

ACTIONS

<u>ACTIONS FROM THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL MEETING HELD ON 20 MAY 2025</u>			
MINUTE NO.		ITEM	RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
2. 25/26		<u>ACTIONS</u>	
*		<p>Members queried action 67(b) in relation to when feedback would be provided to the Panel from the Portfolio Holder (<i>Action 67b: Members were concerned by the underperformance of the percentage of household waste collected for recycling and composting and agreed that a recommendation go forward from the committee that improved publicity be provided to educate the public of the issue including the financial implications to the council of contaminated recyclable waste. UPDATE: This recommendation will be communicated to the PFH for Waste</i>).</p> <p>MINUTED MEETING RESPONSE: The Business Intelligence and Change Manager commented the delay could be related to the upcoming decision on the new waste delivery model but a response from the Portfolio Holder would be chased.</p> <p>UPDATE: Verbal update to be provided at the 15 July 2025 meeting</p>	via Corey Gooch
8. 25/26		<u>Q4 PERFORMANCE REPORT 2024/25</u>	
✓	(a)	<p>Members asked that page references were not made in the covering report as these did not match the agenda numbering</p> <p>UPDATE: Noted for future reports</p>	via Corey Gooch
✓	(b)	<p>Members wished for 'Council run stall occupancy levels' to be a target rather than a trend.</p> <p>UPDATE: This will be reviewed by the Assistant director for Leisure as part of the review of markets.</p>	via Corey Gooch
*	(c)	<p>Members asked for further information regarding why the 'household waste collected for recycling and composting' indicator had been consistently underperforming.</p> <p>UPDATE: As action 2. 25/26 above</p>	via Corey Gooch
✓	(d)	<p>Members questioned the significant drop in performance relating to the 'Percentage of subject access requests responded to within statutory timescales' indicator.</p> <p>MINUTED MEETING RESPONSE:</p>	via Corey Gooch

ACTIONS

		<p>The Business Intelligence and Change Manager would provide the panel with the number of requests as likely to be low in number.</p> <p>UPDATE: A few service areas have faced challenges in responding to requests on time. Although this affected less than five cases, it has slightly skewed the percentages. This issue is being addressed.</p>	
✓	(e)	<p>Regarding 'average answer rate - Revenues and Benefits (PSPS)' members sought clarification as to whether the trend was likely to continue or whether changes needed to be made to the service to improve this indicator.</p> <p>UPDATE: The service expects improvements over the next few quarters. Although immediate changes may not occur, upcoming channel shifts and transformation efforts aim to reduce call volumes and enhance answer rates.</p>	via Corey Gooch
✓	(f)	<p>Members queried the significant increase in the 'Number of FPNs outstanding payment' from Q1 and Q4. Was this due to more FPNs being issued or less FPNs being paid.</p> <p>MINUTED MEETING RESPONSE: The Business Intelligence and Change Manager responded that further information would be requested from the service area regarding the variation in figures and commentary in respect of unpaid FPNs potentially being carried forward to the following months' data.</p> <p>UPDATE: It is normal for payment rates to fluctuate. The number of FPNs issued in a month/quarter does not directly correspond to the number paid, due to the payment periods crossing month/quarter depending on when the FPN was issued. It should also be noted that the figure relates to all FPNs that are issued, however a proportion are likely to be unpaid and therefore prosecuted, meaning payment will never be achieved. We use this live payment rate as a mechanism to monitor payment activity</p>	Donna Hall
✓	(g)	<p>Members expressed concern around the 'Number of working days lost to sickness per FTE' that the figure had increased for Q4 and appeared to be higher than the other authorities within the Partnership.</p> <p>MINUTED MEETING RESPONSE: The Business Intelligence and Change Manager confirmed that an explanation would be sought</p> <p>UPDATE: This is a cumulative indicator, so will naturally climb Q1-Q4, sickness has been benchmarked and South Holland is in line with average sickness figures we are seeing across the country.</p>	via Corey Gooch

ACTIONS

		<u>OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL MEETINGS</u>	
69. 24/25		<u>12 MARCH 2025 HOUSING STOCK CONDITION SURVEY – INITIAL FINDINGS</u>	
*	(a)	<p>Members asked whether damp and mould issues were more prevalent in certain property types. MINUTED MEETING RESPONSE: Detailed analysis of such data would be undertaken on the completion of the stock condition surveys and the findings reported to the committee.</p> <p style="color: red;">UPDATE: Stock Condition survey data programme completion set for Q2 of 25/26 so analysis will take place following that completion, the results of this piece of work can be brought forward in future reports.</p>	Chris Mycock
15. 24/25		<u>23 JULY 2024 ACTIONS</u>	
*		<p>Members referred to action 9(f) 24/25, and requested assurance that all eligible refunds had been ‘proactively’ processed in line with/and since the implementation of, the Planning Guarantee. Had an audit been undertaken for the period to assess whether any refunds were outstanding?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Action 9(f) 24/25: Members requested a figure be provided for how much the authority had paid back in Planning fees? Members would like to know how many pre-applications had been provided and was this considered successful?)</i></p> <p>UPDATE (emailed to members 30/7/24): To provide further clarity in respect of the financial implications: I can confirm from the information on record, that no planning fees have been returned by South Holland District Council during the four quarters of 2023/2024 due to performance, or due to delays in the determination of applications. In instances where applicants have made an additional payment amount that exceeds the planning fee required for their application, these additional fees have been refunded prior to the application being determined. However, the return of these partial payments is not as a result of performance, but solely relates to an initial overpayment by the applicant.</p>	Phil Norman

ACTIONS

		<p>When viewing returned payments in relation to extension of time, should an agreement to an extension of time exceed the timeframes set by the planning guarantee, the applicant is no longer entitled to a refund of their planning fee. During the four quarters (2023/2024), no payments were refunded as a result of exceeding the planning guarantee timeframes". The information requested regarding Planning Guarantees is not readily available. Officers will explore this further and revert in due course.</p> <p>UPDATE 24/9/24: Phil Norman as Assistant Director, is currently exploring the requests and queries further and has advised that this will be reported back in due course.</p> <p>Update 30/09/24: Timeline requested regarding feedback to the panel. Awaiting update.</p> <p>Update 4/11/24 & 2/12/24: Nothing further to report at this stage.</p> <p>UPDATE 03/03/25: A full and robust audit is a significant piece of work. A new Group Manager – Planning Support has very recently been appointed into post. They have been charged with exploring this issue further. Until such time as the work is scoped and begun it is not possible to provide a timeframe for conclusion.</p> <p>UPDATE 26/06/25: Nothing further to report.</p>	
47. 22/23		<p><u>29 NOVEMBER 2022</u> <u>INVESTIGATION OF NETWORK OUTAGE IMPACTING SHDC AND THE WIDER PARTNERSHIP IN SEPTEMBER 2022</u></p>	
✓		<p>A report to come forward to the Panel detailing the results of the resiliency options investigation and subsequent action taken.</p> <p>UPDATE 6 April 2023: Since the previous report, the KCOM links contracts have been novated from LCC to the District Council. Options for a resilient link have been explored and the report is in draft. It is expected this will go through to ICT Strategy in the next month for review.</p> <p>UPDATE 7 June 2023: The options for Internet resiliency have been explored and a paper is currently with Officers for consideration.</p> <p>UPDATE 25 July 2023:</p>	Jackie Wright

ACTIONS

		<p>Report was considered by Strategy Board and has since been presented to PFH, who has asked for alternative options to be explored.</p> <p>UPDATE 25 October 2023: New resiliency options are being tabled with PFH 03/11/23.</p> <p>UPDATE 4 January 2024: Resiliency options were presented to PFH and option to install resilient link has been added to 24/25 revenue budget. Should it be approved budget, it should be noted this solution would still incur some downtime if initiated as the “switch over” would not be viable for less than 1/2 days outage due to the time to implement and replot records. Therefore, services would need to plan for the initial outage through their BCP.</p> <p>UPDATE 23 April 2024: This recommendation was included in the revenue budget to 24/25 and was agreed at Full Council, therefore the work to implement has been started and will be scheduled as a project for delivery.</p> <p>UPDATE 19 Sept 2024: This is now scheduled for install in Q3/Q4 2024/25.</p> <p>UPDATE 16/1/25: Order has been placed with supplier and we are currently in the lead off time, awaiting installation date. Some works will need to be completed once this is in place to make the line active.</p> <p>UPDATE 6/5/25: Site survey completed, router installed, currently waiting on BT OpenReach to perform connectivity of supply.</p> <p>UPDATE 26/06/25 The resilient line has now been installed and configuration concluded. Some internet traffic is being routed across this link to make maximum benefit of the investment. Should an outage occur, internet traffic can now manually be rerouted. This would still mean some downtime, but it would be significantly reduced. This action is now deemed to be completed.</p>	
--	--	--	--