

**Indicators removed from the KPI Set 2014-17**

Indicator	Frequency	Good Performance	2013/14 Out-turn	Comment
<b>DCV 001</b> Percentage of commercial planning applications completed within statutory timescales	Quarterly	Aim to maximise	<b>81.37%</b>	As with the indicator below this indicator is very resource intensive as is not a natural category in planning who classify applications as majors, minors and others. The data for this indicator will still be recorded but for majors only and it will no longer be a key performance indicator.
<b>DCV 002 b)</b> Percentage of those taking pre-application advice where the applications were approved	Bi-Annual	Aim to maximise	<b>N/A</b>	Although this indicator performs well it is a resource intensive exercise to gather the data. What is required here is a measure of the quality of advice given therefore a satisfaction measure will be investigated for 2015 onwards.
<b>DCV 014a</b> Average time taken (weeks) to process planning applications (majors)	Quarterly	Aim to maximise	<b>26.70</b>	These were new indicators for 2013/14, it replaced the indicators about the processing of planning applications within the relevant statutory timescale (majors, minors and others), which are reported to centrally. These statutory indicators have declined in performance and as are centrally reported should be monitored more closely therefore DCV 014a-c has been replaced with Percentage of Planning Applications processed within timescale a) Majors b) Minors c) Others with the median value for each reported also.
<b>DCV 014b</b> Average time taken (weeks) to process planning applications (minors)	Quarterly	Aim to maximise	<b>12.17</b>	
<b>DCV 014c</b> Average time taken (weeks) to process planning applications (others)	Quarterly	Aim to maximise	<b>8.66</b>	
<b>DEP 007</b> Percentage of fly-tipping reports responded to within one working day	Quarterly	Aim to minimise	<b>98.54%</b>	Only 17 instances of fly-tipping were responded to later than 1 working day and overall the number of fly-tipping instances is reducing. However; targeting this indicator is not a priority as performance is so high, therefore it will continue to be monitored but is recommended for removal from the KPI set.
<b>WCN 005</b> Residual Waste per household (kg) (NI 191)	Quarterly	Aim to minimise	<b>452.86kg*</b>	This indicator has been recommended for removal from the KPI by the service manager. This indicator is the flip side of Percentage of waste sent for recycling meaning that if the recycling target is not achieve then this target is also not achieved. The Service Manager has requested

Indicator	Frequency	Good Performance	2013/14 Out-turn	Comment
				that it be replaced by
<b>DCV 009</b> Percentage of planning decisions taken under delegation	Quarterly	Aim to maximise	<b>93.12%</b>	More often than not the type and nature of the planning application will determine if a planning application goes to planning committee. As there is little influence or control by the team over this indicator it has been recommended for removal from the KPI set but monitored still as a service indicator.
<b>CTC 004</b> Percentage of customer contact that is avoidable (NI 14)	Quarterly	Aim to minimise	<b>6.1%</b>	This indicator originated from the National Indicators that were removed as a requirement in 2011. Due to changes in the methodology shortly after the guidance was released, and despite training to correct methods, the data for this indicator is still subjective. For example if a Customer Advisor deems that the information could be accessed through an alternative source, even if the customer cannot access our service through that source for example a person who does not have a computer or internet access rings up and asks for information if that information is online that contact is classed as avoidable.
<b>R&amp;B 007</b> Value of fraud identified (Housing benefits) (Efficiency)	Quarterly	Aim to maximise	<b>£966,390.20</b>	The grant that funds this work has reduced and inturn the resources to support it. The data will continue to be monitored as it forms part of the Annual Audit Committee report on fraud and can be assessed in context with other fraud data, however it is recommended that it is dropped from the KPI set.