

Minutes of a meeting of the **PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL** held in Meeting Room 1, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Tuesday, 18 June 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
A M Newton
N H Pepper
P A Redgate
G P Scalese

A C Tennant
S C Walsh
D J Wilkinson

In Attendance: The Executive Manager for Growth, the Place Manager, the Communities Manager, the Community Safety and Enforcement Manager, the Community Development Manager, the Economic Development and Inward Investment Manager, the Corporate Improvement Manager, the Democratic Services Officer and the Portfolio Holder Communities and Facilities.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

The Panel was advised that notification had been received of the following substitutions for this meeting only:

- Councillor A Newton was replacing Councillor C J T H Brewis

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.

There were none.

3 CRIME AND DISORDER PARTNERSHIP 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. The Portfolio Holder Communities and Facilities, the Communities Manager and the Community Safety and Enforcement Manager were in attendance to provide further information and answer the Panel's questions. The following issues were raised:

- Members asked what the difference was between a public order disturbance and anti social behaviour. Officers advised

Action By

DB, CM

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

that they would feed this information back to Panel members.

- If all multi agency initiatives were being undertaken as mentioned within the report, the same issues should not be reoccurring in areas/parishes – was the model working?
 - Officers responded that the model was working. The Joint Diversionary Panel (JDP) pilot, to ensure early intervention, had been extended. County and youth offending services had benefited from earlier intervention through the JDP. Officers would be critical of reports, and if positive changes or early intervention were not seen, this would be challenged.
- Members responded that the main problem was getting early intervention where incidents were not witnessed or evidenced.
 - Early intervention involved working with young people and the family as a whole. With regard to early intervention around enforcement, evidence was required. Officers did what they could, but without sufficient evidence, the issue could not be pursued. Direct reporting was required.
- The report stated that 99% of all reports of youth related anti-social behaviour were dealt with through an incremental approach and did not require formal enforcement action due to compliance. Members commented that it was difficult to correlate this information with the Police report - could this be done in future reports?
 - Officers responded that 99% was a figure provided to the Authority. Figures that went to the Police were what had also been provided by the Police. The Community Safety and Enforcement Manager stated that she would need to speak to the Police about how information could be broken down from their figures.
- Information showed 3 incidents in Crowland – had the Police asked the Authority, and interrogated CCTV footage, for information, and had this produced outcomes on the 3 incidents? How many times had the Police enquired about specific CCTV footage, with the result that the information was not useful? What did the figures show?
 - Officers responded that they generally worked with the CCTV control centre in Boston to provide the type of information that was required. The information currently covered the whole district – in the future, officers would be looking at whether figures could be broken down. For future reporting of this information, consideration could be given to a monthly breakdown, with quarterly and then annual totals. Information could

DB

DB

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

include the number of CCTV cameras, information on the evidence packages, and the number of arrests made.

- The Donington area was currently being affected by various anti social behaviour issues, vandalism etc. Ward members felt that there was more that the Police could do to address these ongoing issues.
 - Officers responded that they would discuss the specific issues with the ward member. DB

- Members commented that there had been a number of joint working initiatives which had not been particularly successful. It was hoped that this one would be.
 - Officers dealt with a lot of victims of anti social behaviour who were satisfied. However, the Panel was right to challenge on areas that may not appear to be working. Officers would discuss this with the Police Inspector, who had stated that he would be happy to attend the next meeting of the Panel. DB, CM

- Would the Johnson Hospital in Spalding have an Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) in the future?
 - Evidence of value would be required for an IDVA to be based at a specific hospital. An IDVA would be based at a location in the eastern region however, the ideal situation would be for there to be one in all hospitals.

- Had the need for an IDVA be identified because the previous offer was not adequate?
 - An IDVA would provide support at the point where violence was reported. Currently, situations were reported when an individual presented themselves at hospital, but after a lapse of time, the complaint was often not pursued. An IDVA could take up a complaint at the point of reporting.

- Many churches had shown interest in the Safeguarding agenda – could awareness sessions be arranged for those interested?
 - The Communities Manager advised that this could be taken forward. EH

- Members were advised that the Community Warden was providing information of activity on social media, fines relating to enforcement issues were now being given out, and that the Authority was looking to recruit another warden.

- Members asked if all Councillors could meet could meet the Community Wardens.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

- The Portfolio Holder Communities and Facilities agreed that a training session could be arranged on the work of the whole team.
- Were councillors notified of when the Community Wardens attended particular wards? Were reports provided detailing their work, and enforcement action undertaken?
 - The Community Wardens provided information of where they had been on social media. However, care needed to be given with regard to publicising areas that they would be going to beforehand. Work was currently underway with the Communications Team around how the wardens could communicate their work effectively. Officers also stated that it would be helpful for members to report areas and issues of concern. Wardens could be deployed in a particular area if requested by a community. The wardens did have a rota that they worked to, but they also needed to be reactive when required.
- The public was encouraged to contact the Council to report various issues such as enforcement and anti social behaviour - how did the Authority promote itself?
 - Information was included in local magazines, officers went door to door and social media was used. The Communications office was also working on promotion. District Councillors could also assist in spreading information around reporting.
- Members agreed that it was important for individuals to report incidents however, feedback was also required to assure complainants that their reports were being acted on.
 - Officers stated that detailed information could not be provided to a third party. However, members were provided with an assurance that there were checks in place to ensure that reported incidents were acted upon, and that there were triggers set up to ensure that the person was spoken to within the appropriate timeframe.
- Members asked if they could be informed of the number of incidents being dealt with in a particular parish?
 - Officers responded that software currently did not allow for this information to be extracted and then broken down by ward. However, other authorities had raised similar issues and the issue was being looked into.
- Members additionally asked if they could be provided with information on satisfaction levels.
 - Information was available for Parish Councils however, the Police had not provided this.

DB, EH

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

- Dissatisfaction was raised regarding the lack of information provided, and liaison by the Police with Parish Councils. It was stated that PCSOs did not attend Parish meetings, and there was often no responses to communication.
 - Officers responded that some training was provided for Parish Clerks to advise them how to obtain information in readiness for parish meetings.
- It was clear that there were a number of concerns raised by Parish Councils – could this issue be raised with the Inspector? As a community, these issues needed to be resolved.
- Many of the issues addressed within the report, such as mental health, were broad ranging and out of the control of the Authority. These were issues that would be dealt with by relevant agencies specialising in dealing with them. The Police would be aware of issues and the resources needed to deal with them.
- The joint working detailed within the report should be addressing the situation – was it working?
 - The Portfolio Holder commented that the Inspector could be asked to attend the next Panel meeting to answer questions. In addition, resourcing for policing in rural areas should be raised with the local MP.
- The Panel responded that some genuine action was needed to move forward on the issues that had been raised. The Panel made the point that it did not want to only receive reassurances, they needed to see actions and results. The Community Safety and Enforcement department was working well, and the report that had been produced was good. However, there were still concerns and the Performance Monitoring Panel should act as a conduit to address these. Representation should be made to the Police Inspector and the local MP on these concerns.
- Members asked if the Community Safety and Enforcement service was adequately resourced.
 - Officers responded that more work could always be done with more officers.

The Panel agreed that the Police Inspector and the local Member of Parliament be invited to the next meeting of the Panel to answer questions on the concerns raised within the meeting (listed below), and that if further questions and concerns remained, that consideration be given to setting up a Task Group in the future:

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

- Lack of funding for rural policing;
- Perceived lack of liaison and information exchange between the Police and parish councils;
- Effectiveness of data reported by the Police.
- Information around figures reported for enforcement action against young people – correlation between information from the Police and figures used by the Authority.
- Insufficient, meaningful data relating to CCTV footage and how this impacted on investigation of crimes.
- Was the current joint working arrangement successful?

DECISION:

- a) That the content of the report be noted;
- b) That the Police Inspector and the Member of Parliament be requested to attend the next meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel to address the issues raised; and
- c) That a further update report be provided to the Panel in six months time.

(The Community Safety and Enforcement Manager left the meeting following consideration of the above item.)

4 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 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 four progress reports.

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

- The Portfolio Holder advised that face to face feed back was positive. Members commented that it was good to see improvements.
- Feedback regarding cleanliness of changing rooms could be historic feedback – it was important that this was monitored.
- When the new contract had been agreed, had all user groups been contacted, and any existing arrangements picked up?
 - Members were told that users had been advised

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

and that any arrangements known of had been transferred. Where any subsequent issues arose, these were being dealt with as they materialised, on a case by case basis.

- User feedback was important and should be encouraged. Was enough prominence being given to obtaining feedback from customers? Could a survey be undertaken on areas of previous poor performance to identify whether these had improved?
 - Officers responded that customer feedback cards were already available, and that there would be an annual survey. However, more could be done to obtain customer feedback.
- Members responded that the report was positive however, a report written outside of the authority may be more robust. If surveys were being undertaken, the use of customer feedback cards needed to be more proactive. The next update report should include more customer feedback.
- Members were notified that the sauna was currently out of use, and that the children's pool was also out of use for the foreseeable future – the results of these two issues needed to be reflected in a future report.
- Members were concerned to hear that, at the time the leisure contract had changed, it had been found that the sauna did not comply to required standards – would it comply in the future, and had it complied during the period of the last contract?
 - The Portfolio Holder responded that more information on the situation was currently being sought, and then a decision would be made with regard to repair and refurbishment.
- Members responded that it was important to ascertain whether the responsibility lay with the Authority or the previous contractor. The Panel wished to be advised when an update was available.

Members agreed that update reports should continue on a six-monthly basis, and that a brief report be presented back to the next meeting of the Panel to ensure that positive trends continued.

AGREED:

- a) That the content of the report be noted;
- b) That a brief report be presented to the next meeting of the

EH, RR

CM

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -
18 June 2019

Panel, to ensure that the improving trends continue.

(The Community Development Manager and the Portfolio Holder, Communities and Facilities left the meeting following consideration of the above item).

5 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel held on 20 March 2019.

AGREED:

That the minutes be signed as a correct record.

6 QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 6

There were none.

7 TRACKING OF RECOMMENDATIONS

There were none.

8 ITEMS REFERRED FROM THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL.

There were none.

9 KEY DECISION PLAN

Consideration was given to the Key Decision Plan issued on 17 January 2019.

The following issues were raised:

CSU Building Materials Contract – members asked what scrutiny this had been subjected to. Officers advised that this information would be sought and provided to Panel members.

JK, CM

Car parking review – members asked why this only covered card parks in Spalding? Officers responded that Spalding had the majority of car parks that charged. Holbeach only had one car park that charged and the decision had therefore been taken to only review Spalding. Members requested that Holbeach be included in the review to ensure equity across the district.

CP

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -
18 June 2019

AGREED:

That the Key Decision Plan issued on 17 January 2019 be noted.

10 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INWARD INVESTMENT UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Commercialisation (S151) which provided an update on how Economic Development and Inward Investment was undertaken and promoted in South Holland.

NB

The Economic Development and Inward Investment Manager advised that the covering report he had provided did not show the most up to date information. However, the appendix was correct. Members requested that the correct version of the report be circulated to all Panel members, and that an updated version of the report be provided to the next meeting.

Members were advised that the action plan was now complete, and were also provided with an update on other work undertaken by the Economic Development and Inward Investment department. The contract with Opportunity Peterborough was at its 12 month point, and they were working with the Authority in putting together an economic action plan of activities for the short to medium term.

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

- Members commented that industry could be approached for funding, as it would ultimately benefit them. The Authority should do this before any current funding expired.
- There were a number of opportunities that could be linked up – breakfast meetings could be used to promote skills and consider sponsorship packages. Officers responded that a skills presentation had already taken place, and that this was the next part of the process.
- ‘Grants for Growth’ focussed on smaller businesses - a link between this and larger companies was required.
- Officers commented that young people had skills, but not always the skills to be successful in interviews. Links between businesses, Boston College and similar organisations was needed.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

- Some employers were worried about how lower paid jobs would be filled post- Brexit. Members commented that it would be interesting to meet these employers.
- A lot of work was being undertaken with regard to economic development and inward investment, but there were staff issues and utility issues. Was any other work being done to bring in other industries rather than relying so heavily on the food industry?
 - Officers responded that some years ago, there had been a drive for more diversifications however, market forces drove this, and the area had the businesses that were required.
- With regard to the proposed new position with the Economic Development and Inward Investment Team, members expressed concern over the small size of the department, and the fact that it may be difficult to attract and retain applicants.
- A similar industry was being built up in Peterborough where the road and communications infrastructure was better. It was important that the department worked hard to keep businesses in the South Holland area, and to bring new ones in.
- There had previously been an element of criticism with regard to the Authority's marketing strategy.
 - Officers responded that they were looking at producing a communications and marketing strategy, and a micro site linked to inward investment.

AGREED:

- a) That the report be noted; and
- b) That a full, updated report be provided to the next meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel.

(The Economic Development and Inward Investment Manager left the meeting following discussion of this item).

11 Q4 2018-19 PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW REPORT

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 1 January 2019 to 31 March 2019.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

The following key areas of success were highlighted:

- Staff turnover figures had improved;
- There had been a significant reduction in days lost to staff sickness;
- Customer feedback continued to improve, and the number of complaints responded to within 15 working days had increased;
- Housing re-let performance continued to improve

The following areas for improvement were highlighted:

- The year-end gross income generated by EHT&C had not hit its target however, costs associated with the running of EHT&C were relative to income and were therefore also down on what was forecasted. In addition, EHT&C, albeit still in its infancy, continued to grow and develop a sound reputation within the sector and this growth was forecasted to continue into the new financial year.
- There was a small spike in the number of missed waste collections reported however, context was required when looking at the figures.

Officers stated that the information detailed within the report was already 3 months out of date. Consideration was being given to how the Authority's success could be measured against its plan, and how more meaningful measures could be reported e.g. how it reacted to missed collections rather than how many missed collections there were. The Corporate Innovation, Change and Performance Manager was working with the Portfolio Holder, Governance and Customer on proposals, and these would come back as part of the Q1 report. Consideration was also being given to doing some forecasting work. Once the new measures were in place, this would provide the information on forecasted performance which would give better opportunities to react and respond.

Members were in favour of these improvements however, they requested that the Panel be consulted on any proposed changes. The Panel had been involved in suggesting changes to the current report format, and it was important that the Panel was also happy with the format of the new report. Officers confirmed that they would bring forward the proposed suite of measures to the Panel.

Members asked whether there was a breakdown available on the figures for upheld complaints. Officers responded that this information could be provided. In addition, information was also

RB

RB, CM

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL -

18 June 2019

available on how many complaints were subsequently escalated to the next stage.

AGREED:

- a) That the report be noted; and
- b) That the Panel be provided with details of the proposed changes to the Performance Overview report, prior to them being finalised.

12 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.

13 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

There were none.

(The meeting ended at 8:50 pm.)

(End of minutes)