

Minutes of a meeting of the **PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL** held in Meeting Room 1, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Wednesday, 11 September 2019 at 6.30 pm.

PRESENT

B Alcock (Chairman)
M D Booth (Vice-Chairman)

J R Astill
A C Beal
A C Cronin
R Grocock

J L King
J D McLean
N H Pepper
P A Redgate

G P Scalese
A C Tennant
S C Walsh
D J Wilkinson

In Attendance: The Executive Manager Growth, the Place Manager, the Environmental Services Manager, the Communities Manager, the Inward Investment Manager, the Senior Business Intelligence Officer, the Democratic Services Officer and the Portfolio Holder Place.

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors C J T H Brewis

14 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.

There were none.

15 CRIME AND DISORDER

At the last meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel, a Crime and Disorder update had been received where a number of issues had been raised. The Panel had requested that the Police Inspector and the Member of Parliament be requested to attend the meeting. Sir John Hayes, MP was not able to attend however, Inspector Gareth Boxall was in attendance, and the Chairman welcomed him to the meeting.

The Panel raised a number of issues, and Inspector Boxall responded, as detailed below:

- What was the difference between a Public Order Disturbance and Anti Social Behaviour?
 - Inspector Boxall responded that a Public Order Disturbance was an offence against the Public Order Act, which could involve anything from disorderly conduct through to a riot. Anti Social Behaviour was a far wider area and could encompass many things. There were differing

Action By

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

methods in which the two could be dealt with. Criminal offences could be dealt with through the court, and the Anti Social Behaviour Act gave powers to deal with Anti Social Behaviour (this replaced the previous Anti Social Behaviour Orders), and dealt with behaviour that fell below a public order disturbance but which caused offence.

- Several parish councils had expressed dissatisfaction with support provided from the Police. Did the Inspector feel this was because the Lincolnshire force was under funded?
 - Inspector Boxall commented that the Lincolnshire police force was underfunded, and that the Chief Constable was on record as saying that it was poorly funded. The area did not have the same problems as urban areas however, there were still particular problems to be faced in rural areas. All forces now faced problems of crime developing in different ways, and emerging crime types such as cyber crime and internet fraud, whereas in the past, crime followed a more traditional route.
- A constant complaint from the public was that they did not see many police officer on the beat – was this because they were being taken off the beat to deal with more specialist crime?
 - Inspector Boxall stated that there were many reasons for there being less police on the beat, but that specialisms in particular areas was only one reason for this. Overall, police officers having specialisms in a particular area was a good way of dealing with crime.
- The Lincolnshire Police force had been under funded for a long time, and the situation was not improving. It should at least have the same level of funding as other forces.
 - Inspector Boxall replied that there would never be enough money as policing covered so many aspects – as well as carrying out investigations, preventative work also needed to be undertaken. However, the Panel was advised that the Chief Constable was pushing for a fairer funding formula, and that the extra police recently promised by the government would help. The Chief Constable had spoken about preparing for around 350-400 over the next few years, and the Inspector would be making representations to ensure that this area received a fair proportion of these officers. The 350-400 would include replacing officers who left over

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

that period of time. Officers left for a variety of reasons and these would have to be covered, but the recruitment would see a significant uplift in the total number of officers.

- The Panel commented that the funding position would not be changing in the short term, and that society was changing in its regard to authority. How would the Police be able to keep order in the longer term?
 - In answering, Inspector Boxall provided some context to his response, stating that South Holland was a safe place to live, it did not have the same difficulties as inner cities, and generally the public respected authority. Prison terms for a crime committed was important however, efforts also needed to be made to ensure people did not return to crime.
- Members responded that these points were relevant however, problems usually associated with urban areas, for example, drug related crime, were now affecting rural areas. Crime was measured, and the types of crime affecting the area did not make residents feel particularly safe.
 - Inspector Boxall commented that he had some concerns around publishing figures for violent crime, as the full story could not be seen from the statistics alone. Violent crime may have increased however, it had not doubled – such a large increase was due to the change in the way crime was recorded. It was impossible to draw any firm conclusions as a result of these changes. Violent crime could now be categorised as either with or without sustaining injury and it was therefore difficult to see if violent crime had increased. In addition, the majority of violent crimes occurred in the home, where it was difficult to prevent (i.e this was not a problem that could be solved by putting more police on the streets). The Police were undertaking work to prevent domestic abuse however, it was difficult to prevent violence in the home. Any increases that were now seen were due to more reporting of abuse.
- How many additional police were being recruited, and how many of these would be allocated to South Holland?
 - Inspector Boxall advised that exact numbers had not yet been finalised however, figures indicated by the press were around 350 over the next 2-3 years.
- Member asked if the figure would be for additional officers and

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

stated that the public would expect it to be in addition to the normal complement of officers.

- Inspector Boxall responded that it was likely that the number of officers to be replaced, that left each year, would be included within the figure for additional recruits.
- Funding was an important issue– the public believed that nothing was being done to improve the situation however, if incidents were not reported, funding would not be increased.
 - Inspector Boxall agreed that it was important that people reported crime, so that criminals could be caught, or if they weren't at least a picture could be built up of what was happening. Reporting was required in order to get funding resources for the area, and to help the police in allocating resources appropriately.
- With regard to specialisms in detecting high-tech crimes, what percentage of staff were non-warranted professionals?
 - Inspector Boxall advised that when there had been funding cuts in the past, there had been some forward planning and where police officers were in post, their warranted jobs had been used. Some were in office jobs because that was where they were needed, but there were some civilian staff aswell. Expertise could be recruited where needed.
- Members commented that all new recruits were meant to have a degree and they were aware but the Chief Constable of Lincolnshire did not agree with this.
 - Inspector Boxall confirmed that having a degree, or the undertaking to complete one, was the main way into the Police force. The Chief Constable was not in agreement with this requirement, and the outcome of this view remained to be seen.
- Over the years, a lot of funding had gone into CCTV – had it been effective in reducing crime or did it simply move crime to areas where there was no CCTV? In addition, were there adequate resources to act on incidents captured by CCTV?
 - It was difficult to say whether crime had reduced as a result of CCTV as there could be not measure of what was not there. The Inspector felt that it was effective, and there was no evidence to say that crime had moved to different areas. There were two main benefits from CCTV – firstly, operators could advise on crime as it happened, and incidents for

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

officers to attend could be prioritised; and secondly, CCTV could be used after the event to either capture what had happened, or view footage of who had undertaken a crime.

- When South Holland District Council and the Parish Councils had originally decided to fund CCTV, one of the requests was that statistical evidence be fed back to justify the spend. There had been no consistent feedback of this information since it had been installed and some Parish Councils now felt that without it, they may consider withdrawing funding.
 - The Inspector commented that CCTV was a tool to assist in the detection of crime, and would be against taking it out of any area. Providing evidence to justify spend was very difficult as the Police in Spalding did not keep their own records, and it was difficult to show statistically that it had made a difference.
- Members were disappointed with this response. CCTV had been installed twice with the requirement that some statistical information be fed back to show its worth.
- Many District Councillors regularly attended Parish Councils meetings, and the level of support by the Police in attendance and providing information to Parish Councils has decreased to a very large extent. Parish Councils required feedback.
 - The Inspector commented that with reduced resources, it was important to make the best use of staff time and it was not always right that, for example, a PCSO attend meetings when some issues were beyond their control. Most forces did not send officers to Parish Council meetings however, non attendance did not mean that the relationship with Parish Councils should be abandoned – it needed to continue with information being shared in other ways such as email/text/social media etc. In addition, more information was now available of Parish Councils to view on the internet.
- Members responded that some work had to be undertaken with regard to liaison between the Police and Parish Councils. Members that were already involved with Parish Councils were not happy with the current situation. Most were anxious to have a close working relationship with the Police and it would be helpful to find a way to improve engagement.
 - The Inspector replied that he didn't disagree with these comments. Consideration was being given to how neighbourhood policing could be reformed, and how communities and Parish Councils were

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

engaged with.

- Members suggested that an annual meeting could be held, involving the Police, the PCC and Parish Councils – face to face contact worked better. It was also suggested that it would be better to hold regular meetings, with regular contact between teams and parishes.
- Many initiatives were being undertaken, but unless people followed the Police on social media, it was not well publicised. How could Councillors support the Police in publicising their initiatives?
 - The Inspector commented that the Police relied on individuals, such as Councillors, following them on social media. However, not everyone used social media and it was vital to find a way to get the message out in different ways. Consistent messaging was vital, but not just on social media. Consideration was being given to producing a newsletter to be sent to anybody in the local area, and a less frequent for District Councillors and partners, which would provide more detail, statistics and context.
- The Chairman asked if the Police's Facebook page could be linked to Crowland Chatter?
 - The Inspector advised that it could not be linked however, Crowland Chatter could 'follow' the Police and share posts.
- The public obtained much of its information and dis-information from social media. It was important that facts were made readily available to the public.
 - Inspector Boxall responded that the Police did what they could to dispel myths however, there was a resource implication to this. The Police also needed to be careful of the level of information they released where there was an ongoing investigation – for this reason, it was not always possible to correct rumours when they arose.
- Councillor King commented on the continued vandalism problems in her ward. The public reported problems to Parish Councillors who then reported incidents to the Police. There was a perception that not enough was being done, that there was insufficient feedback and that there should be more of a Police presence.
 - The Inspector replied that there were processes for assessing how the Police could best deal with reported crime in light of low staffing numbers.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

Officers would attend unless a higher priority incident arose. If the member was not happy with the service that was being received regarding these incidents, she should contact him in order to pursue this.

- With regard to the additional community payback funding, whose responsibility was it to pay for the supervision of offenders?
 - The Inspector commented that community payback was an effective way of punishing and rehabilitating people. He commented that the community payback scheme fell under the remit of the probation service, but could not confirm who was responsible for paying for the supervision of offenders.
- Members requested that this information be ascertained and fed back to the Panel.
- Members questioned how reliable reported crime figures were. If they were unreliable, how could the Police have any indication of emerging or escalating crime in the area? If the data was not manageable, the public may have little confidence in report crime.
 - The Inspector agreed that interpreting crime statistics was very difficult, due to changes over the years to how crimes were recorded and how forces implemented rules. He advised however that data could be used in many ways, by allowing the Police to draw from detail of crime recorded, and how to resource in appropriate areas. There was always a point in reporting and recording crime, and he hoped that crime reporting settled down in order that comparisons could be made.
- The Chairman thanked Inspector Boxall for attending the meeting and hoped that it had been helpful for him and for Panel members. The Performance Monitoring Panel received regular reports on crime and disorder, they would consider the information provided by the Inspector and advise if they needed to speak to him any further. He hoped that there would be an improvement in liaison with the Police and Parish Councils. He also asked that the suggestion to hold annual meetings involving the Police, the PCC and Parish Councils, and regular meetings between teams and parishes be given consideration.

DB, EH,
CM

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

16 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel held on 18 June 2019.

AGREED:

That the minutes be signed as a correct record.

17 QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 6

There were none.

18 TRACKING OF RECOMMENDATIONS

There were none.

19 ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL.

There were none.

20 KEY DECISION PLAN

Consideration was given to the Key Decision Plan issued on 9 August 2019.

Members commented that some items on the Planner showed a 'not before' date for the decision to be made. It was clarified that this was to ensure that a decision was not made before it had been advertised on the planner for the required amount of time. Members requested that in future, the planner show an anticipated date that each decision would be made.

AGREED:

That the Key Decision Plan issues on 9 August 2019 be noted.

21 PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW REPORT - QUARTER 1 2019/20

Consideration was given to the report of the Portfolio Holder for Governance and Customer which provided an update on how the Council was performing for the period.

Appended to the report was a revised Performance Overview report. The report had been revised to provide better detail and more context on how the Council was performing, and how performance and service delivery linked into the Council's key

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

corporate priorities. The re-design of the report was also driven by the Council's business intelligence agenda, to ensure that the data and information held was used to drive service delivery and key decisions. To tie in with this strategy, the report also included supporting intelligence and data such as comparisons against other similar councils, where possible, as well as the addition of forecasted performance, which was informed by trend and business intelligence analysis.

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

- It was good to see an overall improvement, which made up the vast majority of indicators. However, performance with regard to fly tipping was disappointing, and many members were very unhappy about this. Where an incident could not be cleared within the required timeframe, what action was being taken, and were the current providers of the service satisfactory?
 - Officers responded that not all issues were due to staff availability, and that sometimes problems arose due to difficulties in identifying location. The current service was being provided at a reduced cost, and consideration was being given to the cost of bringing fly tipping collections in house. The Street Scene and Pride teams were looking at picking up issues that the current provider could not deal with.
- Members responded that the website had improved, and that hopefully this should show improvements, and that the next report would reflect this.
- Members commented that some of the 'same period last year' data did not match up to the visual graphs, and it was agreed that officers would correct this information. CG
- Section 3.3 of the covering report provided reasons for poor performance, and provided details on seasonal trends around bringing properties back into use. However, information provided further on was contradictory. CG
 - Officers agreed that the information provided was contradictory, and that more information on seasonal trends was required.
- Members also stated that statistics around empty properties also appeared to be contradictory.
 - Officers responded that empty homes was an annual national indicator and needed to be recognised within the data. The Policy Development Panel was already considering issues around empty homes.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

- Members raised the issue of complaints, and how this information was used? If the problem was a service issue, this was a complaint. It was therefore necessary to differentiate between service issues and formal complaints, and supporting information was therefore required. CG
 - Officers responded that service issues were raised individually by each area, that he would find out the information required and formulate it as a performance issue.

- The report stated that there had been two complaints where a response had not been provided within the required 15 days – had an extension period been agreed? CG
Officers responded that the complainant had been advised to an extended period in order that a suitable response be received.
 - Members replied that if this was the case, the reporting needed to be dealt with in a different way to reflect the reasons behind the delay, rather than reporting that the deadline had not been met.

- Members asked whether it was possible to provide data at a ward level? CG
 - Officers responded that not all data could be provided at ward level, but that work could be undertaken to see what information could be provided in this way.

- Members were generally very complimentary of the revised Performance report, and felt that the layout was clear and easy to understand, although consideration needed to be given to the use of certain colours used and ease of reading. CG

AGREED:

That the report be noted.

22 PUBLIC TOILET TASK AND FINISH GROUP UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Portfolio Holder for Place and the Executive Director Place which provided an update on the progress of the public toilet task and finish group recommendations reported in January 2019.

Since the recommendations of the Task Group were agreed by the Cabinet in February 2019, there had been a number of improvements made to the process of reporting issues and

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

repairs, increased and improved cleaning schedules, and research into how best to continue to provide good quality public toilets to the residents of, and visitors to, South Holland.

In order to fully consider the best options for the future provision of the toilets, a consultation was undertaken on what should be available, and the current usage of the toilets. Despite improved cleaning of the facilities, respondents still felt that cleanliness was lacking, and that the toilets attracted anti-social behaviour. As a result of this feedback, a number of options were detailed within the report as potential ways of improving toilet provision, with option 2 (to re-configure the current buildings) being the recommended option.

Members considered the report, and the following issues were raised:

- Councillor McLean commented that as an Executive Support member, he had had involvement with this project and was pleased with the information produced within the report.
- The facilities in Crowland were not mentioned within the report – was there an intention to improve these?
 - Officers responded that the facilities in Spalding and Holbeach would be addressed first as there was possible funding available for those towns. The facilities in Crowland would be looked at as part of the 5 year capital programme, where all facilities would be considered as part of the priority of the stock condition surveys.
- The report stated that the anticipated completion date for the programme was 2025 – members hoped that improvements could be undertaken within a shorter timeframe and pointed out that this would then reduce the time for which the current issues, such as vandalism, would have to be dealt with.
 - Officers replied that the date of 2025 had been a recommendation from the Task Group. There was a 5 year programme of work to understand however, after structural reviews had been undertaken, a programme of work could then be prioritised. As long as money continued to be available from the Pride initiative, deep cleans could continue, but the officer was in agreement that a shorter time frame for undertaking the improvements suggested would help reduce the need for this.
- Members responded that public toilet provision was a reputational issue, and that it was important to find funding to

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

assist with improvements.

AGREED:

- a) That the contents of the report be noted;
- b) That the report be presented to Cabinet to recommend the option to re-configure the toilets and provision of toilets in South Holland; and
- c) That following consideration of the report by the Cabinet, an update be provided to the next meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel.

CP

CP

23 SWIMMING POOL & LEISURE FACILITIES TASK GROUP UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Place, which provided members with an update on the Swimming Pool and Leisure Facilities Task Group, to ensure that positive trends were continuing.

The Panel had received a six-monthly update at its last meeting, and had requested a further report to this meeting to ensure that the improved trends had continued, following the change in contract provider.

The report provided information on the continued improvement in trends - improved customer feedback; increase in usage of 3%; continuous month on month figures at the Castle Swimming Pool; the sauna had been renovated and was now open again; and there had been no closures of the swimming pool due to staff availability. Officers were continuing to monitor the contract, and an audit of leisure contract management was due to be undertaken.

Members considered the information, and the following issues were raised:

- Members commented that the level of feedback still seemed very low when compared with the number of users. In addition, when using the facility, there had been no clear evidence of comment card, or that verbal feedback was noted.
 - Officers advised that they would feed this information back to the contractor
- The report provided no feedback on the indoor bowls club.
 - Officers advised that information on all sites would

EH

EH, RR

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

be provided within the next update.

- Members stated that it was important that regular inspection visits were undertaken, and that the contractor was not aware of these dates beforehand. Could the Panel be provided with a list of dates in that past that inspections had taken place, to ensure that there was no pattern to the visits, and that visits were taking place.
 - Officers confirmed that inspection were taking and place, and that they were staggered. The information requested would be provided as part of the next update.

EH, RR

- Could newer technology (tablet/iPad) be used to provide feedback? Feedback forms could be custom built to gain useful data to inform the way ahead.
 - Officers responded that they would take this suggestion back to the contractor however, it was there decision as to how they obtained data and the Authority could only suggest ideas.

EH

- When the new contract had been agreed, members had been advised that it would be cost neutral and financially beneficial to the Council – when would information supporting this be available?
 - Officers advised that the contract had currently been running for six months, and that the information requested could be provided after the contract had run for about a year.

EH, RR

- Members were now aware that the leisure facilities had not been left in a suitable state by previous contractor – why had the Authority not been aware of this before they had left the site. A report on this issue was requested for a future meeting.
 - Officers replied that work on the dilapidation schedule was progressing, but that this work would continue for some time. Information around this issue was currently commercially sensitive, and a report would be provided when appropriate. Members were advised that the Council could not evaluate the full condition of the building until the previous tenant had left, but that this was standard practice.

EH, ES

- Members accepted the officer's response, but still requested that a full explanation be provided to a future meeting.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

AGREED:

- a) That the content of the report be noted; and
- b) That a further update report be presented to the Panel in six months time, on 18 March 2020.

EH

24 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INWARD INVESTMENT UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Commercialisation which provided an update on how Economic Development and Inward Investment was undertaken and promoted in South Holland. The report provided a further update on the following work streams:

- Update on relationship with Opportunity Peterborough (the Economic Action Plan was attached as an appendix to the report)
- Business Engagement
- Key Employment Sites
- Inward Investment
- Skills
- Grants4growth
- Strategic Engagement

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

- Members requested that future update reports provide an executive summary at the start of the report, summarising the main headlines, prior to the fuller explanation.
- Members commented that much of the emphasis detailed within the report related to Spalding and Holbeach – was there any activity in the rest of the district?
 - Officers advised that planning permission was being considered for more units at the industrial estate at Crease Drove, that officers were working closely with Crowland Cranes, and links were being developed with port at Sutton Bridge. Most sites were based in Spalding and Holbeach, but officers were happy to work with all businesses, wherever they were in the district.

NB

AGREED:

- a) That the report be noted; and

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

11 September 2019

- b) That a further update report be provided to the Panel in six months time, on 18 March 2020.

NB

25 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.

AGREED:

That the Work Programme provided by the Executive Manager Governance be noted.

26 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

Members commented that the recent review of implemented planning decisions had been very useful, and requested that their thanks be passed on to the Planning and Building Control Manager and the Planning Policy Officer, who had undertaken the tour with them.

(The meeting ended at 8.37 pm)

(End of minutes)