

# Local Government Performance Reporting Framework Financial Year Report 2017/18







SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR RESULTS  
(1 JULY 2017 – 30 JUNE 2018)

# Introduction

The Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF) is a key initiative to improve the transparency and accountability of council performance to ratepayers and to provide a more meaningful set of information to the public. The framework is made up of a range of performance measures and a governance and management checklist items which together build a comprehensive picture of council performance.

The following report provides the prescribed Local Government Performance Reporting Framework service performance indicator results for the full 2017/18 financial year.

The following status icons may assist in interpreting these service performance results

	Result is currently on track / progressing as expected / within expected range for the reporting period
	Result is neutral / yet to be finalised / not measured during reporting period
	Result is currently not on track / not progressing as expected / outside expected range for the reporting period
	Result not available



# Animal Management

Provision of animal management and responsible pet ownership services to the community including monitoring, registration, enforcement and education

Service indicator/measure	Measure expressed as:	Result Financial Year 2017/18	Past End of Year Results	Comment	Status
<b>Timeliness</b>					
Time taken to action animal requests	Number of days taken to action animal requests <i>Expected range: 1 to 10 days</i>	<b>1.08 days</b>	2016/17 Result 1.70 days  2015/16 Result 1.01 days		
<b>Service standard</b>					
Animals reclaimed	% of collected animals reclaimed <i>Expected range: 30% to 90%</i>	<b>67.74%</b>	2016/17 Result 54.70%  2015/16 Result 65.41%		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of animal management service	\$ direct cost of the animal management service per registered animal <i>Expected range: \$10 to \$70</i>	<b>\$31.58</b>	2016/17 Result \$30.65  2015/16 Result \$32.13		
<b>Health and safety</b>					
Animal management prosecutions	Number of prosecutions <i>Expected range: 0 to 50 prosecutions</i>	<b>3 prosecutions</b>	2016/17 Result 3 prosecutions  2015/16 Result 1 prosecution		



## Aquatic Facilities

Provision of indoor and outdoor aquatic facilities to the community and visitors for wellbeing, water safety, sport and recreation

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Service standard</b> User satisfaction with aquatic facilities	User satisfaction with how Council has performed on the provision of aquatic facilities <i>Expected range: N/A</i>	N/A	2016/17 Result N/A 2015/16 Result N/A	Optional measure only. Not being measured in 2017/18	NA
<b>Service standard</b> Health inspections of aquatic facilities	Number of health inspections per Council aquatic facility <i>Expected range: 1 to 4 inspections</i>	<b>2 inspections</b>	2016/17 Result 2 inspections 2015/16 Result 2 inspections		
<b>Service standard</b> Reportable safety incidents at aquatic facilities	Number of WorkSafe reportable aquatic safety incidents <i>Expected range: 0 to 20 incidents</i>	<b>4 incidents</b>	2016/17 Result 0 incidents 2015/16 Result 6 incidents	The number of incidents is not directly controllable – safe operating practices are in place.	
<b>Service cost</b> Cost of indoor aquatic facilities	\$ direct cost less any income received of providing indoor aquatic facilities per visit <i>Expected range: -\$3 to \$10</i>	<b>-\$1.16</b>	2016/17 Result -\$0.88 2015/16 Result \$0.36	Visits have been adjusted (see Utilisation note). Trend remains the same.	
<b>Service cost</b> Cost of outdoor aquatic facilities	\$ direct cost less any income received of providing outdoor aquatic facilities per visit <i>Expected range: \$3 to \$20</i>	<b>\$15.05</b>	2016/17 Result \$14.50 2015/16 Result \$14.12	Visits have been adjusted (see Utilisation note). Trend remains the same.	
<b>Utilisation</b> Utilisation of aquatic facilities	Number of visits to aquatic facilities per head of municipal population <i>Expected range: 1 to 10 visits</i>	<b>8.75 visits</b>	2016/17 Result 8.33 visits 2015/16 Result 7.39 visits	Number of visits for the past three years at all facilities has been amended to count via PoS (point of sale) not traffic counter. Trend remains the same.	



## Food Safety

Provision of food safety services to the community including registrations, education, monitoring, inspections and compliance

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b><i>Timeliness</i></b>					
Time taken to action food complaints	Number of days taken to action food complaints <i>Expected range: 1 to 10 days</i>	<b>1.88 days</b>	2016/17 Result 1.9 days 2015/16 Result 1.3 days		
<b><i>Service standard</i></b>					
Food safety assessments	% of registered class 1 food premises and class 2 food premises that receive an annual food safety assessment <i>Expected range: 50% to 100%</i>	<b>98.00%</b>	2016/17 Result 98.53% 2015/16 Result 89.51%		
<b><i>Service cost</i></b>					
Cost of food safety service	\$ direct cost of the food safety service per registered food premises <i>Expected range: \$300 to \$1,200</i>	<b>\$738.76</b>	2016/17 Result \$639.70 2015/16 Result \$667.85	Cost per premises increased due to returning to normal EFT level compared to 2016/17 and a slight reduction in number of premises	
<b><i>Health and safety</i></b>					
Critical and major non-compliance notifications	% of critical and major non-compliance outcome notifications that are followed up by council <i>Expected range: 60% to 100%</i>	<b>100%</b>	2016/17 Result 95.06% 2015/16 Result 92.31%		



## Governance

Provision of good governance to the community including making and implementing decisions with reference to community engagement, policy frameworks and agreed practice

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Transparency</b>					
Council resolutions at meetings closed to the public	% of Council resolutions made at meetings closed to the public <i>Expected range: 0% to 30%</i>	<b>13.74%</b>	2016/17 Result 11.90% 2015/16 Result 13.71%		
<b>Consultation and engagement</b>					
Satisfaction with community consultation and engagement	Satisfaction rating out of 100 <i>Expected range: 40 to 70</i>	<b>56</b>	2016/17 Result 55 2015/16 Result 58		
<b>Attendance</b>					
Council attendance at Council meetings	% of Council attendance at ordinary and special Council meetings <i>Expected range: 80% to 100%</i>	<b>86.32%</b>	2016/17 Result 91.45% 2015/16 Result 88.10%		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of governance	\$ direct cost of the governance service per councillor <i>Expected range: \$30,000 to \$80,000</i>	<b>\$45,744.44</b>	2016/17 Result \$49,529 2015/16 Result \$43,653		
<b>Decision making</b>					
Satisfaction with Council decisions	Satisfaction rating out of 100 <i>Expected range: 40 to 70</i>	<b>59</b>	2016/17 Result 58 2015/16 Result 61		



## Libraries

Provision of print and digital based resources to the community in a variety of formats including collection services, e-services, research tools and interactive learning programs

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Utilisation</b>					
Library collection usage	Number of library collection item loans per library collection item <i>Expected range: 1 to 9 items</i>	<b>10.58</b>	2016/17 Result 10.02 loans 2015/16 Result 9.41 loans		
<b>Resource standard</b>					
Standard of library collection	% of the library collection that has been purchased in the last 5 years <i>Expected range: 40% to 90%</i>	<b>75.47%</b>	2016/17 Result 77.40% 2015/16 Result 79.34%		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of library service	\$ direct cost of the library service per visit <i>Expected range: \$3 to \$15</i>	<b>\$2.58</b>	2016/17 Result \$2.65 2015/16 Result \$3.01		
<b>Participation</b>					
Active library members	% of the municipal population that are active library members <i>Expected range: 10% to 40%</i>	<b>16.18%</b>	2016/17 Result 14.87% 2015/16 Result 24.17%		





## Maternal and Child Health

Provision of universal access to health services for children from birth to school age and their families including early detection, referral, monitoring and recording child health and development

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Satisfaction</b>					
Participation in first MCH home visit	% of infants enrolled in the MCH service who receive the first MCH home visit <i>Expected range: 90% to 110%</i>	<b>101.20%</b>	2016/17 Result 102.78% 2015/16 Result 99.35%		
<b>Service standard</b>					
Infant enrolments in the MCH service	% of infants enrolled in the MCH service <i>Expected range: 90% to 110%</i>	<b>101.06%</b>	2016/17 Result 100.07% 2015/16 Result 98.83%		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of the MCH service	\$ cost of the MCH service per hour of service delivered <i>Expected range: \$50 to \$200</i>	<b>\$71.22</b>	2016/17 Result \$86.04 2015/16 Result \$72.64		
<b>Participation</b>					
Participation in MCH service	% of children enrolled who participate in the MCH services <i>Expected range: 70% to 100%</i>	<b>73.88%</b>	2016/17 Result 78.13% 2015/16 Result 90.62%	Participation reduced for older age group checkups (2 and 3.5 years). Council introduced a SMS to clients 3 days prior appointment to boost attendance.	
<b>Participation</b>					
Participation in MCH service by Aboriginal children	% of Aboriginal children enrolled who participate in the MCH service <i>Expected range: 60% to 100%</i>	<b>69.90%</b>	2016/17 Result 74.44% 2015/16 Result 118.31%	Relatively low numbers result in larger variations year on year. Council introduced a SMS to clients 3 days prior appointment to boost attendance.	





## Roads

Provision of a network of sealed local roads under the control of the municipal council to all road users

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Satisfaction of use</b>					
Sealed local road requests	Number of sealed local road requests per 100 kilometres of sealed local road <i>Expected range: 10 to 120 requests</i>	<b>98.35 requests</b>	2016/17 Result 96.25 requests  2015/16 Result 71.58 requests		
<b>Condition</b>					
Sealed local roads below the intervention level	% of sealed local roads that are below the renewal intervention level <i>Expected range: 80% to 100%</i>	<b>97.25%</b>	2016/17 Result 97.25%  2015/16 Result 99.33%		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of sealed local road reconstruction	\$ direct reconstruction cost per square metre of sealed local roads reconstructed <i>Expected range: \$20 to \$200</i>	<b>\$87.98</b>	2016/17 Result \$209.37  2015/16 Result \$140.10	Reconstruction projects in 2017/18 generally less complicated than in 2016/17 resulting in reduced cost.	
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of sealed local road resealing	\$ direct resealing cost per square metre of sealed local roads resealed <i>Expected range: \$4 to \$30</i>	<b>\$26.60</b>	2016/17 Result \$33.68  2015/16 Result \$24.21	The nature of projects in 2017/18 has resulted in a reduction in costs (more patching works compared with 2016/17)	
<b>Satisfaction</b>					
Satisfaction with sealed local roads	Satisfaction rating out of 100 <i>Expected range: 50 to 100</i>	<b>68</b>	2016/17 Result 66  2015/16 Result 68		



## Statutory Planning

Provision of land use and development assessment services to applicants and the community including advice and determination of applications

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Timeliness</b>					
Time taken to decide planning applications	Days between receipt of a planning application and a decision on the application <i>Expected range: 30 to 110 days</i>	<b>35 days</b>	2016/17 Result 39 days 2015/16 Result 29 days		
<b>Service standard</b>					
Planning applications decided within 60 days	% of planning application decisions made within 60 days <i>Expected range: 40% to 100%</i>	<b>82.45%</b>	2016/17 Result 80.00% 2015/16 Result 83.98%		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of statutory planning service	\$ direct cost of the statutory planning service per planning application <i>Expected range: \$500 to \$4,000</i>	<b>\$1,860.81</b>	2016/17 Result \$1,617 2015/16 Result \$1,424		
<b>Decision making</b>					
Planning decisions upheld at VCAT	% of decisions subject to review by VCAT that were not set aside <i>Expected range: 30% to 100%</i>	<b>90.41%</b>	2016/17 Result 48.94% 2015/16 Result 42.86%	Significant improvement in the success rate of VCAT reviews.	



## Waste Collection

Provision of kerbside waste collection service to the community including garbage and recyclables

<i>Service indicator/measure</i>	<i>Measure expressed as:</i>	<b>Result Financial Year 2017/18</b>	<b>Past End of Year Results</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Satisfaction</b>					
Kerbside bin collection requests	Number of kerbside bin collection requests per 1000 kerbside bin collection households <i>Expected range: 10 to 300 requests</i>	<b>72.05 Requests</b>	2016/17 Result 61 requests 2015/16 Result 56 requests		
<b>Service standard</b>					
Kerbside collection bins missed	Number of kerbside collection bins missed per 10,000 scheduled kerbside collection bin lifts <i>Expected range: 1 to 20 bins</i>	<b>3.38 bins</b>	2016/17 Result 2.49 bins 2015/16 Result 2.3 bins		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of kerbside garbage collection service	\$ direct cost of the kerbside garbage bin collection service per kerbside garbage collection bin <i>Expected range: \$40 to \$150</i>	<b>\$103.19</b>	2016/17 Result \$101.64 2015/16 Result \$101.50		
<b>Service cost</b>					
Cost of kerbside recyclables collection service	\$ direct cost of the kerbside recyclables collection service per kerbside recyclables collection bin <i>Expected range: \$10 to \$80</i>	<b>\$43.36</b>	2016/17 Result \$30.14 2015/16 Result \$30.06	Increased costs due to inability of contractors to on sell compromised recyclable material to China	
<b>Waste diversion</b>					
Kerbside collection waste diverted from landfill	% of garbage, recyclables and green organics collected from kerbside bins that is diverted from landfill <i>Expected range: 20% to 60%</i>	<b>54.19%</b>	2016/17 Result 54.94% 2015/16 Result 53.96%		