

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL CORPORATE PRIORITIES

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE 2016/17

HOW ARE WE DOING?

In 2013, we published our Corporate Plan, with eight priorities to work towards over a five year period. This summary provides an overview of performance during 2016/17, under each of the 8 Corporate Priorities. We continue to make significant progress across a number of key areas such as the economy and education, but recognise that there are ongoing challenges to face in the coming years. Reviewing performance information regularly is a vital part of ensuring we stay focused on what is important; **ensuring the best quality of life for everyone in the Scottish Borders, prosperity for our businesses and good health and resilience for all our communities.**

KEY

A mixture of performance information is provided under each priority:

The top half of each page contains high level performance indicators that show, for example, the general health of the economy. For comparison we have included last years figure and any Scottish data (where applicable). While the Council may have influence over these indicators, they are largely contextual in nature, and the information is displayed within a grey box.

EMPLOYMENT RATE

76.2%
of people **aged between 16-64**
are now in employment

Scotland	73.1%
SB last year	78.3%

The bottom half of each page contains performance indicators that we have more influence over, for example, how quickly we process planning applications.

Information for each indicator is displayed within a white box above a coloured section. This coloured section (where applicable) will be either Green, Amber or Red and shows where performance has improved or reduced against the **previous year**.

103,761

phone interactions were logged by our **Contact Centres** in 2016/17



(up from 102,342 in 15/16)

green - improved performance

amber - a minor change in performance

red - area for improvement

OUR CORPORATE PRIORITIES



MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE OUR HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT HOW ARE WE DOING?

January 2016 – December 2016:

<p>ROAD SAFETY</p> <p>12 people were killed on our roads in 2016</p> 	<p>ROAD SAFETY</p> <p>65 people were seriously injured on our roads in 2016</p> 	<p>HOUSEHOLD WASTE</p> <p>39.03% of our household waste, on average, was recycled over the last 12 months</p> 	<p>HOUSEHOLD WASTE</p> <p>60.71% of our household waste was sent to landfill, on average, over the last 12 months</p>	<p>HOUSEHOLD WASTE</p> <p>0.26% of our household waste required 'other' treatment, on average, over the last 12 months</p>
SB last year: 6	SB last year: 62	SB last year: 36.89%	SB last year: 62.23%	SB last year: 0.27%

waste • spend to save • low carbon • waste • spend to save • low carbon • waste • spend to save

Our performance during 2016/2017

ROAD CONDITION

46.6%
of the **3,000km of roads** in the Scottish Borders should be **considered for maintenance**

(up from 46.3% in 15/16)

COMMUNITY RECYCLING CENTRES

56.23%
of **waste** was **recycled at SBC Community Recycling Centres**, on average, over the last 12 months

(up from 51.06% during 2015/16)

Case Study Drivewise Borders 'Over 65s'

The Drivewise Borders project concentrates on the 'at risk' groups, according to road traffic accident statistics in the local Borders region.

The over 65s part of the project has seen a welcomed concentration of effort to some of the most vulnerable road users in our communities, updating and cementing their theoretical knowledge. The sheer enthusiasm and the level of engagement shown by attendees, with an uptake rate of Refresher Dives being around 96%, has been very encouraging. Reasons for uptake include widowed women who have lost confidence, and those with health issues returning to driving. Specific issues around day-to-day driving have emerged and topics affecting the older drivers have been freely discussed in a safe and open environment.



The plan to roll out the presentations across the Borders will allow as many members of our rural communities as possible to benefit. During the sessions, the attendees are encouraged to take part in a 'Fun Theory test' and are given a free 'Highway Code' and local information book, which have been well received.



Corporate Priority 5: High Quality Environment

Short Name	Trend Chart	Value	Commentary	Status	Managed By												
Annual Household Recycling Rate (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)	<p>CP05-P001cP How much of our household waste is recycled (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Annual Household Recycling Rate (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Value (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q4 2015</td> <td>37.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 2016</td> <td>38.03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2016</td> <td>37.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2016</td> <td>37.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2016</td> <td>39.03</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>■ Quarters ■ Target (Quarters) — Family Group (previous yr) - Av. — SBC (previous yr) - Av. — Scotland (previous yr) - Av.</p>	Quarter	Value (%)	Q4 2015	37.51	Q1 2016	38.03	Q2 2016	37.53	Q3 2016	37.22	Q4 2016	39.03	39.03	<p>Observations: Over the last four quarters there has been a small but consistent increase in recycling rate observed. This is thought to be related to the introduction of food waste kerbside collections and an increase in garden waste collected at the recycling centres.</p> <p>The tonnes of waste going to landfill have increased slightly over the period of the past four quarters. This could be related to economic activity. However, over this same time there has been a small but consistent decrease in the percentage of waste going to landfill. This is thought to be related to the introduction of food waste kerbside collections and an increase in garden waste collected at the recycling centres.</p>		Ross Sharp-Dent
Quarter	Value (%)																
Q4 2015	37.51																
Q1 2016	38.03																
Q2 2016	37.53																
Q3 2016	37.22																
Q4 2016	39.03																
Annual Household Waste Landfilled Rate (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)	<p>CP05-P001dP How much of our household waste goes to landfill (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Annual Household Waste Landfilled Rate (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Value (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q4 2015</td> <td>62.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 2016</td> <td>61.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2016</td> <td>62.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2016</td> <td>62.52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2016</td> <td>60.71</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>■ Quarters ■ Target (Quarters) — Family Group (previous yr) - Av. — SBC (previous yr) - Av. — Scotland (previous yr) - Av.</p>	Quarter	Value (%)	Q4 2015	62.22	Q1 2016	61.70	Q2 2016	62.20	Q3 2016	62.52	Q4 2016	60.71	60.71	<p>Note: This data is calendar year.</p> <p><i>A system error which has subsequently been resolved has resulted in a small increase in the recycling rates and decrease in the landfilled rates for the first three quarters of 2016.</i></p>		Ross Sharp-Dent
Quarter	Value (%)																
Q4 2015	62.22																
Q1 2016	61.70																
Q2 2016	62.20																
Q3 2016	62.52																
Q4 2016	60.71																

Appendix 2 Scottish Borders Council Executive Committee – Quarterly Public Performance Report, June 2017 (Q4 2016/17)

Short Name	Trend Chart	Value	Commentary	Status	Managed By												
Annual Household Waste 'Other Treatment' Rate (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)	<p>CP05-P001eP How much of our household waste requires other treatment (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Annual Household Waste 'Other Treatment' Rate (%) - UNVERIFIED (cumulative rolling average)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Value (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q4 2015</td> <td>0.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 2016</td> <td>0.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2016</td> <td>0.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2016</td> <td>0.27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2016</td> <td>0.26</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Value (%)	Q4 2015	0.27	Q1 2016	0.27	Q2 2016	0.27	Q3 2016	0.27	Q4 2016	0.26	0.26%	<p>Observations: The percentage of waste going to 'other treatment' has remained steady over the last four quarters. This is a small percentage and is related to material that was sent off for recycling but which identified as contamination through the sorting process.</p> <p>Note: This data is calendar year.</p>		Ross Sharp-Dent
Quarter	Value (%)																
Q4 2015	0.27																
Q1 2016	0.27																
Q2 2016	0.27																
Q3 2016	0.27																
Q4 2016	0.26																
Annual Average Community Recycling Centre (CRC) Recycling Rate (%) (cumulative rolling ave)	<p>CP05-P001fP How much of our waste do we recycle at Community Recycling Centres?</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Annual Average Community Recycling Centre (CRC) Recycling Rate (%) (cumulative rolling ave)</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Value (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q4 2015</td> <td>51.06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 2016</td> <td>52.41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2016</td> <td>54.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2016</td> <td>56.46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2016</td> <td>56.23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Value (%)	Q4 2015	51.06	Q1 2016	52.41	Q2 2016	54.74	Q3 2016	56.46	Q4 2016	56.23	56.23%	<p>Observations: There has been an increase in the recycling centre recycling rates. This is related to increased garden waste tonnages being brought to the sites to be recycled, and also some improvements in the way that we obtain weights from sites where we cannot separately weigh recycling centre tonnages.</p> <p>Note: This data is calendar year.</p>		Ross Sharp-Dent
Quarter	Value (%)																
Q4 2015	51.06																
Q1 2016	52.41																
Q2 2016	54.74																
Q3 2016	56.46																
Q4 2016	56.23																
Number of people killed on Border Roads	<p>CP05-P001aP How many people are killed on our roads?</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Number of people killed on Border Roads</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Number of Fatalities</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q4 2015</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 2016</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2016</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2016</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2016</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Number of Fatalities	Q4 2015	1	Q1 2016	2	Q2 2016	7	Q3 2016	2	Q4 2016	1	1	<p>Observations: In relation to roads in the Scottish Borders there was one fatality in the final quarter of 2016.</p> <p>There were a total of 13 serious casualties as a result of roads accidents in the Scottish Borders in Q4 of 2016. This was down on the previous two quarters. In order to meet national reduction targets, there should be 13 or less serious casualties per quarter.</p>		David Girdler
Quarter	Number of Fatalities																
Q4 2015	1																
Q1 2016	2																
Q2 2016	7																
Q3 2016	2																
Q4 2016	1																

Appendix 2 Scottish Borders Council Executive Committee – Quarterly Public Performance Report, June 2017 (Q4 2016/17)

Short Name	Trend Chart	Value	Commentary	Status	Managed By												
<p>Number of people seriously injured on Border Roads</p>	<p>CP05-P001bP How many people are seriously injured on our roads?</p> <table border="1"> <caption>CP05-P001bP Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q4 2015</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 2016</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 2016</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 2016</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 2016</td> <td>13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Value	Q4 2015	17	Q1 2016	12	Q2 2016	21	Q3 2016	19	Q4 2016	13	<p>13</p>			<p>David Girdler</p>
Quarter	Value																
Q4 2015	17																
Q1 2016	12																
Q2 2016	21																
Q3 2016	19																
Q4 2016	13																
<p>What condition are our roads in? (% of roads requiring maintenance)</p>	<p>CP05-P001gP What condition are our roads in?</p> <table border="1"> <caption>CP05-P001gP Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2012/13</td> <td>41.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013/14</td> <td>43.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014/15</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td> <td>46.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td> <td>46.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Value	2012/13	41.7%	2013/14	43.5%	2014/15	45.5%	2015/16	46.3%	2016/17	46.6%	<p>46.6%</p>	<p>How are we performing: The % of roads now considered as requiring maintenance has only increased by 0.3 percentage points since last year, and is comparable to many other rural local authorities with similar road network challenges.</p> <p>Actions we are taking to maintain or improve performance: During the financial year 2016/17, a mid-year review led to an extra £2.4m being committed to roads and infrastructure. When SBC agreed its capital plan in February this year, an extra 32.5% was committed towards roads and infrastructure for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20 (equating to an increase of almost £7m over the 3 years). A mid-year review will be undertaken during 2017/18 and will establish if additional investment is possible.</p> <p>However, SBC will continue to balance its capital investments priorities across the <i>entire</i> asset base and in future of years will look to shift the balance of investment in roads to <i>planned</i> rather than <i>reactive</i> works. The Roads service will continue to monitor condition and invest where appropriate to avoid further deterioration.</p>		<p>David Girdler</p>
Year	Value																
2012/13	41.7%																
2013/14	43.5%																
2014/15	45.5%																
2015/16	46.3%																
2016/17	46.6%																