

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD

21 SEPTEMBER 2009

PLACE SURVEY RESULTS

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Mike Webb, Portfolio Holder for Community and Customer Engagement and Community Safety
Responsible Head of Service	Hugh Bennett, Assistant Chief Executive
Non Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 To report to Performance Management Board on the Council's results from the biennial statutory Place Survey.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Board considers the Place Survey findings and makes detailed recommendations to Cabinet about actions which should be taken in order to improve the public perception at the next survey, which will take place towards the end of 2010.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Local Government White Paper – *Strong and Prosperous Communities* emphasised a new focus on improving outcomes for local people and places – rather than on processes, institutions and inputs. Central to this is the importance of capturing local peoples' views, experiences and perceptions, so that the solutions for an area can reflect local views and preferences. The Place Survey is a way of achieving this. The Place Survey supplies the data by which a number of national indicators will be measured. The national indicators will measure how well Governments' priorities, as set out in the Comprehensive Spending Review, are being delivered by local government and local government partnerships over the next three years.
- 3.2 This report presents the findings from the 2008/09 Place Survey conducted by Ipsos MORI on behalf of Bromsgrove District Council, their report is included at Appendix 1 (Appendix 1 includes a summary of key findings at the beginning of the Appendix). The survey was conducted via a postal self-completion approach, as prescribed by the Audit Commission and the Department of Communities and Local Government. Fieldwork was carried out from 29 September to 19 December 2008. A total of 1,147 responses were achieved and data has been weighted to ensure results are reflective of the wider population in the District, and to account for non-response bias.

- 3.3 As can be seen in the summary of key findings (page 4 of the appendix) and in the table of comparator scores at page 22, Bromsgrove's results are highly mixed. Some issues such as reducing aspects of crime and anti-social behaviour, and general satisfaction with the area have shown substantial improvements since the last BVPI survey in 2006/07; also Bromsgrove outperforms Worcestershire overall in several areas, such as health and community cohesion; however there has been a general decline in satisfaction overall with the council and the services provided, often putting current satisfaction ratings below the average for all Districts surveyed by Ipsos MORI.
- 3.4 The report concludes that a clear way in which Bromsgrove District Council might greatly improve satisfaction levels is by keeping people more informed of the services that the council provides – something which people feel it currently does poorly in comparison to wider Worcestershire.
- 3.5 Other key messages that the report identifies are that a significant majority of people who think the Council provides value for money are satisfied with the Council overall. Similarly a significant majority of people who feel informed, and those who feel able to influence decisions, are satisfied with the Council. Discussions with other district councils in the county show that the same correlation applies across the county.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial implications

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no legal implications.

6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

- 6.1 The Place Survey covers all four of the Council's objectives.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 7.1 The main risk associated with the details included in this report is:

- Failure to improve public perception of the Council

- 7.2 This risk is being managed as follows:

- Detailed review of the findings of the Place Survey, leading to actions in Council Plan and Business Plans to improve services/perception of services

8 CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The need to address customer perception through improved outcomes and communication.

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no implications for the Council's Equalities and Diversity Policies.

10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 ■ There are no VFM implications

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues None
Personnel Issues None
Governance/Performance Management – Production of the performance report supports the aim of improving performance & performance management
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime & Disorder Act 1988 None
Policy None
Environmental None

12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Please include the following table and indicate 'Yes' or 'No' as appropriate. Delete the words in italics.

Portfolio Holder	Yes(At Cabinet awayday)
Chief Executive	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director (Partnerships & Projects)	Yes (at CMT)
Executive Director (Services)	Yes (at CMT)
Assistant Chief Executive	Yes
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	Yes (at CMT)
Head of Organisational Development & HR	Yes (at CMT)
Corporate Procurement Team	Yes (at CMT)

13. WARDS AFFECTED

All Wards.

14. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Place Survey Report

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

CLG report which summarising the headline findings for England and Government Office regions, available on their website at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/corporate/statistics/placesurvey2008>

Contact officer

Name: John Outhwaite, Senior Policy & Performance Officer

email: j.outhwaite@bromsgrove.gov.uk

Tel: (01527) 881602