

# Appendix 1 Report Key

These columns show the level of performance for the latest reporting period and the same period in the previous year. A question mark means that information is not available

The target is what we want to achieve. A question mark means that a target has not been set

	2008/09 Outturn	2009/10 Outturn	Are we improving	Target	Have we achieved the target	Commentary
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of litter that fall below an acceptable level.	4.00 %	2.00 %	✓	9.00 %	★	
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of detritus that fall below an acceptable level.	5.00 %	5.00 %	→	7.00 %	★	
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having levels of graffiti that fall below an acceptable level.	4.00 %	3.00 %	✓	3.00 %	★	

This is a comparison of the latest outturn against the same period the previous year. The symbols mean

- performance has improved
- performance is stable
- performance has declined
- Information is not available







This traffic light is a comparison of performance against the target set for the year

- The target has been achieved
- Performance is within 10% of the target
- The target has not been achieved
- Not applicable due to no target being set

## Recycling & Street Cleanliness

	Sept 2009 Position	Latest Position Sept 2010	Are we improving	Target	Have we achieved the target	Commentary
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of litter that fall below an acceptable level.	2.00 %	2.00 %	➡	8.00 %	★	
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having deposits of detritus that fall below an acceptable level.	4.00 %	3.00 %	✔	6.00 %	★	
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having levels of graffiti that fall below an acceptable level.	1.00 %	1.00 %	➡	3.00 %	★	
The percentage of relevant land and highways that is assessed as having levels of fly-posting that fall below an acceptable level.	0.00 %	0.00 %	➡	1.00 %	★	
The grade that measures the year on year change in total number of incidents of fly tipping compared with the year on year change in total number of enforcement action (reducing fly tipping incidents and increasing enforcement activity is better performance) Grade 1 is very effective and grade 4 is poor.	1.00	1.00	➡	2.00	★	
The number of kilograms of household waste collected that is not sent for reuse, recycling or is not composted or anaerobic digestion per household.	399.90	388.00	✔	796.00	★	• Data is draft only until confirmed by Wastedataflow.
The percentage of Municipal waste landfilled.	67.33 %	65.75 %	✔	68.00 %	★	• Draft only until confirmed by Wastedataflow
The percentage of household waste arisings which have been sent by the Authority for reuse, recycling, composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion.	30.81 %	32.25 %	✔	32.00 %	★	• Draft only until confirmed by Wastedataflow

## Planning

	Sept 2009 Position	Latest Position Sept 2010	Are we improving	Target	Have we achieved the target	Commentary
The percentage of major planning applications dealt with in 13 weeks	90.00 %	86.36 %		80.00 %	★	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once again we have seen a high level of performance delivered by the Development Control team with support from other planning sections. This has been achieved in the context of a reduced workforce and a mounting new additional workload arising out of application enquiries yet still producing performance figures that are the highest recorded within Tyne and Wear and place the authority within the top quartile (ie top 10 authorities in the country) when measured nationally.</li> </ul>
The percentage of minor planning applications dealt with in 8 weeks	95.08 %	97.04 %		93.50 %	★	
The percentage of 'other' planning applications dealt with in 8 weeks	99.12 %	98.80 %		98.00 %	★	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above commentary</li> </ul>
The total number of net additional dwellings that are deliverable as a percentage of the planned housing provision (in net additional dwellings).	145.00 %	120.16 %		100.0...	★	
The percentage of developed land that is vacant or derelict for more than 5 years.	1.06 %	1.09 %		0.91 %		



## Transport & Road Safety

	Sept 2009 Position	Latest Position Sept 2010	Are we improving	Target	Have we achieved the target?	Commentary
The percentage change in number of people killed or seriously injured during the calendar year compared to the previous year. (Figures are based on a 3 year rolling average).	-2.78 %	6.86 %	✓	8.80 %	▲	• The Council continues to work hard to reduce KSI's through education, promotion and the implementation of traffic engineering measures where appropriate. A prioritisation mechanism has been developed which gives priority to sites with a significant accident history and has been used to assist in formulating a programme of future works.
The percentage change in number of children killed or seriously injured during the calendar year compared to the previous year. (Figures are based on a 3 year rolling average).	-2.54 %	-6.70 %	✗	21.00 %	▲	
The number of people slightly injured in road traffic collisions.	557.00	389.00	✓	910.00	★	
The number of children (aged under 16 years) killed or seriously injured (KSI) in road traffic collisions.	14.00	15.00	✗	13.00	▲	
The number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) in road traffic collisions.	74.00	53.00	✓	93.00	▲	
Congestion - Average journey time per mile (in minutes) during morning peak times.	3.11	3.03	✓	3.25	★	
The percentage of the local authority's A-road and M-road network where maintenance should be considered.	1.00 %	2.00 %	✗	1.00 %	▲	
The percentage of the local authority's B-road and C-road network where maintenance should be considered.	2.00 %	2.00 %	→	2.00 %	★	
The total number of local bus passenger journeys originating in the authority area.	178,165,000.00	180,775,000.00	✓	33,600,000.00	★	
Bus punctuality - Excess waiting time of frequent services (6 or more buses per hour) in number of minutes.	0.65	0.48	✓	0.65	★	
Bus punctuality - the percentage of non-frequent buses (fewer than 6 buses per hour) on time according to scheduled buss departure times	84.00 %	74.70 %	✗	85.00 %	▲	
The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault, which is under the control of the local authority.	4.65	5.55	✗	7.00	★	
The average number of days taken to repair a street lighting fault, where response time is under the control of a DNO.	32.31	24.10	✓	35.00	★	

## Accessibility

	Sept 2009 Position	Latest Position Sept 2010	Are we improving	Target	Have we achieved the target?	Commentary
The percentage of households within 20 minutes of closest secondary school (travelling by public transport, walking and cycling)	100.0...	100.0...	➡	100.0...	★	
The percentage of households within 20 minutes of closest primary school	100.0...	100.0...	➡	100.0...	★	
The percentage of households within 30 minutes of closest A&E hospital	87.10 %	87.10 %	➡	88.20 %	●	• The principal area where things have changed seems to be in Fencehouses, which is largely beyond the 30 minute line anyway. The principal influencing factor is changes to bus timetables, which happens very frequently and when the interchange between one bus and another is part of the trip.
The percentage of households within 20 minutes of closest GP surgery	99.70 %	99.70 %	➡	99.80 %	●	
The percentage of households within 40 minutes of specific employment sites - Doxford	87.80 %	87.80 %	➡	86.90 %	★	
The percentage of households within 40 minutes of specific employment sites - Nissan	79.20 %	79.20 %	➡	70.80 %	★	
The percentage of households within 40 minutes of specific employment sites - Pattinson	77.20 %	77.20 %	➡	83.70 %	▲	
The percentage of households within 40 minutes of specific employment sites - City Centre	84.50 %	84.50 %	➡	89.70 %	▲	
The percentage of people of working age living within the catchment area of a location with more than 500 jobs either travelling by public transport and/or walking.	83.79 %	83.79 %	➡	84.00 %	●	
The percentage of children travelling to school by car (including vans and taxis)	22.79 %	31.20 %	✖	12.67 %	▲	
The percentage of children travelling to school by car share	8.20 %	8.20 %	➡	10.38 %	▲	
The percentage of children travelling to school by public transport	14.13 %	3.30 %	✖	15.20 %	▲	
The percentage of children travelling to school by walking	53.07 %	57.00 %	✔	59.03 %	●	
The percentage of children travelling to school by cycling	0.50 %	0.10 %	✖	1.41 %	▲	
The percentage of children travelling to school by 'other' modes of travel	1.31 %	0.10 %	✖	1.31 %	▲	

## Appendix 2 Traffic Issues Policy Review Recommendations - Progress to September 2010

Progress Summary				
				Total
	3	4	1	8
Description	Due Date	RAG	Commentary	
To review the waiting restrictions in the Business Park area as a priority and, where appropriate, they be reduced to free up available parking space	01/02/2011		For 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 the experimental order is currently being made permanent with no amendments.	
A clearway is proposed to ensure the free-flow of traffic along City Way and part of Doxford Park Way;	01/02/2011			
Gaps be included in the proposed waiting restrictions at various locations on Moorside Road and introduced into the existing Prohibition of Waiting on: Monarch Way, Emperor Way, Admiral Way, Victory Way, Glanville Road, Azure Court and Camberwell Way	01/02/2011			
That the restrictions be fully enforced and the situation monitored to ensure that any problems are not exported to other adjacent areas	01/02/2011		Complete	
That the Council work with the City Hospital to investigate the potential of developing additional park and ride schemes in the city and that measures be taken to better advertise the existing service;	not set		On going in parallel with the proposed implementation of a residents parking scheme around the hospital. A key element of the partnership with the hospital on the residents parking scheme is the effective implementation of the hospital's 5 year travel plan.	
That the possibility of constructing a multi story car park on the Hospital site be investigated further;	not set		Not within the Council's powers but it is intended for the Council to engage with the Hospital's management at senior level.	
That the Hospital investigate further the potential relocation of auxiliary facilities in order to help to free up space for additional parking;	not set		Not within the Council's powers but it is intended for the Council to engage with the Hospital's management at senior level.	
In the longer term consideration is given to the possibility and implications of relocating elements of the Hospital to another site within the city.	not set		Not within the Council's powers but it is intended for the Council to engage with the Hospital's management at senior level.	

## 20mph Zones Policy Review Recommendations - Progress to September 2010

Summary Progress				
				Total
1	4	2		7
Description	Owner	Due Date	RAG	Progress
An enabling policy, to signal that 20mph and traffic calming measures are an integral part of its strategic approach to road safety and traffic management, as part... the Local Development Framework, be introduced.	Newell, James	31/12/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Control is ensuring that all new developments are designed to 20mph. LDF work on going</li> </ul>
The criteria as suggested by the Jacobs report for assessing 20mph speed limit zones be adopted and used to identify pilot areas and re-evaluated prior to Citywide rollout	Newell, James	31/07/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete</li> </ul>
Pilot schemes to be introduced in each of the 15 areas identified in the report in order to assess the impact of 20mph zones in Sunderland and to provide an opportunity to refine the delivery process. Costs to be estimated for schemes and programme developed to deliver. Implementation to be funded through the LTP element of the capital programme	Newell, James	31/12/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is anticipated that the DfT will announce the Council's LTP allocation for the next financial year and future years just prior to Christmas. An LTP programme can then be developed and will give consideration to the funding of 20MPH pilot schemes as a high priority alongside consideration of other key priorities for the council.</li> </ul>
The development of a Communications Plan for the delivery of the programme of 20mph pilot schemes be explored.	Newell, James	not set		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awaiting LTP funding decision for 2011/12 and subsequent years</li> </ul>
Arrangements for monitoring schemes both before and after the implementation of 20mph zones be introduced. Traffic speeds to be measured in pilot areas as programme rolled out. Post implementation monitoring to be undertaken 3 months after scheme completion	Newell, James	not set		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awaiting LTP funding decision for 2011/12 and subsequent years</li> </ul>
The potential delivery of 20mph schemes through the development planning process through encouraging developers to build these treatments into development plans be explored	Donaldson, Bob	not set		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete</li> </ul>
Further dialogue is undertaken with Northumbria Safer Roads Initiative (NSRI) to discuss their policies in relation to enforcement of 20mph limits and to explore whether they are receptive to undertaking enforcement action. Meeting to be convened with the NSRI to discuss the 15 pilot schemes and their assistance with enforcement in the areas and potential use on other areas or routes where 20 mph is applied	Newell, James	30/09/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The government has announced that it will no longer give a direct grant for the partnership after March 2011 and all future funding will have to be predominately through RSG. The partners are therefore reviewing the future operation and funding of the partnership. NSRI is therefore unable at this time to commit to enforcing 20 mph speed limits. It hopes to review the situation once the funding situation is clearer</li> </ul>

## Allotment Provision Policy Review Recommendations - Progress to September 2010

Summary Progress				
				Total
1	3	7		11
Recommendation & Action	Owner	Due Date	RAG	Progress
Officers will contact those on the waiting lists with a view to confirming their continued interest.	Coburn, Ian	31/10/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letters were sent to applicants that have been on the waiting list longer than 5 years asking if they still wanted to be on the list. The waiting lists were amended following feedback from applicants. A copy of the letter is attached.</li> </ul>
Officers will contact other Local Authorities, partners in APSE, Allotments Regeneration Initiative and others to investigate the viability of a points system	Coburn, Ian	30/09/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contacted other local authorities through APSE (Association of Public Service Excellence) and ARI (Allotment Regeneration Initiative). All confirmed that a points system is not used as ARI confirmed that the conventional method is "first come, first served" which is based on fairness and equality for all.</li> </ul>
Officers will continue to encourage allotment societies/associations to take on self managed and leased agreements. Officers will involve partners and allotment organisations in promoting, this issue. Meeting/workshop will be arranged to progress this issue	Coburn, Ian	31/12/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>David Gustard and David McGregor from Land and Property attended the Allotment Secretaries Meeting at Parsons Office on Wednesday 20 October 2010 to give a presentation about Self Management and Leased Allotment Sites. Those present were requested to contact Land and Property Section if they wished to take on self managed or lease arrangements. As of Friday 19 November 2010 no sites have expressed an interest in these options. The Allotment Officer will continue to encourage Site Secretaries to consider these options.</li> </ul>
Officers will investigate charges made by other Local Authorities with a view to increasing charges in line with those Authorities. A report recommending increases will be submitted to DLT for consideration and built into the budget cycle for 2011/12	Coburn, Ian	30/09/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other Local Authorities have been contacted and Sunderland's allotment charges are lower based on 250 sq metre allotment plot. See attached table. A 5% increase has been agreed for 2011/2012. See attached information on the revised charges for Sunderland.</li> </ul>
Officers will explore with Financial function the viability of utilising possible increases in allotment rental income for improvement works within the service	Coburn, Ian	31/12/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial function has confirmed that it will be possible to ring fence allotment rents to be used for improvement works for the existing allotment sites. The Executive Director of City Services will need to authorise this change.</li> </ul>
Officers will liaise with Area Co-ordination Team with a view to seeking Area Committee support in funding improvements where they deem action is needed and affordable	Coburn, Ian	31/03/2011		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A pilot project has been agreed with the North Area Committee which involves 3 sites. One site is land at the former Downhill Primary School and it is intended to create 10 new allotment plots. The second site is the Summerbell allotments at Marley Pots which has 8 plots which are unlettable and the project will clear the plots and bring them back into use. 2 will be used as community allotments and 6 will be allocated to people on the allotment waiting list. The third site is Shields Road Allotments which has 4 derelict plots which will be cleared and brought back into use. 2 will be used as community allotments and 2 plots will be allocated to people on the allotment waiting list.</li> </ul>
Establish with the Planning, Legal and Financial functions whether this approach is practicable under the Council's constitutional and policy framework	Coburn, Ian	31/10/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue has been comprehensively investigated with the Director of Financial Resources, Head of Planning and Environment and senior legal officers. It is not considered practicable due to the law relating to allotments and the Council's own financial regulations. Section 8 Small Holdings Act 1926 states "Where a local authority has purchased or appropriated land for use as allotments, the local authority shall not sell appropriate, use or dispose of the land for any purpose other than use for allotments without the consent of (the Secretary of State). Section 23 of the Small Holdings and Allotment Act 1908 imposes a duty upon an allotments authority to meet the demand for allotments within its area. As demand for allotments is high it is questionable that a robust case for selling off sites could be made. Applying for consent would also incur costs. If plots could be sold off, then their value would not be ringfenced to the service. Planning policy protecting greenspace would have to be satisfied. Any proposal to develop an allotment for other uses would need to be justified on the basis of (1) proposals for a suitable replacement site (2) the number of names on the waiting list in the wider area served by the existing site and for the site itself, (3) detailed proposals for any displaced allotment holders.</li> </ul>
Officers to produce plans of all sites identifying each allotment plot	Coburn, Ian	30/09/2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans have been produced for all allotment sites within the City. An example plan is attached.</li> </ul>



Recommendation & Action	Owner	Due Date	RAG	Progress
Identify sites that we are unable to let owing to derelict condition	Coburn, Ian	30/09/2010	★	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlettable plots have been identified. A list of unlettable plots is attached showing costs to bring back into use. Total cost £164,500.00</li> </ul>
Establish the cost of works required to bring plots to that are capable of improvement to a lettable state and a consistent standard. To include provision of perimeter fencing, internal paths, roadways and a water supply	Coburn, Ian	31/01/2011	⚠	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost of this work is has been established at c.£165K which can not be accommodated within the existing budget. Officers will work with Area Committees with a view to seeking Area Committee support in funding improvements where they deem action is needed and affordable, learning from the model currently underway with North Area.</li> </ul>
A new Allotment Strategy will be produced following consultation with all interested parties and relevant organisations and will also consider the foregoing actions	Coburn, Ian	31/03/2011	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new Allotment Strategy will be produced in due course by the relevant Officer following the new staffing arrangements in the Street Scene Restructure.</li> </ul>

Name  
Company  
Address line 1  
Address line 2  
Address Line 3  
Postcode

Date: 28 JUNE 2010  
Our ref: DR/IAC/EW  
Your ref:

**This matter is being dealt with by:**

E Wilson, Allotment Officer, 0191 5613952, [ethel.wilson@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:ethel.wilson@sunderland.gov.uk)

Dear

**REVIEW OF ALLOTMENT WAITING LISTS**

My Department is currently reviewing the number of people on the waiting lists for allotments.

My records show that you have been on the waiting list for more than five years.

I would be obliged if you could complete the pro forma below and return to **City Services, Parsons Road, Parsons Industrial Estate, Washington NE37 1EZ**. You can also contact us by e mail [ethel.wilson@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:ethel.wilson@sunderland.gov.uk) or telephone Ethel Wilson on 5613952 or Fax 0191 2193959.

**If I do not hear from you within 28 days of the date of this letter, your name will be removed from the waiting list.**

Yours sincerely

Les Clark  
Head of Street Scene

---

\*I wish to stay on the allotment site waiting list

\*I no longer require an allotment and request that my name is removed from the allotment waiting list.

\*Please tick appropriate box

**NAME:-**

**ADDRESS:-**

**SITES APPLIED FOR:**

TENANTS ON THE WAITING LIST PRIOR TO 2005

**COMPARABLE RENTS WITH NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES**

<b>AUTHORITY</b>	<b>RENT BASED ON 250 SQUARE METRES</b>
<b>DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL</b>	<b>£42.00</b>
<b>HARTLEPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL</b>	<b>£47.00</b>
<b>MIDDLESBROUGH COUNCIL</b>	<b>£43.00</b>
<b>NEWCASTLE CITY COUNCIL</b>	<b>£30.00</b>
<b>NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL</b>	<b>£79.00</b>
<b>SUNDERLAND CITY COUNCIL</b>	<b>£30.18</b>
<b>SOUTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL</b>	<b>£84.55</b>

**19 NOVEMBER 2010**

<b>ALLOTMENT CHARGES</b>						
<b>Revised Fees and Charges 2011</b>						
<b>TIER</b>	<b>PLOT SIZE</b>	<b>CHARGES AS FROM</b>	<b>CHARGES AS FROM</b>	<b>INCREASE</b>	<b>INCREASE</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>CATEGORY</b>		<b>1 APRIL 2010</b>	<b>1 JANUARY 2011</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>%</b>	
1	<b>0 – 105</b> <b>SQUARE METRES</b> 0 – 125 Square yards	<b>£10.00</b>	<b>£10.50</b>	<b>£0.50</b>	<b>5.00%</b>	
2	<b>106 - 150</b> <b>SQUARE METRES</b> 126 – 175 Square yards	<b>£15.07</b>	<b>£15.82</b>	<b>£0.75</b>	<b>4.98%</b>	
3	<b>151 - 190</b> <b>SQUARE METRES</b> 176 – 225 Square yards	<b>£20.08</b>	<b>£21.08</b>	<b>£1.00</b>	<b>4.98%</b>	
4	<b>191 - 230</b> <b>SQUARE METRES</b> 226 – 275 Square yards	<b>£25.18</b>	<b>£26.44</b>	<b>£1.26</b>	<b>5.00%</b>	
5	<b>231 – 270</b> <b>SQUARE METRES</b> 276 – 325 Square yards	<b>£30.18</b>	<b>£31.69</b>	<b>£1.51</b>	<b>5.00%</b>	
6	<b>271</b> <b>SQUARE METRES &amp; ABOVE</b> 326 square yards & above	<b>£35.19</b>	<b>£36.95</b>	<b>£1.76</b>	<b>5.00%</b>	

NOTES:



North House

86.30m

Cricket Row

A1 (M)

FB

A1 (M)

Service Area

Service Area

Service Area

Police Station

Ayton Gardens

STONECHAT CLOSE

WHITE THROAT DRIVE

WHITE THROAT

GOLDCREST ROAD

GLENHOLME

Shelter

AYTON

Car Park

Shelter

Community

Car Park

TEAL CLOSE

REDWING CLOSE

BURNIN

Path

Path

Gardens

Car Park

Car

Playground

Playground

Posts

CLOSE

DUNNOCK DRIVE

Playground

SANDPIPER CLOSE

Playground

REDSHANK CLOSE

MARTIN COURT

DUNNOCK DRIVE

SANDPIPER CLOSE

VASEY CLOSE

## SITES WITH UNLETTABLE PLOTS

<b>SITE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF UNLETTABLE PLOTS</b>	<b>ESTIMATED COST TO BRING BACK INTO USE</b>
<b>BRITANNIA TERRACE, FENCE HOUSES</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>£24,500.00</b>
<b>GRAVEL WALKS, HOUGHTON LE SPRING</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>£10,500.00</b>
<b>HUTTON STREET, HETTON LE HOLE</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>£28,000.00</b>
<b>SEAHAM ROAD, HOUGHTON LE SPRING</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>£38,500.00</b>
<b>SUMMERBELL, MARLEY POTS</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>£63,000.00</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>£164,500.00</b>

**N.B. COST OF £3,500.00 per plot which is based on other similar plot clearances.**

NUMBER OF UNLETTABLE PLOTS