

**Report To:** Policy and Resources Committee      **Date:** 25 May 2021

**Report By:** Head of Organisational Development, Policy and Communications      **Report No:** PR/05/21/KB

**Contact Officer:** Karen Barclay, Corporate Policy Officer      **Contact No:** 01475 712065

**Subject:** SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

**1.0 PURPOSE**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with details of the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) 2019/20 and to highlight Inverclyde’s performance across the range of indicators. More information is provided in the Appendix.

Appendix

**2.0 SUMMARY**

2.1 The LGBF indicators are grouped across nine service areas. The Framework 2019/20 comprises 91 measures (excluding housing), however, performance information is currently only available for 73 indicators. It is proposed to submit a further report to the Committee when information regarding the other measures is available.

2.2 In 2019/20, Inverclyde Council was placed in the top two quartiles for 68% of the indicators, while 11% were in the third quartile and just over a fifth (21%) were positioned in the fourth quartile. As outlined in the following table, the Council’s performance has improved year-on-year since 2017/18 which is extremely positive for Inverclyde:

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>
Measures in Quartiles 1 and 2	59%	66%	68%
	38 indicators	47 indicators	50 indicators
Position in the national rankings for the number of measures in Quartiles 1 and 2	Joint 3rd	Joint 1st	1st.

2.3 Councils’ performance across the spectrum of indicators will vary, depending on a variety of factors including deprivation levels, investment and policy decisions and population density.

2.4 A briefing on the LGBF 2019/20 was arranged for the Elected Members on 25 May 2021.

**3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

3.1 It is recommended that the Committee:

- a. notes the progress made on Inverclyde’s performance with the LGBF 2019/20; and
- b. agrees to receive a further report when the information regarding the indicators mentioned at paragraph 5.4 has been published.

**Ruth Binks**  
**Corporate Director – Education, Communities and Organisational Development**

## 4.0 BACKGROUND

4.1 The Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) *Improving Local Government* initiative was developed to:

- support SOLACE to drive improvement in local government benchmarking;
- develop a comparative performance support framework for Scottish local authorities;
- support Councils to target transformational change in areas of greatest impact: efficiency, costs, productivity and outcomes; and
- focus on the *big ticket* areas of spend, plus corporate services.

4.2 At its meeting on 17 November 2020, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed to receive a report on the LGBF 2019/20 when the indicators had been published and the Council's performance in relation to other Scottish local authorities was known; this report fulfils that remit.

Min Ref  
P&R  
Cttee  
17.11.20  
Para 499

4.3 When interpreting the data, it is vital to remember that Councils' performance across the spectrum of indicators may vary, depending on a variety of factors including deprivation levels, investment and policy decisions and population density.

4.4 Given the wide-ranging information outlined in this report, a briefing was arranged for the Elected Members on 25 May 2021.

## 5.0 LOCAL GOVERNMENT BENCHMARKING FRAMEWORK INDICATORS 2019/20

5.1 On 26 February 2021, the Improvement Service published the LGBF 2019/20 figures; an overview of the Framework is available to view here: [Improvement Service - Local Government Benchmarking Framework](#) and information on Councils' performance here: [My Local Council](#). Additionally, on 26 February 2021, the LGBF National Overview Report 2019/20 was published: [National Benchmarking Overview Report 2019/20](#); this document provides information on how much local authorities spend on particular services, service performance and how satisfied people are with the major services provided by Councils.

5.2 In line with public performance reporting requirements, the relevant LGBF 2019/20 information has been published on the Council's website: [Statutory Performance Indicators](#). The LGBF indicators were displayed on this web page by 31 March 2021, together with all the indicators the Council is required to report on, per Audit Scotland's Statutory Performance Indicators Direction 2018.

5.3 Paragraphs 5.8-5.16 provide information on the local and national performance of the LGBF 2019/20. More details are provided in the Appendix.

Appendix

5.4 For the year 2019/20, Inverclyde Council is reporting on 91 LGBF indicators (excluding housing). However, performance details are currently only available for 73 measures. Information for 11 indicators is expected in May or June 2021; it is proposed to submit a further report to the Committee when information regarding those measures is available. The 2019/20 data is not available for seven indicators, more details of which are included at paragraphs 5.7, 5.13 and 5.15.

5.5 The LGBF indicators are grouped across nine service areas and the following table provides an overview of our 2019/20 performance:

	2019/20				Total
	1st quartile	2nd quartile	3rd quartile	4th quartile	
Children's services	7	8	0	1	16
Corporate services	5	0	1	2	8
Adult social care	4	6	1	0	11
Culture and leisure services	2	3	1	2	8
Environmental services	3	4	2	6	15
Corporate assets	0	1	1	0	2
Economic development	3	2	1	3	9
Financial sustainability	1	1	1	1	4
Tackling climate change	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Total %</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100</b>

5.6 The Council's performance has improved year-on-year since 2017/18 which is extremely positive for Inverclyde:

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
Measures in Quartiles 1 and 2	59%	66%	68%
	38 indicators	47 indicators	50 indicators
Position in the national rankings for the number of measures in Quartiles 1 and 2	Joint 3rd	Joint 1st	1st.

#### 5.7 Children's services

This section of the Framework 2019/20 comprises 31 indicators.

Data from Teacher Judgements was not collected because of the Covid-19 pandemic, therefore information on the four literacy and numeracy indicators is not available for the reporting year 2019/20.

Across the board, the percentage of Inverclyde pupils gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5 and at Level 6, including those living in the most deprived areas, increased between 2018/19 and 2019/20.

We saw improvements in four of the six Tariff Scores, the most significant of which was the increase of 116 in the Average total tariff – SIMD Quintile 3, which rose from 969 in 2018/19 to 1,085 in 2019/20. While there was a decrease in the Average total tariff – SIMD Quintiles 4 and 5 - by 35 and 36 respectively - it should be noted that the performance of both measures was still high at 1,080 (SIMD Quartile 4) and 1,173 (SIMD Quartile 5).

While the attainment results are encouraging, it should also be noted that the absence of external information led to the 2020 grades being based on teacher estimates; the data should therefore not be used to show any pattern (either improvement or decline) from 2019.

All of our funded early years provision was graded good/better which placed us joint first in the country for this measure.

The increase in the participation rate for 16-19 year olds per 100 pupils (from 91.77% in 2018/19 to 92.92% in 2019/20) resulted in our position in the national rankings improving from 17th to 14th which places us in the second quartile for this measure.

## 5.8 Corporate services

This section of the Framework 2019/20 comprises eight indicators.

We saw a further decrease in the gender pay gap at the Council, which fell by 0.66% to 7.52% in 2019/20, the lowest figure since this measure was introduced to the Framework in 2015/16.

While the average number of working days per employee lost through sickness absence increased slightly for teachers and all other local government employees (by 0.03 and 0.12 days respectively), our position in the national rankings improved by one in each case and we retained our position in the first quartile in both instances.

Our performance regarding the number of invoices that we paid within 30 days improved (rising from 95.86% in 2018/19 to 96.13% in 2019/20) which resulted in our position in the national rankings increasing from 9th to 5th which takes us from quartile two to quartile one.

## 5.9 Adult social care

This section of the Framework 2019/20 comprises 11 indicators.

Between 2018/19 and 2019/20, our home care costs per hour reduced by £3.24 to £25.80 which resulted in an improved position in the national rankings, rising from 25th (quartile four) to 16th (quartile two).

While our residential costs per resident for people aged 65 or over increased slightly (by £8 to £383 per week), there was a modest improvement in our position in the national rankings (moving from 14th position in 2018/19 to 13th in 2019/20).

We saw increases with three of the four customer satisfaction measures (which are measured biennially). The most significant increase was the percentage of adults supported at home who agreed that they are supported to live as independently as possible: this improved by more than 10% between 2017/18 and 2019/20 (rising from 80.36% to 90.6%). Our position in the national rankings consequently improved for this measure: 21st in 2017/18 (quartile three) to 3rd (quartile one) in the last reporting year.

Although there was a marginal decrease (of 0.79%) in the percentage of carers who feel supported to continue in their caring role, our 2019/20 figure of 38.9% is still comfortably above the national average for this measure (of 34.28%). Additionally, our position in the national rankings improved from 10th to 4th which takes us from quartile two to the first quartile.

While the number of re-admissions to hospital within 28 days (per 1,000 discharges) increased very slightly (by 0.05%), the number of days that people spent in hospital when they were ready to be discharged (per 1,000 population) (75+) increased from 86.68 days to 162.23 days; however, it should be noted that our 2019/20 figure for the latter measure is considerably better than the national average of 773.78 days and we are placed 2nd in the country for this measure.

## 5.10 Culture and leisure services

This section of the Framework 2019/20 comprises eight indicators.

Satisfaction with all culture and leisure services - libraries, parks and open spaces, the McLean Museum, and leisure facilities - all fell between 2016/19 and 2017/20. However, the cost of those facilities also fell, with the exception of libraries which rose very slightly.

The most significant decrease in costs related to Museum visits which fell by £33.52 from £39.20 in 2018/19 to £5.68 in 2019/20 which is closer to what we would expect for this measure. As the Watt Institution was closed April-November 2019, the bulk of these visitor figures represent the number of times the collections database and website were accessed during 2019/20. It is lower than the year before due to a change in analytics software. The new software is much more efficient at removing false page views generated by *web crawlers* and, due to GDPR, people can now opt out of having their site visits recorded.

#### 5.11 Environmental services

This section of the 2019/20 Framework comprises 15 indicators.

While the net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population increased by £778, satisfaction with street cleaning is at its lowest level (67.6%) since 2010/14. Similarly, our Street Cleanliness Score - 84.29 - is also at its lowest level since 2010/11.

Although we saw a decrease in the cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads, there were increases in three of the four classes of roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment.

All costs relating to trading standards, environmental health, money advice and citizen advice per 1,000 population decreased between 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Following a peak at 57.21% in 2017/18, the percentage of total household waste arising that was recycled fell by 2.05% to 53.95% which resulted in a decrease of five places in the national rankings to 11th (quartile two).

#### 5.12 Corporate assets

This section of the Framework 2019/20 comprises two indicators.

Between 2018/19 and 2019/20, there were falls of 2% and 5.47% respectively in the percentage of our operational buildings that are suitable for their current use and in the percentage of the internal floor area of our operational buildings that is in a satisfactory condition. These results are partially explainable by the introduction of new condition surveys which provide a more accurate picture of our property portfolio.

#### 5.13 Economic development and planning

This section of the Framework 2019/20 comprises 10 indicators.

The number of unemployed people assisted into work from Inverclyde Council operated/funded employability programmes increased by more than a quarter, rising from 20.32% in 2018/20 to 25.94% in the last reporting year. This performance resulted an improved position in the national rankings, changing from 8th to 2nd.

While the increase in the number of Business Gateway start-ups per 10,000 population was fairly modest (at 0.34), it resulted in our position changing from 17th overall to 13th which means we moved from the quartile three to quartile two for this measure.

Information is not available for 2019/20 on the average time taken (in weeks) to deliver a business or industry planning application decision.

Our investment in economic development and tourism per 1,000 population increased by more than £11,000 to its highest level (£125,039) since 2016/17.

The percentage of people earning less than the Living Wage was the highest it has

been (30.9%) since 2012/13. This resulted in our position in the national rankings falling from 22nd (quartile three) to 29th (quartile four).

Our town centre vacancy rates were the highest in Scotland last year. While the national average in 2019/20 was 11.71%, it should be noted that the range for this measure is significantly broad with the Orkney Islands placed 1st overall with a figure of 2.27% while our figure was 20.75% in the last reporting year.

#### 5.14 Financial sustainability

This section was introduced to the Framework 2019/20 and comprises four indicators.

The first measure in this section concerns useable reserves. Our total useable reserves figure, expressed as a percentage of the Council's annual budgeted revenue, was 24.21%, a slight increase (of 0.66%) from 2018/19. This positions us at 6th in the country and in the first quartile. (Orkney Islands and Shetland Islands Councils are significant outliers in terms of this measure with figures of 272.9% and 308.79% respectively.) The Council's Reserves Policy was approved by the Policy and Resources Committee in 2019.

Min. Ref.  
P&R  
Cttee  
17.9.19  
Para 561

The next indicator focuses on the proportion of the Council's revenue that is not committed to projects. Our uncommitted General Fund Balance figure, expressed as a percentage of the Council's annual budgeted net revenue, was 2.75% in 2019/20, a marginal increase (of 0.08%) from the previous reporting year. This is slightly below the Scottish average (of 3.8%) and positions us at 13th in the country and in the second quartile. (Again, it should be noted that Orkney Islands and Shetland Islands Councils are significant outliers with figures of 10.4% and 30.04% respectively.)

The third measure in the financial sustainability section looks at the proportion of a Council's income that is used to meet financing costs, net of investment income. In terms of the ratio of financing costs to the net revenue stream - General Fund, Inverclyde's figure for 2019/20 was 12.63%, a decrease of 2.24% from 2018/19. This positions us at 31st in the country and in quartile four.

The final indicator in this part of the Framework examines the extent to which Councils' budgets reflect actual spending. Our actual out-turn as a percentage of budgeted expenditure was 98.77% in the last reporting year which represents an increase of 0.64% on 2018/19. This positions us at 23rd in the country and in the third quartile.

#### 5.15 Tackling climate change

This section was introduced to the Framework 2019/20 and comprises two indicators; the details for the last reporting year are not yet available, however, historical information is included in the Appendix. Additionally, the Council's Climate Change Plan, which covers the period 2017/22, was approved in 2018 and is available to view here: [🔗 Climate Change Plan](#).

Min Ref  
E&R  
Cttee  
18.1.18  
Para 36

## 6.0 IMPLICATIONS

### 6.1 Finance

Financial implications:

One-off costs

Cost Centre	Budget heading	Budget year	Proposed spend this report	Virement from	Other comments
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Annually recurring costs/(savings)

Cost centre	Budget heading	With effect from	Annual net impact	Virement from (if applicable)	Other comments
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

## 6.2 Legal

The Council is required to publish the LGBF indicators as part of its statutory obligation for public performance reporting.

## 6.3 Human Resources

There are no direct human resources implications arising from this report.

## 6.4 Equalities

(a) Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out?

	Yes.
X	No. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a substantive change to an existing policy, function or strategy. Therefore, no Equality Impact Assessment is required.

(b) Fairer Scotland Duty

If this report affects or proposes any major strategic decision:

Has there been active consideration of how this report's recommendations reduce inequalities of outcome?

	Yes.
X	No.

(c) Data Protection

Has a Data Protection Assessment been carried out?

	Yes. This report involves data processing which may result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals.
X	No.

6.5 Repopulation: Provision of Council Services which are subject to close scrutiny with the aim of delivering continuous improvement for current and potential citizens of Inverclyde support the Council's aim of retaining and enhancing the area's population.

## **7.0 CONSULTATION**

- 7.1 Each Directorate has considered the relevant indicators and will use them as part of self-evaluation processes they undertake to inform future improvement planning, including the devising of the Corporate Directorate Improvement Plans 2022/25.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 Inverclyde Council's performance across the spectrum of indicators varies, depending on a variety of factors including deprivation levels, investment and policy decisions and population density.

## **9.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 9.1 Statutory and Key Performance Indicators Annual Report 2019/20 – report to the Policy and Resources Committee on 17 November 2020.



## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>Children's services - 31 indicators</b>							
<b>CHN 1</b>	Cost per primary school pupil	5,246.00	5,464.00	5,429.00	15th	19th	11th
<b>CHN 2</b>	Cost per secondary school pupil	7,244.00	7,413.00	7,313.00	16th	21st	14th
<b>CHN 3</b>	Cost per pre-school education place	7,204.00	7,330.00	7,692.00	32nd	29th	25th
<b>CHN 4</b>	% of Pupils gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5	62	66	67	17th	9th	11th
<b>CHN 5</b>	% of Pupils gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6	32	36	38	18th	10th	11th
<b>CHN 6</b>	% of Pupils living in the 20% most deprived areas gaining 5+ Awards at Level 5	46	52	54	8th	4th	5th
<b>CHN 7</b>	% of Pupils living in the 20% most deprived areas gaining 5+ Awards at Level 6	17	22	27	12th	4th	4th
<b>CHN 8a</b>	Gross cost of <i>children looked after</i> in residential-based services per child per week	3,010.00	2,763.00	-	9th	6th	-
<b>CHN 8b</b>	Gross cost of <i>children looked after</i> in a community setting per child per week	262.14	231.62	-	9th	5th	-
<b>CHN 9</b>	Balance of care for <i>looked after children</i> - % of children being looked after in the community	86.43	86.34	-	22nd	22nd	-
<b>CHN 10</b>	% of Adults satisfied with local schools	2015/18 86.33	2016/19 86	2017/20 78	2015/18 4th	2016/19 4th	2017/20 7th
<b>CHN 11</b>	% of Pupils entering positive destinations	93.3	95.82	-	26th	8th	-
<b>CHN 12a</b>	Overall average total tariff	883	886	934	18th	14th	10th
<b>CHN 12b</b>	Average total tariff – SIMD Quintile 1	633	699	767	13th	5th	4th
<b>CHN 12c</b>	Average total tariff – SIMD Quintile 2	766	833	844	16th	6th	6th
<b>CHN 12d</b>	Average total tariff – SIMD Quintile 3	1,089	969	1,085	3rd	7th	3rd

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>CHN 12e</b>	Average total tariff – SIMD Quintile 4	1,135	1,115	1,080	5th	6th	12th
<b>CHN 12f</b>	Average total tariff – SIMD Quintile 5	1,290	1,209	1,173	4th	11th	16th
<b>CHN 13a</b>	% of Primary 1, 4 and 7 pupils combined achieving the expected Curriculum for Excellence Level in literacy	new indicator for 2018/19	76	-	-	9th	-
<b>CHN 13b</b>	% of Primary 1, 4 and 7 pupils combined achieving the expected Curriculum for Excellence Level in numeracy	new indicator for 2018/19	82	-	-	8th	-
<b>CHN 14a</b>	Literacy attainment gap: Primary 1, 4 and 7 pupils combined - % point gap between the least deprived and the most deprived pupils	new indicator for 2018/19	20.69	-	-	12th	-
<b>CHN 14b</b>	Numeracy attainment gap: Primary 1, 4 and 7 pupils combined - % point gap between the least deprived and the most deprived pupils	new indicator for 2018/19	17.52	-	-	15th	-
<b>CHN 17</b>	% of Children meeting developmental milestones	76.35	75.79	-	32nd	32nd	-
<b>CHN 18</b>	% of Funded early years provision which is graded <i>good</i> or better	95.83	95.83	100	8th	9th	1st
<b>CHN 19a</b>	School attendance rates per 100 pupils	-	92.23	-	-	26th	-
<b>CHN 19b</b>	School attendance rates per 100 <i>looked after children</i>	-	87.41	-	-	11th	-
<b>CHN 20a</b>	School exclusion rates per 1,000 pupils	-	20.97	-	-	19th	-
<b>CHN 20b</b>	School exclusion rates per 1,000 <i>looked after children</i>	-	141.18	-	-	14th	-

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>CHN 21</b>	Participation rate for 16-19 year olds per 100	91.6	91.77	92.92	20th	17th	14th
<b>CHN 22</b>	% of Child protection re-registrations within 18 months	4	9.38	-	12th	25th	-
<b>CHN 23</b>	% of <i>Looked after children</i> with more than one placement in the last year (August-July)	13.57	15.61	-	2nd	7th	-
<b>Corporate services - 8 indicators</b>							
<b>CORP 1</b>	Support services as a % of total gross expenditure	3.16	3.18	3.42	4th	4th	7th
<b>CORP 3b</b>	% of the highest paid 5% employees who are women	53.92	58.67	59.88	15th	6th	8th
<b>CORP 3c</b>	The gender pay gap	8.71	8.18	7.52	30th	30th	30th
<b>CORP 4</b>	The cost per dwelling of collecting Council Tax	13.34	10.23	10.09	29th	27th	27th
<b>CORP 6a</b>	The average number of working days per employee lost through sickness absence – teachers	5.18	4.92	4.95	9th	4th	3rd
<b>CORP 6b</b>	The average number of working days per employee lost through sickness absence – all other employees	10.58	10.36	10.48	10th	7th	6th
<b>CORP 7</b>	% of Income due from Council Tax received by the end of the year	95.52	95.67	95.35	24th	24th	22nd
<b>CORP 8</b>	% of Invoices sampled that were paid within 30 days	97.13	95.86	96.13	1st	9th	5th
<b>Adult social care - 11 indicators</b>							
<b>SW 1</b>	Home care costs per hour for people aged 65	28.69	29.04	25.80	22nd	25th	16th

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
	or over						
<b>SW 2</b>	Self-directed support (Direct Payments and Managed Personalised Budgets) spend on adults 18+ as a % of total social work spend on adults 18+	5.56	5.32	5.05	12th	12th	16th
<b>SW 3a</b>	% of People aged 65 and over with long-term care needs who receive personal care at home	67.78	65.16	65.82	6th	11th	11th
<b>SW 4b</b>	% of Adults supported at home who agree that their services and support had an impact in improving or maintaining their quality of life	76.56	-	82.76	25th	-	10th
<b>SW 4c</b>	% of Adults supported at home who agree that they are supported to live as independently as possible	80.36	-	90.6	21st	-	3rd
<b>SW 4d</b>	% of Adults supported at home who agree that they had a say in how their help, care or support was provided	77.32	-	81.72	12th	-	5th
<b>SW 4e</b>	% of Carers who feel supported to continue in their caring role	39.69	-	38.90	10th	-	4th
<b>SW 5</b>	Residential costs per week per resident for people aged 65 or over	391.00	375.00	383.00	15th	14th	13th
<b>SW 6</b>	Rate of re-admission to hospital within 28 days (per 1,000 discharges)	91.6	92.77	92.82	9th	9th	9th
<b>SW 7</b>	% Proportion of care services graded <i>good</i> (4) or better in Care Inspectorate inspections	92.11	82.09	79.37	3rd	15th	19th
<b>SW 8</b>	Number of days people spend in hospital when they are ready to be discharged (per 1,000 population) (75+)	172.08	86.68	162.23	2nd	1st	2nd

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>Culture and leisure - 8 indicators</b>							
<b>C&amp;L 1</b>	Cost per attendance at sport facilities	2.59	1.57	1.12	17th	6th	5th
<b>C&amp;L 2</b>	Cost per library visit	3.25	1.99	2.04	18th	13th	13th
<b>C&amp;L 3</b>	Cost of museums per visit	12.93	39.20	5.68	28th	28th	19th
<b>C&amp;L 4</b>	Cost of parks and open spaces per 1,000 population	24,592.00	26,990.00	26,093.00	23rd	25th	29th
<b>C&amp;L 5a</b>	% of Adults satisfied with libraries	2015/18 78.67	2016/19 78.87	2017/20 75.2	2015/18 9th	2016/19 9th	2017/20 15th
<b>C&amp;L 5b</b>	% of Adults satisfied with parks and open spaces	2015/18 88.33	2016/19 88.37	2017/20 87.7	2015/18 10th	2016/19 8th	2017/20 9th
<b>C&amp;L 5c</b>	% of Adults satisfied with museums and galleries	2015/18 72.67	2016/19 67.23	2017/20 54.9	2015/18 10th	2016/19 13th	2017/20 25th
<b>C&amp;L 5d</b>	% of Adults satisfied with leisure facilities	2015/18 87	2016/19 84.67	2017/20 80	2015/18 3rd	2016/19 3rd	2017/20 3rd
<b>Environmental services - 15 indicators</b>							
<b>ENV 1a</b>	Net cost per waste collection per premise	41.96	36.96	40.98	2nd	1st	3rd
<b>ENV 2a</b>	Net cost of waste disposal per premise	94.89	101.71	92.19	11th	18th	12th
<b>ENV 3a</b>	Net cost of street cleaning per 1,000 population	18,883.00	19,492.00	20,270.00	28th	29th	28th
<b>ENV 3c</b>	Street Cleanliness Score	87.1	89.6	84.29	29th	26th	30th

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>ENV 4a</b>	Cost of maintenance per kilometre of roads	26,674.00	23,834.00	22,562.00	31st	31st	29th
<b>ENV 4b</b>	% of A class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	2016/18 24.1	2017/19 19.03	2018/20 20.6	2016/18 12th	2017/19 4th	2018/20 6th
<b>ENV 4c</b>	% of B class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	2016/18 36.13	2017/19 29.68	2018/20 30.78	2016/18 23rd	2017/19 15th	2018/20 17th
<b>ENV 4d</b>	% of C class roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	2016/18 39.61	2017/19 42.67	2018/20 43.93	2016/18 21st	2017/19 27th	2018/20 28th
<b>ENV 4e</b>	% of Unclassified roads that should be considered for maintenance treatment	2014/18 38.91	2015/19 38.69	2016/20 37.97	2014/18 20th	2015/19 20th	2016/20 19th
<b>ENV 5</b>	Cost of trading standards and environmental health per 1,000 population	24,206.00	25,522.00	23,445.00	24th	26th	25th
<b>ENV 5a</b>	Cost of trading standards, money advice and citizen advice per 1,000 population	4,165.00	4,719.00	4,512.00	10th	11th	10th
<b>ENV 5b</b>	Cost of environmental health per 1,000 population	20,041.00	20,803.00	18,933.00	24th	27th	27th
<b>ENV 6</b>	% of Total household waste arising that is recycled	57.21	56	53.95	5th	6th	11th
<b>ENV 7a</b>	% of Adults satisfied with refuse collection	2015/18 90	2016/19 86.73	2017/20 86.07	2015/18 3rd	2016/19 5th	2017/20 4th
<b>ENV 7b</b>	% of Adults satisfied with street cleaning	2015/18 73.33	2016/19 71.27	2017/20 67.6	2015/18 13th	2016/19 10th	2017/20 11th
<b>Corporate assets - 2 indicators</b>							
<b>CORP-ASSET 1</b>	% of Operational buildings that are suitable for their current use	92.37	92.91	90.91	6th	6th	9th
<b>CORP-ASSET 2</b>	% of Internal floor area of operational buildings in a satisfactory condition	91.41	92.01	86.54	14th	13th	23rd

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>Economic development - 10 indicators</b>							
<b>ECON 1</b>	% of Unemployed people assisted into work from Council operated/funded employability programmes	21	20.32	25.94	8th	8th	2nd
<b>ECON 2</b>	Cost of planning and building standards, per planning application	7,407.00	9,033.00	7,148.00	31st	32nd	31st
<b>ECON 3</b>	Average time (in weeks) per business and industry planning application	8.42	7.79	not available	14th	9th	not available
<b>ECON 4</b>	% of Procurement spend spent on local enterprises	28.54	31.36	27.49	13th	12th	16th
<b>ECON 5</b>	Number of Business Gateway start-ups per 10,000 population	11.17	18.3	18.64	29th	17th	13th
<b>ECON 6</b>	Investment in economic development and tourism per 1,000 population	93,656.00	113,769.00	125,039.00	22nd	22nd	24th
<b>ECON 7</b>	% of People earning less than the Living Wage	23.8	26	30.9	23rd	22nd	29th
<b>ECON 8</b>	% of Properties receiving superfast broadband	95.47	97.1	97.5	7th	6th	6th
<b>ECON 9</b>	Town centre vacancy rates	20.78	17.72	20.75	26th	30th	32nd
<b>ECON 10</b>	Immediately available employment land as a % of total land allocated for employment purposes (in the Local Development Plan)	85	77.27	74.56	3rd	7th	8th
<b>Financial sustainability - 4 indicators</b>							
<b>FIN SUS 1</b>	Total useable reserves as a % of Council annual budgeted revenue	28.77	23.55	24.21	5th	7th	6th
<b>FIN SUS</b>	Uncommitted General Fund Balance as a %						

## SOLACE Improving Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2019/20

### Comparison of local performance 2017/18-2019/20

		Performance			Rank		
		2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
<b>2</b>	of Council annual budgeted net revenue	3.55	2.67	2.75	12th	17th	13th
<b>FIN SUS 3</b>	Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream - General Fund	14.04	14.87	12.63	32nd	32nd	31st
<b>FIN SUS 5</b>	Actual out-turn as a % of budgeted expenditure	98.33	98.13	98.77	25th	24th	23rd
<b>Tackling climate change - 2 indicators</b>							
<b>CLIM 1</b>	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions area-wide per capita	4.17	4.09	-	6th	7th	-
<b>CLIM 2</b>	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions area-wide: emissions within scope of the local authority per capita	4.1	4.02	-	5th	5th	-