter 2)			Com	ments & Benchm	arking (whe	ere availa	able)
			requerity							100% 80% 60% 40% 20%	98% Three Rivers Best	T4% Welwyn Hatfield 25%	37%	Shire districts 90% 85% 85% Average
3.	Process of planning applications: 'other' applications - % determined within 8 weeks A high result is good for this indicator	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance Nick Fenwick	Quarterly	RESULT: 100% 80% 60% 40% 20%		ications de	97%	in 8 weeks	98%	Targ Ther dete	ve target: et for Q2: 90% re were 142 application 8 vector within 8 vector w	eations in thi veeks. England & S	s categor	

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency	F	Results (Quarter 2)		Comments & Benchmarking (where available)
4.	CSC service levels – 85% calls answered in 20 seconds (Revenues and Benefits calls are not included) A high result is good for this indicator	Service Transf'tion Andrew Cox	Monthly	80% 78% 60% 40% 20%	vels – 85% call answ 73%	77%	Below target: Target for Q2: 85% Target for 2017/18: 85%
5.	Long wait calls received to CSC Long wait = calls not answered within 2 minutes (Revenues and Benefits calls are not included) A low result is good for this indicator	Service Transf'tion Andrew Cox	Monthly	Q2 16/17 RESULT: 13% CSC service levels: 30% 25% 20%	Q1 17/18 long wait calls (not	Q2 17/18 answered in 2 mins)	Below target: Below target: Target for Q2: 3% Target for 2017/18: 3%
				10% 8% 5% 0% Q1 (Jun) 16/1	7 Q4 (Mar) 16/	TARGET: 95% 17 Q1 (Jun) 17/18	

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency	Results (Quarter 2)	Comments & Benchmarking (where available)
6.	CSC service levels 95% all calls answered	Service Transf'tion Andrew Cox	requerity	Report not available.	Target for Q2: 95% Target for 2017/18: 95%
7.	Calls resolved at first point of contact	Service Transf'tion Andrew Cox		Report not available.	Target for Q2: 3% Target for 2017/18: 3%
8.	Complaints resolved at stage one	Service Transf'tion Andrew Cox		Report not available.	Target for Q2: 90% Target for 2017/18: 90%
9.	% of stage 1 complaints resolved within 10 days	Service Transf'tion Andrew Cox		Report not available.	Target for Q2: 80% Target for 2017/18: 80%

II. QUALITY OF LIFE INDICATORS

	Indicator	Service	Reporting		Quarter 2)			Comments & Benchmarking (where available)											
		area	frequency																
	HOUSING:																		
10.	Affordable homes	Place	Biannually						Target for 2017/18: 32										
	completions, including	Shaping & Corporate			Social	Affordable	LCH	Total	Tuiset 101 2017/10. 32										
	social / affordable rent, affordable sales and	Performance		Size of home	Rented	Rented	0		Handovers have exceeded the target of 32 so far this										
	starter homes.			1 bed	2	10	2	14	year.										
	(Starter homes do not	Nick		2 bed	7	11	2	20											
	contribute to reduction in	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick	Fenwick		3 bed	0	0	0	0	
	homeless households on the waiting list or in			Total	9	21	4	34											
	temporary accom.)																		
	A high result is good for																		
	this indicator																		

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency			Results (Quarter 2)		Comments & Benchmar	king (where	e available)		
11.	Number of statutory homeless	Place Shaping & Corporate	Quarterly	RESULT: 32 Number of statutory homeless (new cases)				No target set. Benchmarking: Herts and England performance:				
	A low result is good for this indicator	Performance Nick		40	Number of	statutory homeless (new ca	ises)	Q1 2017/18 Numbers accepted as kineed	eing homel	ess and in priority		
		Fenwick		35			32		Total	Number per 1,000 households		
				30				Broxbourne	66	1.65		
				25				Dacorum	50	0.77		
				20				East Herts	13	0.21		
				15				Hertsmere	51	1.21		
								North Herts	32	0.24		
				10				St Albans	22	0.37		
				5				Stevenage	19	0.51		
				0				Three Rivers	12	0.32		
					Q2 16/17	Q1 17/18	Q2 17/18	Watford	38	0.94		
								Welwyn Hatfield	38	0.79		
								England		0.61		
								London		1.11		
								England exc. London		0.52		

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency	Results (Quarter 2) Con	mments & Benchmar	king (where av	/ailable)							
12.	Reasons for homelessness	Place Shaping &	Quarterly	No target set.										
	Narrative indicator	Corporate Performance Nick		Watford BC: Homeless acceptances - top main reasons for loss of last s home		Q1 - Jun								
		Fenwick		Loss of private sector tenancy	4	(13%)								
				Parental eviction	12	(39%)								
				Family or friend eviction	5	(16%)								
				Other	1	(3%)								
				Relationship break non-violent	4	(13%)								
				Left hospital/institution/care	2	(6%)								
				Left prison/on remand	1	(3%)								
				Relationship breakdown - violent	2	(6%)								
				Total Homeless Acceptances		31 43								
				Homeless applications For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of			e sector tenancy							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances			England exc London							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18)	quarter exceeded the	loss of a private	England							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide	quarter exceeded the England	loss of a private	England exc London							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (parents) Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide	quarter exceeded the England 15%	London 15%	England exc London 14%							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (parents) Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (other)	equarter exceeded the England 15% 12%	London 15%	England exc London 14% 10%							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (parents) Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (other) Relationship breakdown with partner (violent)	equarter exceeded the England 15% 12% 17%	London 15% 15%	England exc London 14% 10%							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (parents) Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (other) Relationship breakdown with partner (violent) Relationship breakdown with partner (other) Mortgage arrears (repossession or other loss of home) Rent arrears	England 15% 12% 17% 7%	London 15% 15% 6% 2%	England exc London 14% 10% 14% 7%							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (parents) Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (other) Relationship breakdown with partner (violent) Relationship breakdown with partner (other) Mortgage arrears (repossession or other loss of home)	England 15% 12% 17% 7% 6%	London 15% 15% 6% 2% 0%	England exc London 14% 10% 14% 7% 1%							
				For the first time since 2012/13, parental evictions this last of Benchmark against England and London (Q1 2017/18) Homeless acceptances Top main reasons for loss of last settled home Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (parents) Relatives/friends no longer able or willing to provide accommodation (other) Relationship breakdown with partner (violent) Relationship breakdown with partner (other) Mortgage arrears (repossession or other loss of home) Rent arrears	England 15% 12% 17% 7% 6% 3%	London 15% 15% 6% 2% 0% 3%	England exc London 14% 10% 14% 7% 1% 3%							

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency			Results (Quarter 2))	Comments & Benchma	rking (where	e available)
13.	Number of households living in temporary accommodation	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	RESULT		s in temporary accor	Above target: Target for Q2: 200	Target fo	r 2017/18: 200	
	A low result is good for this indicator	Nick Fenwick		220 200 • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	216	212	TARGET: 200	This is the first time since number of households in the Benchmarking: Herts are Q1 June 2017 Number of household accommodation	n TA was bel	ow 200 erformance:
				80 60					Total	Number per 1,000 households
				40				Broxbourne	495	12.37
				20				Dacorum	84	1.30
				0	02.16/17	Q1 17/18	02.17/1	East Herts	20	0.32
					Q2 16/17	Q1 17/18	Q2 17/1	Hertsmere	176	4.17
								North Herts	80	1.39
								St Albans	111	1.86
								Stevenage	98	2.62
								Three Rivers	83	2.21
								Watford	212	5.22
								Welwyn Hatfield	75	1.57
								England		3.33
								London		14.84
								England exc. London		1.21

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency		Re	sults (Quarter 2)		Comments & Bench	marking	g (where av	ailable)
14.	Number of households living in temporary accommodation with children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for this indicator	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance Nick Fenwick	Quarterly	RESUL	185 Q2 16/17	186 Q1 17/18	on with children	No target set for this This is the P1E retur it includes pregnant These households he expected children. figure was 185 hous expected.	n figure t womer ad a tota In Septe	to government with no other all of 381 chiles and the contract of the contract	ner dependent Idren including the equivalen
	1										
15.	Number of households living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	RESUL Ho	ouseholds in ter	nporary accommoda children	ation without	No target set for thi The table below sho range of the 19 hous	ws a bre		gender and ag
15.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for	Shaping & Corporate	Quarterly	Но		= =	ation without	The table below sho range of the 19 hous	ws a breseholds.	eakdown by	Grand
.5.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end	Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	Ho	ouseholds in ter	children	ation without	The table below sho range of the 19 hous	ws a breseholds.		Grand Total
.5.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for	Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	Ho 30 25 20	ouseholds in ter	children		The table below sho range of the 19 house Age Group 16-17	ws a breseholds. Men 1	Women	Grand Total
5.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for	Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	Ho 30 25	ouseholds in ter	children		Age Group 16-17 18-24	ws a breseholds. Men 1 3	Women 2	Grand Total 1 5
5.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for	Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	Ho 30 25 20	ouseholds in ter	children		Age Group 16-17 18-24 25-44	ws a breseholds. Men 1 3 6	Women 2 2	Grand Total 1 5 8
5.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for	Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	Ho 30 25 20 15	ouseholds in ter	children		Age Group 16-17 18-24 25-44 45-59	ws a breseholds. Men 1 3 6 2	Women 2	Grand Total 1 5 8 3
5.	living in temporary accommodation without children Snap-shot at quarter end A low result is good for	Shaping & Corporate Performance	Quarterly	Ho 30 25 20 15	ouseholds in ter	children		Age Group 16-17 18-24 25-44	ws a breseholds. Men 1 3 6	Women 2 2	Grand Total 1 5 8

Q1 17/18

Q2 17/18

Q2 16/17

	Indicator	Service area	Reporting frequency	Results (Quarter 2)	Comments & Benchmarking (where available)
16.	Rough sleepers within the authority area Snap shot taken on one night in November A low result is good for this indicator	Place Shaping & Corporate Performance Nick Fenwick	Annual	Not reported for Q2	Count held in November 2016: 13 Next count due in November 2017. New Hope continues to deliver the council's Outreach Services contract to work with rough sleepers including through its Rough Sleepers Prevention Service. Feedback from New Hope about rough sleepers they worked with in 2016-17 includes the following: • At least a third of the rough sleepers they have worked with were problematic drug users. The majority of these were known to be involved with begging and various aspects of criminality in the town centre • A large rise in chaotic lifestyles in the rough sleeping population was seen, mostly due to drug use • 17% of rough sleepers worked with during 2016/17 were EEA nationals. Although the service engaged well with this client group it was difficult to find them accommodation due to lack of income and alcohol issues