AGENDA

Committee - PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL

Date & Time - Tuesday, 30 August 2016 at 6.30 pm

Venue - Meeting Room 1, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding

Membership of the Performance Monitoring Panel:

Councillors: B Alcock (Chairman), G R Aley, J R Astill, M D Booth (Vice-Chairman), C J T H Brewis, T A Carter, R Clark, G K Dark, P C Foyster, R Grocock, J L King, J D McLean, A M Newton, A C Tennant and J Tyrrell

Substitute members on the Performance Monitoring Panel may be appointed only from members who are not on the Cabinet. Substitutions apply for individual meetings only.

Quorum: 5

Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn their mobile telephones to silent mode

Democratic Services
Council Offices, Priory Road
Spalding, Lincs PE11 2XE

Date: 19 August 2016

Please ask for Christine Morgan: Telephone 01775 764454
e-mail: cmorgan@sholland.gov.uk
AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence.

2. Declaration of Interests - Where a Councillor has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest the Councillor must declare the interest to the meeting and leave the room without participating in any discussion or making a statement on the item, except where a councillor is permitted to remain as a result of a grant of dispensation.

3. Crime and Disorder update - The Portfolio Holder for Community Development will be in attendance to provide an update report on community safety and how it is being delivered through the various tiers of Groups and Panels (including the East Lincs CSP and Lincolnshire CSP). (A copy of the minutes of the Panel meeting of 16 September 2015 where the last update was received, is enclosed)

4. Policing in the South Holland area - At its meeting on 16 September 2015, during a Crime and Disorder update by the Portfolio Holder for Community Development, the Panel raised a number of issues and requested that Inspector Jo Reeves of Lincolnshire Police be requested to attend a meeting when the next Crime and Disorder update was delivered, to answer members’ questions regarding policing matters.

The following representative will be in attendance to answer Councillors’ questions:

Inspector Jo Reeves – Lincolnshire Police

5. Update on Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) in South Holland - To update members on progress with the South Holland CCTV scheme and the use of the system to date (report of the Director of Place attached).

6. Performance Overview Report Quarter 1 2016/17 - To provide an update on Council performance for the period 1 April 2016 – 31 June 2016 (report of the Executive Director Strategy and Governance enclosed)

7. Minutes - To sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel held on 15 June 2016 (copy enclosed).

8. Questions asked under Standing Order 6

9. Tracking of Recommendations - To consider responses of the Cabinet to reports of the Panel.

10. Items referred from the Policy Development Panel.

11. Key Decision Plan - To note the current Key Decision Plan, published 4 August 2016 (copy enclosed)

13. Performance Monitoring Panel Work Programme - To set out the Work Programme of the Performance Monitoring Panel (report of the Executive Manager Governance enclosed). (Pages 53 - 64)

14. Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent -

NOTE: No other business is permitted unless by reason of special circumstances, which shall be specified in the minutes, the Chairman is of the opinion that the item(s) should be considered as a matter of urgency.
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13. **CRIME AND DISORDER UPDATE**

The Portfolio Holder for Community Development was in attendance to provide an update report on community safety and how it was being delivered through the various tiers of Groups and Panels (including the East Lincolnshire CSP and Lincolnshire CSP). He advised on the following issues:

- The Lincolnshire Community Safety Partnership’s 14/15 Annual Report was still not yet complete however, when it was, it would be circulated to members.
- He confirmed that the Lincolnshire Community Safety Partnership’s priorities for 2015-18 were – 1) Anti-Social Behaviour and Hate Crime; 2) Domestic Abuse; 3) Reduction in re-offending; 4) Serious organised crime; 5) Sexual violence; and 6) Substance abuse.
- Anti-social behaviour training had been undertaken by the Anti-Social Behaviour Officer and the Safer Communities Officer.
- Mental health issues – a number of people in the area had been processed.
- Community Safety Survey – this survey was still underway and was available online on the Council’s website.
- An initiative to combat illegal sale of alcohol in Spalding was working well.
- One of the CSP’s targeted areas in the past had been around road safety. Statistics around this were improving, which was a success for the CSP.
- Pressure was being put on the Home Office with regard to funding for policing in the area. Changes in the population of the area were having an impact on real communities, and this information was being used to make the case for increased funding.

Consideration was given to this information, and the following issues were raised:

- With regard to domestic abuse, was additional publicity having an impact on reporting levels?
  - People had to be encouraged to report domestic abuse and convinced that it could make a difference. Increased reporting would attract more funding.

- Now that the new CCTV system was in operation in certain parts of the South Holland area, were there any figures available regarding arrests/convictions?
The Portfolio Holder advised that he would look into whether there was any data available. All cameras were now working and recording in Spalding, there were some issues with other cameras that were being refined.

- In the absence of a plentiful police presence, more reliance was being placed on CCTV. An assurance was needed that it was being used effectively.
  - The Portfolio Holder advised that there was a wish to use CCTV cameras to address issues that fell under the Council’s jurisdiction. The Portfolio Holder was currently in discussions with the Portfolio Holder for Place with regard to using CCTV to address environmental crime.

- Councillors reiterated the point that had been made above, and at previous meetings, with regard to the lack of data showing the numbers of arrests, convictions etc linked to information gathered from CCTV. This information had to be provided to demonstrate that the cameras were producing results.

- When the CSPs met, was there any analysis of why certain actions were or were not taken when a crime was committed?
  - The Portfolio Holder advised that the reporting of crime, such as attempted break-ins, was an issue as this could become a greater problem further along the line. Enforcement was undertaken, but not in all instances and this was a question to ask of the Police.

- With regard to mental health issues, was this an issue of greater relevance nationally, or was it a significant issue in this area?
  - Matters relating to mental health and vulnerable people were an issue everywhere. Multi-agency working between bodies such as the Council, health authorities and the Police was required to address these areas.

- Councillor Brewis commented on issues around access to justice provided by Magistrate’s Courts. There had been consultation regarding a reduction in service provided by the Court in Lincoln. Sufficient consideration should be given to all those involved in hearings and proceedings at the court. Should the area of jurisdiction necessarily be Lincoln for some parts of the South Holland area as other locations were more convenient for certain sections of the district? In the drive to save money, had issues such as expenses, (including travel
expenses if travelling further was necessary), for all those involved been considered?
  o The Portfolio Holder requested that Councillor Brewis send him details of the issues raised and consultation undertaken.

A number of issues were raised which were policing matters, and the Portfolio Holder suggested that Inspector Jo Reeves be invited to the meeting in six months time, where he would be providing his next update, to answer these questions and any others that Panel members wished to ask:

- There was a perception that bodies such as the East Lincolnshire CSP and Lincolnshire CSP were ‘talking shops’, achieving little of any real substance, and that money would be better spent on a greater Police presence in the South Holland area. What evidence was there that bodies such as the CSPs provided any benefit or made a real difference?
- Councillors were concerned about the lack of data showing the numbers of arrests, convictions etc linked to information gathered from CCTV. This information had to be provided to demonstrate that the cameras were producing results.
- Data regarding moving traffic offences was requested – how many prosecutions had there been in this area?
- At what point were the Police alerted when an incident was viewed on CCTV? Was there a trigger level?
- Councillors raised concerns over the level of people committing offences and ignoring the law because it was felt that they could ‘get away with it’.
- Enforcement following attempted criminal incidents was undertaken in some instances, but not always. Why was this? Minor incidents should still be dealt with.

AGREED:

a) That the update provided by the Portfolio Holder for Community Development be noted;

b) That the Portfolio Holder for Community Development be requested to provide a further update to the Panel in six months time; and

c) That Inspector Jo Reeves of Lincolnshire Police be requested to attend the same meeting to answer members’ questions regarding policing matters.

(The Portfolio Holder for Community Development left the meeting following discussion of this item).
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1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 In February 2014 South Holland District Council agreed to enter into a partnership agreement with Boston Borough Council to transfer the operation of the CCTV service to Boston Borough Council for an improved monitoring service.

1.2 The previous system needed to be replaced to improve the effectiveness of the system, improve the quality of transmitted and tracked images, comply with new legislation and codes of practice governing the monitoring of Public Space CCTV and to provide a regularly monitored system.

1.3 Once agreement for the project was in place, a programme of surveys, parish council consultation, final camera locations, equipment specifications, final permissions for installation of kit on various infrastructure and properties took place.

1.4 The installation of the wireless infrastructure kit and the cameras took place between June and September 2015. This highlighted transmission problems with the proposed main wireless links, affecting the town links to the control point. Alternative wireless providers were investigated and re-surveying of each town for alternative transmission points was undertaken. This delayed the transmission of camera images to Boston control room.

1.5 During this period, all installed cameras were recording and footage was available if needed. There were occasional instances where installed cameras had temporary faults, for example, a blown fuse or disconnected power. These were rectified once identified. This could not be monitored or picked up immediately through the control room as the cameras at this stage were not transmitting so alternative arrangements were made to view the cameras locally and notify control of any issues with 24 hour checks built into the procedures.
Challenges with transmission of information from the cameras to the control room have led to significant delays to the project and to final sign off. However, as of 17 August 2016, Spalding, Crowland and Holbeach cameras are transmitting to Boston Control room.

There are 19 cameras in Spalding, 4 in Holbeach and 2 in Crowland currently. Of these 25 cameras, 23 are recording and transmitting into the Boston control room. There are 2 Spalding cameras that are recording with images available locally that still need to be brought on line into the control room. Some additional equipment is due to be installed to rectify this. All 25 cameras are operational and recordings are available if needed. Additional cameras for Holbeach and Crowland are being investigated and revisiting the exact locations for line of site and coverage. This work has been delayed while the main transmission links were resolved, however, a solution is expected shortly.

In addition to the monitoring of the CCTV system, Boston Borough Council also have a radio for the Chamber of Commerce’s Shopwatch and Pubwatch Scheme in the control room. The Shopwatch and Pubwatch initiatives are separate services to the district’s CCTV system and the district CCTV schemes add value to these two schemes through our partnership work with Boston Borough Council. Interaction with Shopwatch and Pubwatch radios helps direct CCTV resources to where they are needed while reducing any overly intrusive monitoring and privacy issues.

Monitoring data is available for the Spalding cameras period June 2015 – July 2016. The full details and breakdown can be found in Appendix A and B. The figures for April 2016-March 2017 will be the first full year of monitoring and will provide an accurate base line for quarterly and yearly comparisons. This data only relates to Spalding. Appendix B is for Quarter 1 of 2016/17 and includes incidents for Crowland and Holbeach cameras.

As detailed in the appendices, since the cameras have been installed, CCTV Operators have completed 104 incident records and contributed to 17 arrests. For clarity, CCTV data does not include records for arrests resulting from images reviewed post incident. The majority of data available in the CCTV Statistical reports is internal control room data. Incidents include; thefts, anti-social behaviour, criminal damage, suspicious activity, traffic collision, drink offences and public order. The highest number of recorded incidences is for missing persons or concern for welfare with 23 incidences.

OPTIONS

a) The update information provided in the report be noted.
b) CCTV statistical information should continue to be reported quarterly.
c) Any future queries about the scheme should be directed to the Communities Manager in the first instance.

Do Nothing – no monitoring of performance data or use of the system.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Ongoing reporting and monitoring of the scheme will help inform the future direction and usefulness of the scheme.

The reporting and presentation of factual information should assist with confidence in the scheme.
4.0 EXPECTED BENEFITS

4.1 The report is for information on the update of the project. The benefits of the CCTV system will continue to be reported and monitored.

4.2 The new system has increased the level of service with regular monitoring and statistical information provided. It also provides assurance that the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice is complied with.

5.0 IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Constitution & legal


5.2 Contracts

5.2.1 The ongoing monitoring of the cameras will be monitored through a Memorandum of Understanding between South Holland District Council and Boston Borough Council. It will commence once all the cameras in South Holland are commissioned and the original project complete. This document will include the reporting information required which will be presented to Members in the quarterly monitoring reports.

5.3 Corporate Priorities

5.3.1 The CCTV Service contributes to our Corporate Priority: ‘To develop safer, stronger, healthier and more independent communities.

5.4 Crime and Disorder

5.4.1 Measuring the impact of CCTV on crime and disorder is difficult. However, there are a number of national assumptions about CCTV and the role it plays in crime prevention, identifying offenders, efficient deployment of police resources and perceptions of personal safety for residents.

5.4.2 The Effectiveness of CCTV Task Group (May 2010) were informed that in the first six months of installing CCTV cameras in the district, shoplifting reduced by 60% and there was a corresponding increase in neighbouring areas.

5.5 Equality and Diversity / Human Rights

5.5.1 There are no implications of this update report. However, the Human Rights Act 1998 and Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights which protects an individual’s right for a private and family life must be considered when operating a CCTV scheme on behalf of a public authority.

5.6 Financial

5.6.1 Capital expenditure of £98,475 was incurred in 2014/15 and the project was closed in 2015/16 with an under spend of £10k.
5.6.2 Commissioning of the monitoring service, which will be provided by Boston Borough Council, has been subject to delay due to various technical difficulties. These have now been resolved in the main and the service will commence in September 2016.

5.6.3 Annual cost of the monitoring service is approximately £32k and £19k will be paid this year. In addition £10k will be paid for commissioning of the system and electricity charges are estimated at £2k giving an overall charge of £31k for 2016/17 which is £23k lower than budget.

5.6.4 Monitoring charges are paid by Spalding special expenses £8k, Holbeach parish council £4k and Crowland parish council £3k. Part year charges are estimated at £8k which is £2k lower than budget.

5.6.5 Net cost of the service for 2016/17 is £23k (£21k below budget) and £24k from 2017/18 onwards with an annual budget reduction of £20k reflected in medium term financial plan this year.

5.7 Risk Management

5.7.1 Regular reporting of the incident data for CCTV will provide an accurate picture of functionality and use of the service. This will provide factual information, confidence in the service and mitigate risks around perception from misinformation.

5.8 Safeguarding

5.8.1 The CCTV scheme itself contributes to safeguarding local communities. 23 incidences of missing person or concern for welfare were recorded since the cameras have been monitored.

6.0 WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

6.1 All Wards

7.0 ACRONYMS

7.1 CCTV – Closed Circuit Television

Background papers:- None

Lead Contact Officer
Name and Post: Emily Kate Holmes, Communities Manager
Telephone Number: 01775 764469
Email: eholmes@sholland.gov.uk

Key Decision: No

Exempt Decision: No
This report refers to a Mandatory Service / Discretionary Service

Appendices attached to this report: (list appendices below or delete)
Appendix A 2015/16 Statistical Report June-March Spalding Cameras
Appendix B Q1 2016/17 Statistical Report April - June
SHDC CCTV Annual Statistical Report

2015/16
Introduction

This document provides an examination of data collected by the CCTV department of Boston Borough Council. This data is collected and studied in order better understand the performance and achievements of the South Holland District Council CCTV system but is clearly not (nor indeed intended to be), a full picture of criminal activity within the covered areas.

The majority of data in this report has been exported from the 'VTAS' software used in the Boston CCTV control room. Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council have no set targets for incidents or arrests, and do not receive any benefits or funding based on results or achievements. Altering or manipulating statistics would serve us no purpose, so the figures within this document can be confidently taken as factual.

Scale of Data – South Holland DC

For the period between 01/04/15 and 01/04/16, CCTV operators have:

- Completed 83 incident records
- Contributed to 17 arrests

*It should be noted that we do not have records for arrests resulting from images reviewed post incident. These figures would be useful for measuring performance; however it would require the police to compile and forward these figures to us. The majority of data within this report is internal data only.

Incidents

Boston CCTV operators logged 83 incidents for SHDC within the period described. The table below breaks this down into incident categories, showing the number of incidents for each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Category</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing Person / Concern for Welfare</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order / Disturbance Affray</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft - Shoplifting / Retail</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink Offence - Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - Collision</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Activity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - Drink Driving</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm Activation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft - of Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - SOCAP (No Insurance)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Person</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below shows the incidents that have been logged for each camera location. It is worth noting that the sum of all the figures below will total more than the 83 incidents logged. This is because some incidents may involve usage of more than one camera when they are being progressively monitored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 201</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 202</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 203</td>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 204</td>
<td>Hall Place</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 205</td>
<td>Sheep Market</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 206</td>
<td>Red Lion Street</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 207</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 208</td>
<td>Herring Lane</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 209</td>
<td>Swan Street</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 210</td>
<td>Winfrey Avenue</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 211</td>
<td>Westlode Street</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 212</td>
<td>Winsover Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 214</td>
<td>The Crescent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 215</td>
<td>Vine Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 226</td>
<td>Castle Sports Complex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 227</td>
<td>Castle Sports Complex</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 228</td>
<td>Castle Sports Complex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A CCTV system is not just a system of cameras and monitors, but also a hub of communications for different agencies. The table below shows the incidents categorised by how they were initiated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Source</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of Public Via Telephone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Generated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police - Phone</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police - Radio</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubwatch - Bravo Radio</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security / other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopwatch - Bravo Radio</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankee - Radio - Non-BBC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that the largest number of incidents that CCTV deal with come to our knowledge via Police communications. The CCTV control room is in direct contact with Police controllers and on the ground officers via the Airwaves radio system.

We have seen a trend over several years showing more success via interaction with outside agencies such as Police and local Shopwatch / Pubwatch radio schemes. This assists with directing CCTV resources to where and when they needed, while reducing any overly intrusive monitoring and privacy issues.
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Incidents Summary Analysis by Zone

01/04/2016 00:00:00 to 01/07/2016 00:00:00
### Category Summary

#### Zone: SHDC Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Sub Category Name</th>
<th>No. of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs*</td>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Person / Concern for</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order / Disturbance</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft - Shoplifting / Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - Collision</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Total No. of Incidents in Zone SHDC Zone: 21

---

Total No. of Incidents: 21
Incidents Summary Analysis by Zone
01/04/2016 00:00:00 to 01/07/2016 00:00:00

No. of Incidents by Category

No. of Incidents by Sub Category
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Incidents Summary Analysis by Zone
01/04/2016 00:00:00 to 01/07/2016 00:00:00

Call Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Source</th>
<th>No. of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operator Generated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police - Phone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police - Radio</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubwatch</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopwatch</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total No. of Incidents in Zone SHDC Zone: 21

Total No. of Incidents: 21
Incidents Summary Analysis by Zone

01/04/2016 00:00:00 to 01/07/2016 00:00:00

No. of Incidents by Call Source

- Operator Generated: 4.3%
- Police - Phone: 4.3%
- Police - Radio: 42.9%
- Pubwatch: 28.8%
- Shopwatch: 10.0%
- Total: 100.0%
### Camera Summary

**Zone: SHDC Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera Name</th>
<th>Camera Location</th>
<th>No. of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 201</td>
<td>Bridge Street</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 202</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 203</td>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 204</td>
<td>Hall Place</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 205</td>
<td>Sheep Market</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 206</td>
<td>Red Lion Street</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 207</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 208</td>
<td>Herring Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 209</td>
<td>Swan Street</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 210</td>
<td>Winfrey Avenue</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 211</td>
<td>Westlode Street</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 212</td>
<td>Winover Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 213</td>
<td>St Thomas Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 214</td>
<td>The Crescent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 215</td>
<td>Vine Street</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 217</td>
<td>The Vista</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 218</td>
<td>South Street Crowland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 219</td>
<td>West Street Crowland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 220</td>
<td>High Street Holbeach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 221</td>
<td>High Street Holbeach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 222</td>
<td>Station Road Holbeach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 223</td>
<td>Church Street Holbeach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 224</td>
<td>High Street Holbeach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 226</td>
<td>Castle Sports Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 227</td>
<td>Castle Sports Complex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHDC 228</td>
<td>Castle Sports Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Total No. of Incidents in Zone SHDC Zone:** 21

---

**Total No. of Incidents:** 21
1.0 BACKGROUND

1.0.1 The Quarter 1 Performance Report 16/17 (Appendix A) aims to provide Members and residents with information about how the Council is delivering its services and how it is progressing against its Corporate Priorities. The covering report presents a summary of the status of the Council's key projects and indicators.

1.0.2 Areas where performance has improved since the previous period (Q4 2015/2016) are brought to Members' attention, as are areas of concern where performance is below expected levels or is considered to be worsening.

1.1 Key Performance Indicators

The Covalent performance management system has now been in situ for long enough for a full year of corporate data to be collated. This will mean that there will be data to project seasonality and baseline measurements into the performance framework.

1.1.1 Q1 saw similar levels of performance against indicators as had been experienced in Q4 last year as per the previous report submitted to the Performance Monitoring Panel.

The performance is rated as good with 56.25% of indicators being green which indicates good performance above the organisational expectation. There are 2 amber indicators and 5 red indicators which in total make up the remaining 43.75% of indicators.

1.1.2 The current status of performance indicators (as represented by the returns of Q1) still represents good performance.

56.25% of “like for like” performance indicators are green which continue to indicate good performance within organisational guidelines, although they have fallen slightly from the 62.5% demonstrated at the previous out-turn (Q4 2015/16). There are 2 amber indicators which represent 12.5% of indicators and 5 red indicators which make up the remaining 31%.
1.2 **Areas of Success**

There has been good performance identified across various aspects of Council business:

1.2.1 **Customer Service**

Call waiting times stand 79 seconds against a tolerance of 86 seconds. It is worth noting however that this is portrayed against a 2015/16 Q4 performance of just under 50 seconds. It could be that this is purely down to a seasonal effect as the same quarter last year saw a wait time of 96 seconds which makes this year’s performance 17% better than the same time last year. There is also the impact of EU referendum queries that should be considered with would have considerable extra load over and above the load seen in the last quarter.

The amount of customer complaints that are upheld at both stage 1 and 2 are well within the corporate tolerance thresholds of 25%.

1.2.2 **Commercial Property**

Commercial Property Occupancy is performing exceptionally well with 100% occupancy across the portfolio. This is contextualised against an occupancy rate of 93.33% during the same period last year.

1.2.3 **Staffing**

Staff turnover stands at 1.33% against a tolerance of 2.5% which is an improvement and indicates that employees have a good level of satisfaction in the workplace.

1.2.4 **Planning**

Planning application determination is performing well with 87.7% of applications being determined within time frames. This is well above the tolerance target of 70% and substantially better than the performance for the same period last year which was 50.6%
1.2.5 **Revenues**

Business Rate and Council Tax collections are both performing above their targets for the year so far.

1.3 **Areas of Concern**

The following areas of business are either not achieving minimum standards, or are experiencing a significant decline in performance:

1.3.1 **Customer Service**

Call abandonment rate has increased to 10.63% against a target of 10%. Whilst this is not massively over the target, it reflects slippage against a score of 6.47% in the last quarter. It is likely that this is directly attributable to the increase in call volume due to the EU referendum and the transition of the financial year.

1.3.2 **Housing Re-Let Time**

The performance of the re-letting of void properties, whilst still being over the tolerance threshold of 28 days, has seen considerable recent improvement.

Performance in Q1 16/17 has improved markedly from the last quarter and has dropped to just 31 days (representing a drop of 14 days since the last report). This shows a positive direction of travel and indicates that process improvements are delivering against the objectives. Additionally it is worth noting that the same period last year saw a performance of some 55 days for total key to key void times. The performance this quarter is 44% better than the same time last year and 31% better than the last quarter.

The Place Directorate have monitored the elements of the void process closely and as part of the work to improve the total days taken to re-let properties, new performance measures have been implemented.

Since the Q4 report presented last time, performance is being measured in each element of the letting process and separated by tenure; general needs or sheltered housing. These are then broken down into:

- Time taken for contactor works to be completed (keys from outgoing tenant to back from contractor)
- Time taken to let (keys from contractor to keys given to new tenant)

By separately monitoring these elements we are able to see where the delay in the total time to re-let a property is and work to understand how to rectify this.

It is apparent that letting of sheltered property in Q1 is taking 8 times longer than the 3 day target. It is also notable that this element of the chain is also nearly double the length of time that was seen last year for the same measure. This is a common feature in the housing sector where sheltered housing schemes are not the desired model for older people who prefer to live in their own dwellings for longer, or for people who require extra care which is over and above the provision that can be made available in sheltered housing.
2.0 **OPTIONS**

2.1 Members are asked to consider the information contained within the report.

2.2 To do nothing.

3.0 **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 Report for consideration, in order to fulfil the Performance Monitoring Panel’s remit.

4.0 **EXPECTED BENEFITS**

4.1 The Council’s performance is properly scrutinised.

5.0 **IMPLIEDATIONS**

5.1 **Constitution & Legal**

5.1.1 The report is made within the terms of reference of the Performance Monitoring Panel.

5.2 **Corporate Priorities**

5.2.1 The report presents progress monitoring of performance of the corporate priorities.

5.3 **Financial**

5.3.1 The report contains information on the Council’s performance which does convey some information relating to financial matters.

5.4 **Reputation**

5.4.1 Performance issues can cause some reputational consequence. It is the purpose of this report to highlight performance issues at an early stage.

5.5 **Risk Management**

5.5.1 Performance issues may be subject to risk management measures to protect Council interests.

5.6 **Staffing**

5.6.1 The report contains information relating to staffing issues.

6.0 **WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED**

6.1 No Wards or Communities are affected.

7.0 **ACRONYMS**

7.1 EMT – Executive Management Team
Background papers:- None

Lead Contact Officer
Name and Post: Greg Pearson – Corporate Improvement & Performance Manager
Telephone Number: 01362 656866
Email: greg.pearson@breckland-sholland.gov.uk

Director / Officer who will be attending the Meeting
Name and Post: Greg Pearson – Corporate Improvement & Performance Manager

Key Decision: No
Exempt Decision: No

Appendices attached to this report:
Appendix A Quarter 1 Performance Report
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## 2016/17 Q1 SHDC PMP Report

**Generated on:** 16 August 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio Holder</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Same Period Last Year</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Short Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 2015/16</td>
<td>Q1 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>% of Calls Abandoned</td>
<td>13.65%</td>
<td>10.63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>Average Wait Time in Seconds</td>
<td>95.67</td>
<td>79.33</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>% of Customer Complaints Upheld - Stage 1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>% of Customer Complaints Upheld - Stage 2</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Roger Gambba-Jones</td>
<td>% of household waste recycled or composted</td>
<td>29.24%</td>
<td>31.54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Roger Gambba-Jones</td>
<td>Missed Waste Collection Rate</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Roger Gambba-Jones</td>
<td>Waste sent to 'Energy from Waste' per Household (kg)</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>140.5</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Anthony Casson</td>
<td>Commercial Property Occupancy</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>Staff turnover %</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Holder</td>
<td>Performance Indicator</td>
<td>Q1 2015/16</td>
<td>Q1 2016/17</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance Portfolio SHDC; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td># of Working Days Lost to Sickness per FTE</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (total ave. key to key) All Tenures</td>
<td>55 days</td>
<td>31 days</td>
<td>28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Keys In to Keys Back from Contractor) - All</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Contractor) - General Needs</td>
<td>54 days</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Contractor) - Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td>17 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Letting) - General Needs</td>
<td>19 days</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Letting) - Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>13 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Key to Key) - General Needs</td>
<td>49 days</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Housing re-let (void) time (Key to Key) - Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>59 days</td>
<td>40 days</td>
<td>28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>Cases Prevented from Homelessness per 1,000 households</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Malcolm Chandler</td>
<td>% of all planning applications determined within time</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>87.67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance Portfolio SHDC; Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>Housing Benefit LA Error Rate</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>Business Rate In Year Collection Rate</td>
<td>31.54%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>29.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Sally-Ann Slade</td>
<td>Council Tax In Year Collection Rate</td>
<td>30.48%</td>
<td>30.35%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Christine Lawton</td>
<td>New Homes - Affordable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of a meeting of the PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Wednesday, 15 June 2016 at 6.30 pm.

PRESENT

B Alcock (Chairman)
M D Booth (Vice-Chairman)
J R Astill
C J T H Brewis
T A Carter
J L King
J D McLean
A C Tennant
A M Newton

In Attendance: The South Holland Place Manager, the Environmental Services Manager, the Environmental Protection Manager, the Change and Performance Manager, the Housing Landlord Manager, the Business Intelligence Officer and the Democratic Services Officer

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors G R Aley, R Clark, G K Dark, P C Foyster and R Grocock.

1. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the following meetings were signed by the Chairman as a correct record:

- Performance Monitoring Panel – 5 April 2016
- Special joint meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel – 26 April 2016
- Special joint meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel – 16 May 2016

With regard to the meeting of Performance Monitoring Panel on 5 April 2016, where reference was made to inviting a representative from Network Rail to attend a future Panel meeting to discuss how issues around how complaints and queries were dealt with (minute 41e), the following issues and concerns were raised:

- The outside space was in a very poor state, with much of the area being overgrown. It gave a very poor impression to those arriving in Spalding by train.
- Part of the station building had been let out, and some of it was boarded up. Again, it gave a poor impression of the town, and the building itself was listed.
- Currently, any downtime as a result of barriers closing when trains travelled through Spalding created severe backlogs for those travelling on the roads. The anticipated increase in trains travelling through Spalding would make this problem worse. A bridge in the town had been discussed, but this...
would be some time in the future.

- There had been recent incidences where faulty rail barriers, sometimes in combination with roadworks, had resulted in certain areas of Spalding being inaccessible, causing access issues and also major travel disruption. It was felt that these issues could cause potential problems for the emergency services. Was this an issue that should be considered within the Authority’s Emergency Plan?
- There were still concerns regarding the complaints process at Network Rail. Members had contacted the company on a variety of issues, had been provided with reference numbers for their complaints, but no resolution to them.

Although the Panel initially felt that a representative from Network Rail should attend to answer questions on all of these issues, the Place Manager advised that they were too varied for one representative to deal with and that in reality, they would be dealt with by a number of different departments. He also advised that some of the issues could be dealt with through planning processes. The following suggestions were therefore made:

- Poor upkeep of outside space – This could be dealt with through a S215 notice relating to untidy land.
- Condition of part of the listed station building – This could be investigated by a planning enforcement officer.
- The issue of downtime caused by railway barriers, and the potential public safety risk of emergency vehicles not being able to get through could not effectively be dealt with by Network Rail attending a Panel meeting. It was important to consider two areas - the consequence of the barrier closures, and the pattern of downtime; and the provision of emergency services vehicles. There had to be liaison with both Network Rail and the emergency services. With regard to whether the Emergency Plan accounted for these situations, the Planning Manager commented that this would be an area in which to start considering how the problems could be addressed, with the long term solution of a bridge being part of the Local Plan, although this would be some time in the future. He also pointed out that many towns were bisected by the railway and that this was not an issue peculiar to Spalding.

Following discussion on these various matters, the Panel agreed that rather than asking Network Rail to attend a future meeting, that a list of officers/ bodies to be contacted for each of the issues raised be provided in order that the Panel could progress the various complaints/concerns. In addition, it was requested that the Emergency Plan be considered in light of members’ comments.
AGREED:

a) That the minutes of the following meetings be signed by the Chairman as a correct record:
   • Performance Monitoring Panel – 5 April 2016
   • Special joint meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel – 26 April 2016
   • Special joint meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel – 16 May 2016; and

b) That in order for the Panel to progress the various complaints/concerns raised relating to Network Rail, a list of officers and bodies to be contacted for each of the issues be provided.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.

There were none.

3. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 6

There were none.

4. TRACKING OF RECOMMENDATIONS

There were none.

5. ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL.

There were none.

6. KEY DECISION PLAN

Consideration was given to the Key Decision Plan issued on 6 June 2016.

AGREED:

That the Key Decision Plan issued on 6 June 2016 be noted.

7. END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT Q4 2015/2016

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Strategy and Governance, which provided an update on the Council’s performance up to 31 March 2016. Areas where
performance had improved since the previous quarter were brought to Members’ attention, as were areas of concern where performance was below expected levels or were considered to be worsening.

With regard to Key Performance Indicators, Quarter 3 saw similar levels of performance against indicators, as had been experienced in Quarter 2. The performance was rated as good. The current status of performance indicators, as represented by the returns of Quarter 4, still represented good performance.

Areas of success highlighted in the report included the following, which were below tolerance levels/within time frames: call abandonment rate; call waiting times; commercial property occupancy; staff turnover; and planning application determination.

Areas of concern highlighted in the report included the following: high levels of staff sickness; the performance of the re-letting of void properties; and a decline in the performance on missed waste collections.

The Panel considered the information detailed within the report, and the following issues were raised:

- It was stated in the report that the Council had adopted a new sickness management process. How was sickness now managed, and what was the process?
  - Officers did not have this information available and members were therefore advised that they would be provided with this in due course after the meeting.

- The performance of the re-letting of void properties was still an area of concern to the Panel.
  - At the last meeting, the Panel had requested that a ‘deep-dive’ investigation be undertaken at a future meeting to investigate the issues. The Chairman suggested that a Task Group be set up to undertake this investigation, and the Place Manager agreed that this would be the appropriate forum, given the confidential nature of some of the information. The Task Group should be focussed, with the intention of understanding the current problems and making recommendations to improve performance.
  - Councillors Booth, Brewis and Carter volunteered to be members of the Task Group. The Democratic Services Officer would contact the Panel members not in attendance to ascertain whether they wished to serve on the Task Group.
The Place Manager suggested that he and the Housing Landlord Manager attend the first meeting of the Task Group to provide guidance with the scope, and that a member of the Performance Team should also be in attendance to advise on how data was managed.

- With regard to commercial property occupancy, what was the definition of occupancy? Members were concerned that some units were rented out but were being used for storage, while there was a waiting list for businesses requiring commercial properties.
  - The Place Manager advised that this issue would be investigated and a response sent to Panel members.

AGREED:

a) That the report of the Executive Director Strategy and Governance be noted;  

b) That Panel members be advised how the Authority’s new sickness management procedure operated;  

c) That upon completion of the work of existing Task Groups, a new Task Group be set up to look at performance of the re-letting of void properties, as follows:
   
   i. The Task Group should be focussed, with the intention of understanding the current problems around the re-letting of void properties, and making recommendations to improve performance;
   
   ii. Membership of the Task Group to consist of Councillors Booth, Brewis and Carter, and the Democratic Services Officer to contact those Panel members not at the meeting to clarify if they wished to be members; and
   
   iii. That the Place Manager, the Housing Landlord Manager and a member of the Performance team attend the Task Group’s first meeting to provide guidance with the scope, and to advise on how data was managed; and

   d) That Panel members be provided with a definition of what was classed as commercial property occupancy, and whether rented properties being used purely for storage were in contravention of the terms of occupancy.
PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -
15 June 2016

(The Change and Performance Manager and the Business Intelligence Officer left the meeting following discussion on the above item).

8. PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL WORK PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Manager Governance, which set out the Work Programme of the Performance Monitoring Panel. The Work Programme consisted of two separate sections, the first setting out the dates of the future Panel meetings along with proposed items for consideration, and the second setting out the Task Groups that had been identified by the Panel.

A number of particular items for discussion were identified on the agenda and each was discussed as follows:

Sir Halley Stewart Playing Field Task Group

The original Task Group had commenced its work in February 2014 at the request of the Council, in response to concerns from the Charity Commission about management of the Sir Halley Stewart Playing Field that sufficient public benefit was being demonstrated. The Task Group had concluded that the Council was compliant with the Commission’s Guidance on public benefit, and had also recommended that the Performance Monitoring Panel be invited to appoint a Task Group on an annual (single meeting) basis for the specific purpose of ensuring that the Council remained compliant with Charity Commission Guidance.

The Chairman confirmed that this Task Group should be set upon conclusion of the work of current task groups that were undertaking work.

Biennial Review of Implemented Planning Decisions

The Chairman advised that the tour in respect of the review would be undertaken in September 2016. Officers would meet with the Chairman to discuss the process and Panel members would be asked to submit suggestions of sites to visit in due course.

The effectiveness of SHDC’s fraud process within the housing stock

The Chairman commented that fraud within the housing stock was a national issue, specifically in relation to individuals living in Council properties that they were not entitled to, subletting and
benefit fraud. He suggested that the Panel may wish to investigate how robust the Authority’s systems were in this area. It was agreed that the Place Manager provide the Panel with information on these issues prior to a decision being made with regard to setting up a Task Group.

Environmental Enforcement

Councillor McLean had raised a number of issues around the enforcement of environmental issues e.g. littering, dog fouling etc. Reference was made to recommendations made by the Enforcement Policy (Street Scene) Task Group in November 2008, specifically ‘to implement the robust enforcement objective recommended in the SHDC Street Scene Strategy that all Community and Neighbourhood Services Officers currently operating in an enforcement role are trained and authorised to be generic enforcement officers and deal with street scene issues in both targeted and one off actions’.

The Environmental Services Manager was in attendance to explain what had happened since the Task Group had made its recommendations. The Panel was advised that since then, the Authority had gone through a restructure and a number of management reviews, the Community and Neighbourhood Services department was no longer in existence and that Environmental Services was now its own department. In addition, there had also been changes in legislation around enforcement.

A part-time enforcement officer was now in post. His main priority was fly-tipping, but he also dealt with issues around fixed penalty notices. There was still a desire by the Authority to continue issuing fixed penalty notices for littering offences. There had been an increase in the number of notices given out since the Authority had employed a dedicated officer to deal with this issue.

The Panel discussed the topic further and the following issues were raised:

• The Chairman commented that due to the changes detailed above, the recommendations from the original Task Group may no longer be appropriate however, the problem still existed and an alternative solution was therefore required.
  o The Place Manager responded that, as part of its work, the Authority’s Transformation Programme would be looking at a review of place services which would include addressing how enforcement in the round was undertaken. The departments of the Environmental Services Manager and the
Environmental Protection Manager had similar issues around enforcement, and common processes to deal with them were required. How the Authority dealt with all regulatory issues as an organisation had to be considered. Proposals could be shared with the Panel towards the end of the year, following consultation with staff.

- With regard to fly-tipping, were cameras and/or signs used to deal with this problem?
  - Cameras were sometimes used however care had to be taken and the legal process involved could sometimes be lengthy. However, signage to discourage fly-tipping in an area had been used, and had produced good results.

- How was dog-fouling dealt with?
  - No fixed penalties had been given for dog-fouling – this was a notoriously difficult area to enforce as officers had no powers to compel individuals to provide details of their identity. However, the Authority’s dog warden was very effective in helping to reduce its incidence. Posters were also put up in areas where the issue was a particular problem.

- What were the issues in dealing with persistent offenders?
  - For all offences, there were repeat offenders. They could sometimes be dealt with however there were issues with lone working, the attitudes of individuals and obtaining evidence of who committed the offence.

- Could officers use body cameras to identify offenders, similar to those used by the police?
  - The Place Manager commented that there could be data protection issues involved.

- Members requested that this issue be looked into.

- Members questioned whether the Authority could be doing more with regard to enforcement.
  - The Place Manager responded that it was doing as much as it could with the resources at its disposal. The focus needed to be on prevention and education first, before enforcement. Coordination of efforts amongst officers would also help.

Following consideration of these issues, it was agreed that the Panel be provided with details of how the Authority could improve
how it dealt with enforcement issues, through a coordinated Authority-wide approach to enforcement and undertaking of preventative educational measures.

AGREED:

a) That both sections of the Panel’s Work Programme, as set out in the report of the Executive Manager Governance, be noted;

b) That a single meeting Task Group to investigate whether the Council remained compliant with Charity Commission Guidance in respect of the Sir Halley Stewart Playing Field be set up upon conclusion of the work of the Swimming Pool and Leisure Centre Contract Task Group;

c) That the Panel be provided with information around the Authority’s processes to prevent fraud within the housing stock, prior to a decision being made as to whether to set up a Task Group to investigate this area; and

d) That the Panel be provided with a report detailing how the Authority would undertake enforcement in the future, through a coordinated Authority-wide approach to enforcement and undertaking of preventative educational measures.

(The meeting ended at 8.35 pm)

(End of minutes)
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Representations in respect of all the matters shown should be sent in writing, at least one week before the date or period the decision is likely to be made, to:

Shelley French, Democratic Services Support Officer, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, Lincolnshire, PE11 2XE
Telephone: 01775 764451 Fax: 01775 711253 Email: demservices@sholland.gov.uk

The Key Decision Plan shows all Key decisions that the Council is likely to make over the next twelve months

The Key Decision Plan is updated on a rolling basis and shows the decisions that will be considered and the date when the decision is expected to be made. In accordance with the Council’s Constitution the DECISIONS detailed within this document, unless otherwise stated, come into force and may then be implemented on the expiry of a 5 working day call-in period from the date of publication of any decision.

**Key decisions are:** “A decision which, in relation to an executive function, has a significant effect on communities in two or more Wards of the Council and / or is likely to result in the Authority incurring expenditure, generating income or making savings in any single financial year above the threshold of £75,000 in respect of revenue expenditure and £180,000 in respect of capital expenditure.”

**Significant decisions are:** 1. A decision made in connection with setting the Council Tax; 2. A decision to approve any matter relating to a Policy or Strategic Plan; 3. Any non-Executive decision which significantly affects the community in two or more wards or electoral divisions. Some of the decisions will be recommendations to full Council, particularly if they impact on the Budget and the Policy Framework (comprising of statutory plans and strategies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORTFOLIO HOLDER / SUBJECT</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF DECISION</th>
<th>CONSULTEES AND METHOD OF CONSULTATION</th>
<th>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>LIKELY DATE OF DECISION AND WHO WILL MAKE DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Agenda Item 11.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORTFOLIO HOLDER / SUBJECT</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF DECISION</th>
<th>CONSULTEES AND METHOD OF CONSULTATION</th>
<th>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>LIKELY DATE OF DECISION AND WHO WILL MAKE DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing</td>
<td>To award a contract.</td>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing. Meetings and discussions.</td>
<td>Housing Landlord Manager</td>
<td>Between 1 Aug 2016 and 31 Aug 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Glazing Replacements Contract</td>
<td>To award a contract</td>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing. Meetings and discussions.</td>
<td>Housing Landlord Manager</td>
<td>Between 1 Aug 2016 and 31 Aug 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing</td>
<td>To award a contract</td>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing. Meetings and discussions.</td>
<td>Housing Landlord Manager</td>
<td>Between 1 Aug 2016 and 31 Aug 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Support Works Contract</td>
<td>To award new sewerage maintenance contract for the housing stock.</td>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing Landlord, Housing Manager. Informal meetings and discussions.</td>
<td>Housing Landlord Manager</td>
<td>Between 1 Sep 2016 and 30 Sep 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing</td>
<td>To award a contract</td>
<td>Portfolio Holder for Housing. Meetings and discussions.</td>
<td>Housing Landlord Manager</td>
<td>Between 1 Sep 2016 and 30 Sep 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTFOLIO HOLDER / SUBJECT</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF DECISION</td>
<td>CONSULTEES AND METHOD OF CONSULTATION</td>
<td>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS</td>
<td>LIKELY DATE OF DECISION AND WHO WILL MAKE DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Council</td>
<td>To receive consultation responses and in light of them determine whether in principle to approve the final scheme and consent to the various matters contained in it.</td>
<td>Members of the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader (The Lord Porter of Spalding CBE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lincolnshire Devolution Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal consultation jointly with all other Lincolnshire authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1 Sep 2016 and 30 Sep 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cabinet Membership

The Lord Porter of Spalding CBE (Leader)
Councillor C N Worth (Deputy Leader of the Council)
Councillor M G Chandler (Deputy Leader)
Councillor A Casson (Portfolio Holder)
Councillor P E Coupland (Portfolio Holder)
Councillor R Gambba-Jones (Portfolio Holder)
Councillor C J Lawton (Portfolio Holder)
Councillor S Slade (Portfolio Holder)
Councillor G J Taylor (Portfolio Holder)

If you have any comments or queries regarding any of the entries in the Key Decision Plan please contact:

Shelley French, Democratic Services Support Officer, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, Lincolnshire, PE11 2XE
Telephone: 01775 764451 Fax: 01775 711253 Email: demservices@sholland.gov.uk
Report of: Mark Stinson – Shared Executive Manager Governance

To: Performance Monitoring Panel – 30 August 2016

(Author: Christine Morgan - Democratic Services Officer)

Subject: Final Report of the Swimming Pool and Leisure Facilities Contract Task Group

Purpose: To present the Task Group’s Final Report to the Panel for consideration.

Recommendation:

To approve the Final Report of the Swimming Pool and Leisure Facilities Contract Task Group, prior to its consideration by the Cabinet.

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction


1.1.2 The scope of the Task Group was:

- To consider performance, in relation to the contract, by the Authority and the contractor, particularly with reference to building maintenance and cleanliness, promotion of the facilities and reinvestment in the facilities
- To look at the Council’s performance in monitoring the leisure facilities; and
- To learn from the outcomes of this scrutiny, to inform future contracts and contract monitoring.

1.1.3 The membership of the Task Group consisted of Councillors J R Astill, T A Carter, G K Dark (Chairman), J L King and A M Newton

1.2 Review Process

1.2.1 The Task Group met on a number of occasions. It first considered the contract documents for the Spalding Castle Complex and the swimming pool, and also user feedback, media and social media report and national guidance in respect of swimming pool temperature. A visit to both sites was also undertaken. The following witnesses were interviewed by the Task Group:

- Emily Holmes – Communities Manager
- Phil Perry – Leisure Facilities Manager
- Mrs R Fox – 1Life Contract Manager

1.2.2 The evidence and information received was analysed collectively to inform the conclusions and recommendations contained with the Final Report, which is attached at Appendix A.
2.0 OPTIONS

2.1 The Panel may:

- Approve the Task Group’s Final Report for consideration by the Cabinet; or
- Request that alterations be made/further consideration be given to the Final Report prior to its presentation to the Cabinet; or
- Do nothing.

3.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 That the Final Report received approval for its consideration by the Cabinet.

4.0 EXPECTED BENEFITS

4.1 If approved by the Performance Monitoring Panel and the Cabinet, the report and its recommendations will be taken on board to improve processes and procedures in the future, as identified.

4.2 If agreed by the Cabinet, the timelines for implementation of the recommendations will be considered and monitored by the Panel.

5.0 IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Constitution and Legal

5.1.1 The service is currently subject to a formal contract which expires in 2018, and that contract contains a number of obligations on both parties.

5.1.2 This is an executive function and any changes to the arrangements will need to be approved by Cabinet unless they are outside of the Policy Framework or Budget, which would require Council approval.

5.2 Contracts

5.2.1 Contract management is an issue that has been identified by the Task Group as an area requiring more robust management. In addition, the Task Group commented that the large number of additions and variations to the Contract between the Council and the leisure provider over the years made it difficult to identify requirements clearly.

5.3 Corporate Priorities

5.3.1 The Work of the Task Group links to the following Corporate Priorities:

- To provide the right services, at the right time and in the right way;
- To develop safer, stronger, healthier and more independent communities while protecting the most vulnerable.

5.4 Health & Wellbeing

5.4.1 Provision of leisure facilities is important for the health and wellbeing of the local community and as mentioned at 5.3.1 above, is linked to more than one of the Council’s Corporate Priorities.
5.5  Reputation

5.5.1 The Task Group was originally set up following criticism and adverse publicity in 2015 around cleanliness and ‘wear and tear’ of the swimming pool in Spalding, specifically.

5.6  Transformation Programme

5.6.1 Future option appraisals in respect of Leisure Facilities provision in South Holland will be detailed in the Council’s Transformation Programme. The Task Group has recommended that the Performance Monitoring Panel be involved in the consultation stage of this process.

6.0  WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

6.1 The swimming pool and leisure centre are located within the Spalding Castle Ward however individuals from many wards within South Holland use the facilities.

7.0  ACRONYMS

7.1 None.

Background papers:- None

Lead Contact Officer
Name and Post: Emily Spicer – Environmental Services Manager
Telephone Number: 01775 764884
Email: emily.spicer@sholland.gov.uk

Key Decision: No

Exempt Decision: No

This report refers to a Discretionary Service

Appendices attached to this report:

Appendix A Final Report of the Swimming Pool and Leisure Facilities Contract Task Group
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1. Introduction

1.1 The Spalding swimming pool and sports complex are extremely well utilised facilities. The swimming pool which is designed for competitive swimming and general fitness (not leisure) attracts 165,083 customers every year whilst the sports complex 150,932 per year (based on 2015/16 total). However, following criticism and adverse publicity in 2015 around the cleanliness and ‘wear and tear’ of the Spalding swimming pool specifically, the Performance Monitoring Panel questioned the performance of the leisure facility’s contract and the Authority’s management of the contract.

1.2 The Performance Monitoring Panel agreed that this criticism, directed at the Council, should not have been necessary with programmed maintenance or if issues at the facilities were dealt with when reported.

1.3 Members of the Council agreed that there needed to be an understanding of how the current position had been arrived at, and that a Task Group would provide the appropriate means to do so.

1.4 In order to understand the situation, the performance of the current leisure facilities contract at the Spalding swimming pool and sports complex would need to be evaluated alongside the Authority’s management of that contract.

1.5 The Performance Monitoring Panel agreed that the Task Group should take a positive role, to discover where mistakes, if any, had been made, and how this understanding could bring opportunities for the future management of the contract and beyond.

2. Scope of the Review

2.1 The scope and therefore terms of reference were defined as:

- To consider performance, in relation to the contract, by the Authority and the contractor, particularly with reference to building maintenance and cleanliness, promotion of the facilities and reinvestment in the facilities;
- To look at the Council’s performance in monitoring the leisure facilities; and
- To learn from the outcomes of this scrutiny, to inform future contracts and contract monitoring.

3. Membership of Task Group

3.1 The Task Group comprised Councillors JR Astill, TA Carter, GK Dark (Chairman), JL King and AM Newton. The Lead Officer was Emily Spicer and the Task Group was supported by Christine Morgan.
4. **Background to Review**

4.1 The review was conducted as a result of criticism received within local media and social media of the Spalding swimming pool facilities (please see section 1 of this report). The review was also seen as an opportunity to learn from current issues so that they may be of assistance in future leisure and/or contract provision.

5. **Method of Review**

5.1 The Task Group met on a number of occasions to consider the contract documents in respect to the Spalding Castle Complex and swimming pool provision, user feedback, media and social media reports, and national guidance in respect to swimming pool temperature. Officer witnesses were called – Phil Perry (Leisure Facilities Manager) and Emily Holmes (Communities Manager). External witnesses were also called – Mrs R Fox (1 Life Contract Manager). A site visit was also undertaken.

6. **Summary of Findings**

6.1 The Task Group is content that the Spalding leisure facilities (both the swimming pool and complex) provide a good standard of activities for residents of South Holland to use. The swim school in particular is extremely popular and has recently received an award for high standards of teaching. It is important therefore to note that in relation to the high usage of the facility, the number of complaints received is not high.

6.2 Whilst a number of complaints reported within local media cited the temperature of the swimming pool water being ‘too cold’, research by the Task Group has concluded that temperatures are compliant for competitive swimming, diving, fitness swimming and training pools. It is clear that moving to higher temperatures than the code of practice recommends would cause a number of problems including competitive swimmers finding them too uncomfortable and an increase in micro-organisms.

6.3 It was found that improvements were needed to the general cleanliness of the changing room areas and to provide an established proactive cleansing regime that could be clearly monitored and prove contract compliance.

6.4 Considerable improvements were required to the customer feedback / complaints process in order to meet the requirements set out in the contract documentation. Through their own experiences, members of the Task Group found that in some cases, complaints were taking up to 6 months to be addressed. At the very least, essential minor repairs were not being addressed in a timely fashion. It was evident that there was no consistent approach to the recording of complaints made by users of the facilities.
6.5 Due to the vast number of additions and variations to the Leisure Facilities contract it seemed that there was no clear direction of travel. Specifically, actions to be taken in respect to the cleaning regimes and cleanliness of the facilities were overly complicated and too broad. The cleaning regimes of any future contracts need to be addressed with real clarity.

6.6 A vast improvement of the fixtures and fittings within the facilities is needed with consideration of all users’ needs. For example, ladies’ toilet facilities within the changing room areas need to be addressed, flooring and hand washing facilities that children are encouraged to use need to be available, disabled access to be reconsidered, toilet facilities available for spectators.

6.7 In order to ensure contract compliance, recorded monitoring of the whole facility should be undertaken on a weekly basis.

6.8 Improvements and/or changes need to be made to the blue over shoes policy. The Task Group felt that the reasons why blue overshoes need to be used was not clearly promoted, nor any type of encouragement for users to wear them. In addition, children and wheels on push chairs continue to go through to the changing rooms without any type of cover. A publicity campaign would assist in promoting the blue overshoe message.

6.9 The Task Group found there to be no clear contract management system in place. The Group felt that the contract requirements were clear, but these were not followed through as positively as they need to be.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 The Task Group reached the following conclusions:

(a) That the facilities provide an extensive range of leisure activities.

(b) That the current cleansing routines at the swimming pool are based on a reactive model which is not fit for purpose and therefore needs to be changed to a more proactive regime.

(c) It is essential that good contract management is undertaken by the Council / Contract Manager, and when required, the appropriate procedures are followed when contract compliance has lacked or lapsed.

(d) That there is a need for improved contract management of the Leisure Facilities contract.

(e) That the facilities, in particular the changing rooms within the swimming pool, appear to be in need of repair and maintenance.

(f) That the ‘blue overshoe’ policy does not work in its present format.
7.2 The Task Group makes the following recommendations:

a) That a full time cleaner is considered by 1Life as part of their annual budget allocations. It is evident that additional hours are required for the proactive cleaning of the swimming pool facility, in particular the changing room areas, in order to adhere to the requirements of the contract.

b) That contract management of the site improves with a formally recorded daily and weekly monitoring regime and that should standards fall short of the requirements within the contract, the contract warning system is to be followed through and be robustly pursued by the contract manager.

c) That staff within the facilities record and notify management of any repairs required on a daily basis and that these are dealt with in a timely manner. In addition, all outstanding repairs and maintenance should be undertaken promptly to improve standards at the leisure facilities.

d) That the blue overshoe policy is reviewed immediately and a new, more effective policy is put in place within 3 months.

e) That these recommendations are allocated to an identified officer to ensure they are actioned and that an update is received by the Performance Monitoring Panel on actions against these at 7 February 2017 meeting.

f) That the Performance Monitoring Panel is involved in the consultation stage of any future option appraisals in respect to Leisure Facilities provision in South Holland as detailed in the Transformation Programme.

8. Financial Implications of Recommendations

8.1 The above recommendations should be included within current contract income and expenditure and will therefore provide no financial implications to South Holland District Council at this time.

9. Main Sources of Information and individuals contacted during the Review

9.1 The main sources of information were through those witnesses referred to in paragraph 5.
SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report of: Shared Executive Manager, Governance – Mark Stinson
To: Performance Monitoring Panel – 30 August 2016
(Author: Christine Morgan – Democratic Services Officer
Subject: Performance Monitoring Panel Work Programme
Purpose: To set out the Work Programme of the Performance Monitoring Panel

Recommendation:
That the Panel gives consideration to the report and identifies any issues for discussion.

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 This report records the issues for consideration that have been identified by the Panel for inclusion on its Work Programme.

1.2 Issues

1.2.1 Appendix A sets out the dates of future Panel meetings along with proposed items for consideration. These items were either originally suggested by councillors or are being referred to the Panel from officers or the Cabinet. This appendix will be updated as new items are identified.

1.2.2 Appendix B sets out the task groups that have been identified by the Panel. The table shows:

- The name of the task group
- What it wants to achieve
- Key dates
- Membership of the task group
- When the task group will be reporting back to the Panel

1.2.3 It is hoped that in presenting the information in this way, and by having the report as a standing item on the agenda, it will record the issues identified by the Panel and provide the opportunity for councillors to monitor the progress of its Work Programme.

2.0 OPTIONS

2.1 To note and consider the current status of the Work Programme.

2.2 To do nothing.

3.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 To allow councillors to feed into the Panel’s calendar of Work Programme items and the Work Programme on a regular basis, to ensure that they stay relevant and up to date.
4.0 **EXPECTED BENEFITS**

4.1 The calendar of Work Programme items and the Work Programme will provide councillors with up to date and relevant information. Timelines for various calendar items and proposed task groups within the Work Programme are included within the appendices.

5.0 **IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 **Carbon Footprint / Environmental Issues**

5.1.1 There are no direct carbon footprint and environmental issue implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their carbon footprint and environmental issue implications will be assessed.

5.2 **Constitution & Legal**

5.2.1 There are no direct constitution and legal implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their constitution and legal implications will be assessed.

5.3 **Contracts**

5.3.1 There are no direct contract implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their contract implications will be assessed.

5.4 **Corporate Priorities**

5.4.1 In identifying issues for inclusion on the Work Programme, councillors consider the suitability of the subject, taking into account such considerations as whether the issue is strategic and significant and whether it is likely to lead to effective outcomes. One of the indicators against which each potential task group is scored identifies how strongly the topic links to the Council’s key aims and priorities.

5.5 **Crime and Disorder**

5.5.1 There are no direct crime and disorder implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their crime and disorder implications will be assessed.

5.6 **Equality and Diversity / Human Rights**

5.6.1 There are no direct equality and diversity and human rights implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their equality and diversity and human rights implications will be assessed.

5.7 **Financial**

5.7.1 There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their financial implications will be assessed.

5.8 **Health and Wellbeing**

5.8.1 There are no direct health and wellbeing implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their health and wellbeing implications will be assessed.
5.9 Reputation

5.9.1 There are no direct reputational implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, any reputational implications for the Authority will be assessed.

5.10 Risk Management

5.10.1 There are no direct risk management implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their risk management implications will be assessed.

5.11 Safeguarding

5.11.1 There are no direct safeguarding implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their safeguarding implications will be assessed.

5.12 Staffing

5.12.1 There are no direct staffing implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their staffing implications will be assessed.

5.13 Stakeholders / Consultation / Timescales

5.13.1 There are no direct stakeholder/consultation/timescale implications associated with this report. As individual items are progressed through the work programme, their stakeholder/consultation/timescale implications will be assessed.

6.0 WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED

6.1 When a task group is considered for inclusion on the Panel’s Work Programme, it is assessed against criteria covering ‘Importance’, ‘Impact’ and ‘Value for Money’. The ‘Impact’ and ‘Value for Money’ score indicators consider how strongly the issue will affect a ward(s), customer group(s) or service area(s). Only issues scoring highly will be included on the Work Programme.

7.0 ACRONYMS

7.1 None.

Background papers:- None

Lead Contact Officer
Name and Post: Christine Morgan
Telephone Number: 01775 764454
Email: cmorgan@sholland.gov.uk

Key Decision: No
Exempt Decision: No

This report refers to a Mandatory Service
Appendices attached to this report:

Appendix A  Work Programme Calendar
Appendix B  Task Group Work Programme 2016/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Agenda items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 August 2016 | • Crime and Disorder – Update report on community safety and how it is being delivered through the various tiers of Groups and Panels (including the East Lincs CSP and newly formed Lincolnshire CSP) – Update to be provided every six months by the Portfolio Holder for Community Development  
• Inspector Jo Reeves of Lincolnshire Police to attend to answer members’ questions regarding policing matters  
• Update providing evidence of CCTV’s usefulness in prosecuting crime (to be provided to this meeting and regularly thereafter)  
• Update relating to progress on issues encountered relating to the new CCTV system (a decision on whether to resurrect the CCTV Task Group to be made upon receipt of this information)  
• Performance Report – Quarter 1, 2016-17  
• Swimming Pool and Leisure Centre Contract Task Group – Final Report |
| 25 October 2016 Special joint meeting of PMP and PDP | • Transformation Programme |
| 8 November 2016 | • Performance Report – Quarter 2, 2016-17  
• Update report on the current situation regarding issues around contracts, in particular in relation to the on-line contracts register (updates provided 16 September 2015 and 5 April 2016). The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager and the Portfolio Holder for Legal, Performance and Democratic Services to attend.  
• Opportunities for bringing externalised contracts in house – the Portfolio Holder for Legal, Performance and Democratic Services and the Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager to attend to discuss.  
• Discussion regarding drainage in the South Holland area – representatives from a local board and national strategic partnership to attend.  
• Report detailing how the Authority would undertake enforcement in the future, through a coordinated Authority-wide approach to enforcement and undertaking of preventative educational measures (requested at PMP 15/6/16) – Emily Spicer |
| 24 January 2017 Special joint meeting of PMP and PDP | • Transformation Programme |
For consideration later in the year

- Note: Following consideration of the Key Decision Plan, PMP and PDP have requested that a special Joint Meeting will be held to discuss the setting up of the South Holland Building Consultancy prior to it being considered by Cabinet (date to be confirmed).

***************

To be considered annually:

The Sir Halley Stewart Playing Field Task Group presented its Final Report to Council on 21 January 2015. Its first recommendation was:

That the Council (i) advises the Charity Commission that the Task Group has considered the Commission’s Guidance on public benefit and is satisfied that the Council is compliant; (ii) provides a copy of this report to the Commission in order to outline the actions proposed by the Council; and (iii) invites the Performance Monitoring Panel to appoint a Task Group on an annual (single meeting) basis for the specific purpose of ensuring that the Council remains compliant with Charity Commission Guidance.

Membership of Task Group to be agreed and meet on an annual basis to consider the issue.
## PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL – WORK PROGRAMME 2016/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Task Group</th>
<th>What the Task Group wants to achieve</th>
<th>Date added to Work Programme</th>
<th>Date Work Commenced</th>
<th>Membership of Task Group</th>
<th>Proposed date of report to Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Swimming Pool and Leisure Centre Contract Task Group            | To review the Spalding swimming pool and leisure centre, specifically:  
  - To consider performance, in relation to the contract, by the Authority and the contractor, particularly with reference to building maintenance and cleanliness, promotion of the facilities and reinvestment in the facilities;  
  - To look at the Council’s performance in monitoring the leisure facilities; and  
  - To learn from the outcomes of this scrutiny, to inform future contracts and contract monitoring.  | 1 December 2015             | 21 January 2016      | J R Astill  
  T A Carter  
  G K Dark (Chairman)  
  J L King  
  A M Newton                                                                 | 30 August 2016                                                           |
| Performance of the re-letting of voids Task Group               | Scope to be agreed at first meeting  
  Scope to be focussed, with the intention of understanding the current problems around the re-letting of void properties, and making recommendations to improve performance.  
  Task Group to commence upon completion of the Swimming Pool and Leisure Centre Contract Task Group | 15 June 2016                |                     | GR Aley  
  MD Booth  
  CJTH Brewis  
  TA Carter                                                                 |                                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Task Group</th>
<th>What the Task Group wants to achieve</th>
<th>Date added to Work Programme</th>
<th>Date Work Commenced</th>
<th>Membership of Task Group</th>
<th>Proposed date of report to Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Halley Stewart Playing Field Task Group</td>
<td>Recommendation of the original Task Group to appoint a Task Group on an annual (single meeting) basis for the specific purpose of ensuring that the Council remained compliant with Charity Commission Guidance.</td>
<td>15 June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>GR Aley, JR Astill, GK Dark, PC Foyster, AM Newton</td>
<td>Interim report to PMP 29 January 2013 Interim report to Cabinet 19 February 2013. Tracking of recommendations to PMP 26 March 2013 Updates to PMP: 8 April 2014, 16 September 2014, 25 November 2014, 16 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of CCTV Task Group</td>
<td>Purpose of Review – To establish the current situation with regard to CCTV and make recommendations to Cabinet on the way forward. Terms of Reference – To examine the effectiveness of the SHDC CCTV service and prospects for future provision. Panel received update on 8 April 2014 from the Portfolio Holder for Localism and Big Society on the position regarding CCTV. Performance information will be available on the new system in the future, once it becomes operational. <strong>The Task Group will remain in operation to scrutinise performance and will start to do this once the information becomes available.</strong></td>
<td>6 November 2012</td>
<td>21 November 2012</td>
<td>B Alcock, M Howard, R M Rudkin, D J Wilkinson (Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Facilities Task Group</td>
<td>To make recommendations, regarding the present and future leisure provision in South Holland.</td>
<td>30 May 2012</td>
<td>21 January 2014</td>
<td>G R Aley (Chairman), D Ashby</td>
<td>Interim report presented to joint PMP/PDP – 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Task Group</td>
<td>What the Task Group wants to achieve</td>
<td>Date added to Work Programme</td>
<td>Date Work Commenced</td>
<td>Membership of Task Group</td>
<td>Proposed date of report to Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Task Group incorporating members of the Performance Monitoring and Policy Development Panels.</td>
<td>1. By establishing what leisure provision the District Council presently provides, examining costs, resident satisfaction and competitiveness in order to identify ways of increasing income or reducing expenditure; 2. To understand what the District Council wishes to provide and what the public and major employers need; 3. To examine the options for future provision either to be supplied by the Council, the private sector or shared management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Casson, G K Dark, R Perkins, S Slade, E Sneath, S Wilkinson</td>
<td>August 2014 To Cabinet 7 October 2014 Tracking of recommendations to PMP 25 November 2014 Update on leisure options to PMP 3 March 2015 (PDP members to attend PMP meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed at PMP 25 November 2014 – A date for completion of the Business Plan looking at Leisure Services provision, being drawn together by the Community Development and Health Manager, be confirmed by the Assistant Director Community, and that a joint meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel, for consideration of the document, be arranged. Following consideration of the update to PMP on 3 March 2015 (PDP members were invited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead Officer: Phil Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership to be considered following District Council Election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Task Group</td>
<td>What the Task Group wants to achieve</td>
<td>Date added to Work Programme</td>
<td>Date Work Commenced</td>
<td>Membership of Task Group</td>
<td>Proposed date of report to Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Task Group</td>
<td>(to attend), it was agreed that leisure provision must be a priority for the Council, and must be considered as a priority by the next administration following the District Council election.</td>
<td>31 May 2011</td>
<td>31 May 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To review the development of sporting activities across the district (in light of the possibility of new leisure provision in the future).</td>
<td><strong>June/September 2014??</strong> – Leisure Task Group to report to PMP. If this item falls within the remit of the Task Group, remove this from the Work Programme.</td>
<td>31 May 2011</td>
<td>31 May 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny of the Authority’s Emergency Plan</td>
<td>To scrutinise the robustness of the Emergency Plan.</td>
<td>8 April 2014</td>
<td>8 April 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Communications Strategy</td>
<td>On 31 May 2012, the Panel had expressed its interest in undertaking a piece of work on Communications, in particular communication and consultation by the County Council with the District and Parish Councils and</td>
<td>31 May 2012</td>
<td>31 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Task Group</td>
<td>What the Task Group wants to achieve</td>
<td>Date added to Work Programme</td>
<td>Date Work Commenced</td>
<td>Membership of Task Group</td>
<td>Proposed date of report to Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication by the District Council with Members. The Joint Communications Team Leader attended a meeting on 10 July 2012. The Assistant Director-Democratic Services provided a briefing on 15 October 2013, advised that there was a timeline for the Communications service review, a report would be available within the next few months, and a strategy would follow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of management companies set up to undertake maintenance on residential estates throughout the district past, present and for the future.</td>
<td>Scope to be confirmed.</td>
<td>25 November 2014</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The efficiency and effectiveness of the service given to the authority by Lincolnshire Legal Services.</td>
<td>Scope to be confirmed.</td>
<td>25 November 2014</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>