

Minutes of a meeting of the **PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Wednesday, 2 May 2018 at 6.30 pm.

PRESENT

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

G R Aley
J R Astill
C J T H Brewis

T A Carter
P C Foyster
J D McLean

A M Newton
A C Tennant
J Whitbourn

In Attendance: The Portfolio Holder Communities and Facilities, the Portfolio Holder Housing and Health, the Executive Director Commercialisation, the Place Manager, the Communities Manager, the Environmental Services Manager, the Building Consultancy Manager, the Emergency Planning Officer, the Acting Inward Investment Manager, the Senior Business Intelligence Officer, the Finance Accountant, the Democratic Services Officer and Detective Chief Superintendent Chris Davison.

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors G K Dark, J L King and M D Seymour.

48 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.

There were no declarations of interest.

49 CRIME AND DISORDER UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Place which provided members with an update on community safety partnership work at a County and local level.

There had been fundamental changes in the structure of the county community safety partnership arrangements during 2017, and these were outlined within the report in addition to an update on the local multi-agency work. The Safer Lincolnshire Partnership (SLP) was the name of the multi-agency community safety partnership.

Detective Chief Superintendent Chris Davison, the Portfolio Holder Communities and Facilities and the Communities Manager were in attendance to provide further information and answer the Panel's questions. The following issues were raised:

- Members had frequently asked for information from the CCTV cameras – it was appreciated that this had now been provided to the Panel, and it was asked that the report should now go to

Action By

EH

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

Parish Councils.

- Officers confirmed that this information could be shared with Parish Councils.
- PCSOs were a valuable presence in the area. What was the financial picture for the remainder of the financial year, and was the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) lobbying hard for a rural police presence?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent commented that the PCSOs role was very valuable – they were the eyes and ears of the Police. With regard to the general overall financial picture, this was the remit of the PCC however it was confirmed that funding was secured for the current financial year. He also confirmed that the PCC was lobbying for funding for rural forces, and was this week speaking to the relevant Minister in Central Government on this matter.
- The report suggests some involvement with, for example, perpetrators of antisocial behaviour, and their families. If issues were dealt with at an earlier stage, many problems could potentially be avoided.
 - Early intervention was the main focus of the partnership. Rather than trying to deal with issues at the point of failure, it was important that issues were focussed on at an earlier stage. There needed to be more preventative work.
- Was Operation REPEAT (Reinforcing Elderly Persons Education at All Times), referred to within the report, already underway?
 - Training for practitioners had been undertaken last year, and additional training was planned over the summer.
- Within the report, begging and vagrancy was identified (along with other issues) as an example of anti-social behaviour. It was important that this was not seen purely as anti-social behaviour, and that people were given the help and support that they may require.
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent agreed that begging and vagrancy was not purely a policing matter. It was a complex issue, and appropriate partnership mechanisms were in place to tackle issues.
- Reducing Offending – what was being done across the range

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

of offenders?

- The Detective Chief Superintendent stated that there were very few offenders who only committed one type of crime and therefore, dealing with the issue by crime type was ineffective. It was more effective to deal with the individual and the circumstances around them.
- It had been stated that PCSOs were the Police's eyes and ears. The Incidents Summary Analysis appended to the report did not appear to bear this out – the number of incidents reported by PCSOs seemed very low in comparison to other reporters.
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent stated that he would pick this up with the local inspector.
- How would consultation with the public of the SLP's work be undertaken?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent stated that communication was important and that historically, partnerships had not communicated what they did, and the results of what it did in an effective way. It was also important to clarify actual crime against the perception of actual crime. The PCC had a specific mandate to reflect the views of people in the area. Various methods of consultation such as surveys, neighbourhood panels and specific events to invite the public to contribute could be undertaken. It was necessary to engage people online as well as with more traditional events.
- The report referred to information sharing - what did this entail?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent replied that all agencies needed to share information in order to deal with specific issues. To work in a meaningful way, it was necessary that information on individuals, and issues surrounding them, could be shared.
- Did the partnership involve volunteer organisations, and did information sharing also include them?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent advised that the Safer Lincolnshire Partnership, at Strategy Board level, included all these partners. Charitable and third sectors would need to be engaged going forward, but currently those partners with statutory duties were the main bodies to engage.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

- Was the Partnership undertaking any preventative work with schools?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent reported that a Joint Diversionary Panel had already been developed which looked at each outcome around a child to ensure that a child was not being unnecessarily criminalised, and that meaningful activity was being undertaken.

- Two Community Wardens had been secured by the Authority through the Controlling Migration Fund. Had these two roles been considered in light of the partnership's work?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent advised that the partnership would share information of initiatives and share best practice across the county.

- Younger children needed to understand the repercussions of low level anti-social behaviour. Were there any initiatives to address this?
 - The Detective Chief Superintendent agreed, and advised that there was a Stay Safe partnership which delivered these messages. In addition, the Joint Diversionary Panel ensured that activity undertaken was meaningful.

Members requested that a further update report be provided to the Panel in six months time, and that the following information be included:

- Evidence of publicity around initiatives;
- Progress of the key initiatives;

AGREED:

- a) That the content of the report be noted; and

- b) That a further update report be provided to the Panel in six months time, to include information on the following:
 - Evidence of publicity around the LSP's initiatives;
 - Details of progress in the key initiatives

EH, CM

50 SWIMMING POOL AND LEISURE FACILITIES CONTRACT TASK GROUP

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Place which provided members with an update on the

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

recommendations of the Swimming Pool and Leisure Facilities Contract Task Group. The Task Group had presented its recommendations to Cabinet in November 2016, and the Panel had since been provided with two progress updates.

The Communities Manager highlighted the following:

- There were still some issues around the timeliness of maintenance, and this was still an area of focus;
- There continued to be regular engagement with users;
- Regular inspection visits were undertaken and tracked;
- The Communities Manager was due to meet the Contract Manager the next day and would be raising any issues;
- Attendance figures were down, due to maintenance issues – this would be addressed;
- Future leisure options (update required, as detailed in recommendations at Appendix A) – members were advised that a short term leisure contract, to run from March 2019, was being sought. Invitations to tender would be sent in May 2018, reviewed in August 2018 and members would be updated November 2018.

The Panel considered the information and the following issues were raised:

- The drop in attendance was disappointing. The Panel would be looking at future update reports to monitor this.
- Officers had stated that the new contract was due to commence 1 March 2019, for a five year term, with the option of a two year extension. Members had not been aware of the extension option.
 - Officers responded that the initial five year management contract was to allow the Authority to progress to the next stage with regard to future leisure provision. The optional two years extension would provide some leeway if required however, officers were confident that the five years should be sufficient and the extension would not be required.
- Customer feedback information was given within the report – how did this compare to last quarter?
 - Officers were unable to provide the information but advised that it would be included in the future.
- Members responded that customer feedback for previous periods should be included in future reports for comparison purposes.

EH

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

- In response to a question regarding the GP Referral Programme, officers clarified that this had been successful and was centred around health issues such as back care and obesity. The programme had previously been funded through LCC Public Health but was now run at the provider's own cost.
- With regard to the full boiler replacement in 2018, officers clarified that replacement parts were the responsibility of SHDC and repairs were the responsibility of 1Life.
- Members questioned whether a number of unscheduled visits per month could be undertaken rather than pre-announced visits.
 - Officers responded that weekly inspections were being undertaken which had been beneficial in keeping standards up. There was no fixed time or pre-warning of these visits. The number of visits could potentially reduce to a couple of visits per month.
- Members responded that the number of visits could be determined by the service but they would not wish for control to be relaxed.

It was requested that the report to the next meeting address visitor numbers and complaints – both positive and negative comments should be considered, and the negative comments understood.

EH, CM

AGREED:

- a) That the content of the report be noted; and
- b) That a further update report be considered in six months time, addressing the issues raised by the Panel.

(The Portfolio Holder Communities and Facilities, the Communities Manager and the Detective Chief Superintendent left the meeting following discussion of this item).

51 REVIEW OF HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY

With the agreement of the Chairman, this item was withdrawn from the agenda, to be discussed at the next Panel meeting.

MC

52 RE-LETTING OF VOID PROPERTIES TASK GROUP

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Place which presented an update on the current situation relating

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

to void properties. A Task Group looking at the re-letting of void properties had presented its recommendations to the Cabinet on 25 July 2017, where it had been agreed these recommendations be incorporated within the Place Review.

At the Panel's last meeting, members had considered housing voids as part of the Quarter 3 2017-18 Performance Overview Report. Voids had been highlighted as an area for improvement, members were unhappy with this performance and had requested that the issue come forward to this meeting to be considered alongside performance against the Task Group's recommendations.

Officers advised that the report detailed progress made to date however, there was still work to be done. Members considered the report and the following issues were raised:

- What work was still to be done?
 - Members were advised that there were issues around bringing properties back into use, and this linked to the Allocations Policy. Another issue was how processes and policies around areas such as recharges were managed, and how tenants were advised of their responsibilities. Work was being undertaken on addressing these areas, and a new team was taking some of these forward. Further information would be provided in reports that would be brought to the Panel in July.
- Councillors that had been part of the Re-Letting of Void Properties Task Group were disappointed with progress. The Task Group had submitted its Final Report and recommendations in July 2017, and it was felt that there was no great improvement in performance. Letting times, when compared to the same quarter last year, appeared to be worsening.
 - Officers responded that targets were being missed, but only slightly. A significant number of properties had been let during this time, and these were not failing. The Authority was delivering properties to tenants in need, and there were some successes.
- Members responded that the entire process appeared to be taking longer than the same period the previous year.
- The tenancy and recharge policies were currently under review – were the current policies satisfactory and when would the reviewed ones be in place.
 - Officers responded that the reviews were almost

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

complete, and that the recharge policy was being looked at again.

- Members felt that the current performance was not encouraging and that significant improvement was required in the near future, given that the Voids Task Group had concluded its work some time ago. Housing allocations and voids were interrelated issues interrelated and an update on both was therefore requested at next meeting.
 - Officers responded that the report to the next meeting would provide more context to the current situation.

AGREED:

- a) That the report of the Executive Director Place be noted; and
- b) That a further update report on housing allocations and void properties be provided to the next meeting of the Panel, to provide information on performance and context on the background relating to these issues.

PS, CM

(The Portfolio Holder Housing and Health and the Executive Manager People and Public Protection left the meeting following discussion of this meeting.)

53 **MINUTES**

AGREED:

- a) The minutes of the meeting of the Joint Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel held on 25 January 2018 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record;
- b) The minutes of the meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel held on 6 February 2018 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.
- c) That officers liaise with the Chairman of the Panel regarding any outstanding issues.

54 **QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 6**

There were no questions asked under Standing Order 6.

55 **TRACKING OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

There were no responses of the Cabinet to consider.

56 ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL.

There were no items referred from the Policy Development Panel.

57 KEY DECISION PLAN

Consideration was given to the Key Decision Plan issued on 23 April 2018.

AGREED:

That the Key Decision Plan issued on 23 April 2018 be noted.

58 QUARTER 4 2017-18 PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW REPORT

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director, Strategy and Governance which provided an update on Council performance for the period 1 January 2018 to 31 March 2018.

Quarter 4 saw performance drop slightly in comparison to Quarter 3. Performance was rated as 'moderate' with 10 indicators being green (48%) which indicated good performance. There were 4 (14%) amber indicators and 8 red indicators (38%); highlighting lower than expected performance. There were 6 indicators which were classified as data only – this meant that they were monitored without requiring a target.

In discussing the report, the following key points emerged:

- With regard to sickness reporting, it was suggested that changes be made to make it easier to show the proportion of days lots to the Authority.
- Staff turnover and exit information – members asked if a summary of exit surveys could be provided in future reporting.
 - Officers would liaise with Human Resources in order to provide as much detail as possible, and this would be included within the next update report.

AGREED:

That the report be noted.

(The Senior Business Intelligence Officer left the meeting

CP

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

following discussion of the above item).

59 **SECTION 106 MONIES**

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Place which provided information on how Section 106 monies were constructed, negotiated and monitored, as requested by the Panel at its meeting in August 2017.

The report provided an explanation of what S106 agreements were, the circumstances under which they were appropriate, the implications of the emerging Local Plan policy framework, and the outcomes of the assurance review undertaken in December 2017. The report also provided information relating to ongoing workstreams, these including a comprehensive review of all S106 agreements, the monitoring of trigger points (both financial and non-financial), and the identification of responsible officers.

Officers emphasised that as S106 agreements were concluded at the time permission was granted, there was often a considerable time lapse between that point and the commencement or conclusion of development. This was particularly pertinent in relation to the larger schemes which could take a number of years to commence. Once commenced, the larger schemes were generally constructed over a protracted time frame. There was therefore a need to ensure that the process of monitoring S106 agreements was robust and that it focussed on monitoring both on-site commencement and appropriate trigger points. Officers undertook to provide a further report to the Panel in six months time, this addressing the issues identified above and providing a comprehensive oversight of S106 agreements currently in place across the District.

The Panel considered the information provided, and the following issues were raised:

- Had any monies not been spent within the appropriate time period of any S106 agreements, and if so, had the monies gone back to the developer?
 - Officers confirmed that no S106 monies had been returned.
- Forward planning with regard to spend of S106 monies (rather than waiting until monies were received) and how it could be used effectively was necessary e.g. could S106 monies be used to contribute to an improved bus service in Spalding?
 - Officers responded that the monies associated with any particular agreement could only be utilised in

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

connection with the requirement of the agreement itself, unless agreed otherwise by the developer. Amendments would generally require a formal amendment to the agreement itself. In relation to the bus provision associated with the ongoing Holland Park development, the triggers for transport provision had been determined at the time the application was approved in direct consultation with the County Council.

- The Authority should liaise with Parish Councils before allocating open space, as they were often the bodies that maintained it and knew where it was most needed.
 - Officers responded that open space provision negotiated in connection with any development scheme was part and parcel of the application process. The Parish Councils were directly involved in this consultative process. In cases where open space provision was made off-site, officers would liaise with both the applicant and/or developer, together with the Parish Council to ensure that appropriate provision was made – and that this included appropriate arrangements for ongoing maintenance.

AGREED:

- a) That the report be noted; and
- b) That a further report be submitted to the Panel in six months time providing information on the following areas:
 - An overview of existing S106 agreements;
 - An explanation of the main trigger points;
 - The identification of an officer responsible for monitoring the terms of the agreement, particularly the commencement of works;
 - The mechanism for ensuring that monies associated with S106 agreements were secured in accordance with the terms of the agreement;
 - The identification of any officer responsible for ensuring that financial contributions were spent accordingly and within prescribed timescales;
 - The approach taken to ensuring members were regularly updated on S106 matters.

RF, PJ, CM

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Place which provided information on how the Authority would respond in an emergency situation.

Under the Civil Contingencies Act (CCA) 2004, South Holland District Council, as a Category 1 responder, had a duty to have plans in place to respond to and support an emergency, whilst at the same time maintaining its essential services to the local community. The Authority had a document entitled 'The Place – Emergency Response and Business Continuity Plan – 2017/18' which detailed the process of how it would react in an emergency.

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

- The success of the Authority's response depended upon the first contact – when reported, would there be a suitably qualified individual available to respond to the call?
 - Officers advised that there would be, that there was 24 hour telephone coverage, and that this was staffed on a rota basis.
- Members responded that the Authority's out of hours number was not as good as it should be – would the emergency response line be better?
 - Officers advised that there had been some initial problems when the LCC line had been set up however, these had now been resolved however, if there were any issues, officers at South Holland would be advised of any reported emergency..
- Members asked how the public could be made aware of what number to call in the event of any emergency.
 - If an individual rang the Council telephone number, they would hear a message with the Emergency Response contact number. The telephone number was also advertised on the entrance doors to the Council. Then a call was answered, the issue would be diverted to the correct body.
- Members asked if the processes put in place would still work, as the Authority was opting out of county wide service level agreement.
 - Officers responded that the Authority was not on its own, as it was still a member of the Lincolnshire Resilience Forum.
- Was there a direct role for the local community as part of the emergency plan?

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

- Individuals could join local action group, with their views being fed back. The Emergency Planning Officer would make contact with the groups and support them where they could.
- Members responded that this needed to happen soon. There were many people willing to get involved however, due to lack of information, this interest was waning. In addition, some areas did not have a local action group.
- The Portfolio Holder Place advised that the main role of the Emergency Planning Officer would initially be to ensure that the Authority had the resilience that it had been lacking. Lincolnshire County Council was the primary emergency authority, and even though South Holland District Council had withdrawn from the SLA, it would still be covered by LCC as it was the County Council's statutory duty. Community groups would also be supported, with their position being clarified.

Members requested that Terms of Reference be clarified, that a further report be presented to the Panel once this had been resolved, and that officers contact voluntary groups.

AGREED:

- a) That the report be noted; and
- b) That officer provide a further report to the Panel once Terms of Reference with regard to Emergency Planning had been clarified, and that officers contact local action groups.

ES, KB, CB

(The Portfolio Holder Place, the Communities Manager, the Building Consultancy Manager and the Emergency Planning Officer left the meeting following discussion of this item).

61 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Commercialisation, which provided an update on Economic Development over the last six months.

In discussing the report, the following key points arose;

- It was important to attract new businesses, and also to appreciate existing ones.
 - Officers responded that the Open for Business agenda was being brought forward, demonstrating the Council's desire to speak to businesses and gain feedback.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

- An event involving schools was being considered for later in the year, with the aim of working towards addressing the skills shortage.
- Members asked whether there had been any discussions with regard to the railway station, and the new franchise?
 - To date, this had not taken place, as there could be no meaningful conversation until it was known who the franchise would be awarded to. The Authority needed to be prepared for when this did happen.
- Members asked whether there had been any feedback from businesses with regard to traffic problems, and whether any of them had been affected.
 - Although officers knew of the traffic problems, they were not aware of any feedback from businesses. A traffic survey was currently underway, and it was important for the Authority to engage with Highways on the results of this.
- Members commented that the following points should be made with regard to road improvements in the area: 1) That the A16 was important as it connected the area and the food industries; and 2) Although the A17 carried a large amount of traffic out of the district, it was a major distributor of local produce around the country.
 - Officers responded that the LEPP and LCC were regularly lobbied with regard to infrastructure issues.
- Members requested that a further update report be provided in six months time to advise of progress in the intervening period.

AGREED:

- a) That the report be noted; and
- b) That a further update report be presented to the Panel in six months time.

NB, CM

62 COMMERCIALISATION

The Executive Director Commercialisation provided the Panel with a presentation on the Council's Delivery Programme, and how Commercialisation opportunities were being considered by the Delivery Unit.

Following the presentation, the following issues were raised:

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

- Was the Authority on target to achieve the financial income identified from commercialisation?
 - Yes, this was on target and was likely to exceed predictions due to the Crease Drove and DWP projects not being included in the original forecasts.
- What was the situation with regard to staff resourcing of commercialisation. Historically, this had been an issue – had this now been overcome?
 - Recruiting was currently underway for a HRA team to support the HRA Programme, and a large number of permanent staff were now in previously interim posts. There was still a need for some specialist help, but the Authority was now in a better position with regard to the resourcing of commercialisation. As the initiative was accelerated in the future, there may be a need to increase resource, and members would be updated if this was to happen.
- Members commented that the presentation provided broad information which was helpful however, the Panel may want to look at particular issues in more detail.
 - Officers responded that if the Panel had any particular projects it wished to scrutinise in more depth, that relevant officers be advised.
- The Chairman requested that as individual issues emerged as potential projects, that the Panel be advised in order that it could consider them in more detail if required.

AGREED:

- a) That the presentation be noted; and
- b) That as potential projects arose, officers advise the Panel in order that it could consider if it wished to scrutinise them in more detail.

RH, MH,
CM

63 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 three 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.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL - 2

May 2018

AGREED:

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

64 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

There were no urgent items.

(The meeting ended at 9.00 pm)

(End of minutes)