

**2009/10 NPI quarterly report  
Q3 (Oct-Dec 2009)**

Cells shaded grey identify not applicable, not required, calculated automatically or information.

Cells shaded turquoise identify data required from lead officer.

TMBC's 2008/09 results and 2009/10 targets are compared with All English authorities based on 2007/08 comparative data provided by the Audit Commission, where possible.

Top Quartile performance
Mid Range performance
Bottom Quartile performance

Direction of travel - compares current performance against performance for the same cumulative period of the previous year.		Target achieved/on profile compares current performance against 2009/10 target.	
+	Better than prior performance	Y	Target being achieved/on profile.
=	Same as prior performance	N	Target <b>not</b> being achieved/ <b>not</b> on profile.
-	Worse than prior performance	c	Cumulative performance

Number/Description	Lead officer
<b>Central Services</b>	
NP14 The proportion (percentage) of customer contact that is of low or no value to the customer.	Bruce Hill (co-ordinator)
NP182 Satisfaction of businesses with local authority regulation services (score out of 100).	Bruce Hill (co-ordinator)
<b>Environmental Health Services</b>	
NP184 Percentage of food establishments in the area which are broadly compliant with food hygiene law.	Jane Heeley
NP191 Kilograms of residual household waste per household.	Phil Beddoes
NP192 Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting.	
NP195-litter Percentage of relevant land and highways assessed as having an unacceptable level of deposits of litter.	
NP195-detritus Percentage of relevant land and highways assessed as having an unacceptable level of deposits of detritus.	
NP195-graffiti Percentage of relevant land and highways from which unacceptable levels of graffiti are visible.	
NP195-fly-posting Percentage of relevant land and highways from which unacceptable levels of fly-posting are visible.	
NP196 Improved street and environmental cleanliness - effectiveness in reducing fly-tipping.	

Previous data				
2007/08 result	2007/08 top/bottom quartile entry points	2008/09 target	2008/09 3/4-year Apr-Dec	2008/09 result
			4.5	3.3
			80	80
		80	88	88
			418	563
40.60	No comparative data	46.30	48.02	46.24
8	No comparative data	6	7	5
8	No comparative data	7	7	6
4	1 5	4	1	1
1	0 1	0	0	0
2	1 3	1	3	3

Current data							
2009/10 target	2009/10 Q3 Oct-Dec	2009/10 3/4-year Apr-Dec	Direction of travel (+/=/-)	Target achieved/on profile (Y/N)	>10% from 2008/09 result?	>10% from 2009/10 target?	Explanation of variance from target, actions to achieve target/positive direction of travel and other comments
Not set	12.0	6.7	-	No target	Yes	No target	Q3 monitoring: Benefits - new claims and changes of circumstances Building Control - site inspections and private searches.
80	74	75	-	N	No	No	
88	74	84	-	N	No	No	Decreasing percentage seems to be attributable to businesses failing to maintain their food safety management systems.
555	134	403	c +	Y	Not comparable	Not comparable	Overall reduction in waste collected linked to economic downturn
46.40	44.49	46.76	-	Y	No	No	
5	3	4	+	Y	Yes	Yes	Monitoring is based on three periods each of four months so cannot be reported quarterly. Q3 result is for second four months (Aug-Nov).
6	8	7	=	N	Yes	Yes	Monitoring is based on three periods each of four months so cannot be reported quarterly. Q3 result is for second four months (Aug-Nov).
1	1	1	=	Y	No	No	Monitoring is based on three periods each of four months so cannot be reported quarterly. Q3 result is for second four months (Aug-Nov).
0	1	1	-	N	Yes	Yes	Monitoring is based on three periods each of four months so cannot be reported quarterly. Q3 result is for second four months (Aug-Nov).
1	1	2	+	N	Yes	Yes	This represents a scoring figure based on level 1 to 4, so % variance is not applicable. This represents a significant increase in enforcement and a small increase in fly tipping incidents.

**2009/10 NPI quarterly report  
Q3 (Oct-Dec 2009)**

Cells shaded grey identify not applicable, not required, calculated automatically or information.

Cells shaded turquoise identify data required from lead officer.

TMBC's 2008/09 results and 2009/10 targets are compared with All English authorities based on 2007/08 comparative data provided by the Audit Commission, where possible.

Top Quartile performance

Mid Range performance

Bottom Quartile performance

Number/Description	Lead officer
<b>Housing Services</b>	
NP155 Number of affordable homes delivered (gross).	Janet Walton
NP156 Number of households living in Temporary Accommodation.	
<b>Financial Services</b>	
NP180 The number of changes of circumstances which affect customers' Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit entitlement within the year.	Andrew Rosevear
NP181 Average time taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events.	
<b>Planning Services</b>	
NP157-major Percentage of <b>major</b> planning applications determined within 13 weeks.	Lindsay Pearson
NP157-minor Percentage of <b>minor</b> planning applications determined within 8 weeks.	
NP157-other Percentage of <b>other</b> planning applications determined within 8 weeks.	

Previous data				
2007/08 result	2007/08 top/bottom quartile entry points	2008/09 target	2008/09 3/4-year Apr-Dec	2008/09 result
239	No comparative data	240	213	251
78	No comparative data	55	No data	39
New in 2008/09			No data	No data
New in 2008/09			No data	No data
67.27	79.07 62.96	70.00	68.57	72.73
76.50	83.66 71.62	77.00	75.20	75.65
90.38	91.82 84.00	90.00	91.57	91.21

Direction of travel - compares current performance against performance for the same cumulative period of the previous year.		Target achieved/on profile compares current performance against 2009/10 target.	
+	Better than prior performance	Y	Target being achieved/on profile.
=	Same as prior performance	N	Target <b>not</b> being achieved/ <b>not</b> on profile.
-	Worse than prior performance	c	Cumulative performance

Current data							
2009/10 target	2009/10 Q3 Oct-Dec	2009/10 3/4-year Apr-Dec	Direction of travel (+/=/-)	Target achieved/ on profile (Y/N)	>10% from 2008/09 result?	>10% from 2009/10 target?	Explanation of variance from target, actions to achieve target/positive direction of travel and other comments
190	108	211	c -	Y	Not comparable	Not comparable	Frantschach, Carpenters Lane, Cattle Market, Old Cannon Wharf
35	20	20	Not comparable	Y	Yes	Yes	
7,000.0			c Polarity not clear	Polarity not clear	Not comparable	Not comparable	We have just received the first data from the DWP (extracted from the SHBE file) and as at 16 November 2009 (year to date figure), we have 14420 changes. No data is available after this date. The DWP issued some guidance with the data to stating there may be some inconsistencies making it unreliable for bench marking.
15.0	10.4	10.5	Not comparable	Y	Not comparable	Yes	A higher number of changes in circumstances have been included in the calculation than originally anticipated such as those due to a legislative change in November. These effect a lower overall result.
70.00	60.00	70.00	+	Y	No	No	Less than 1% point from target. Subject to sensitivity due to relatively few number of cases.
77.00	79.69	74.33	-	N	No	No	"Minor" applications include significant schemes (eg: up to ten dwellings) and is the category where the greatest increase in complexity of cases has been experienced.
90.00	92.46	90.69	-	Y	No	No	