

PERFORMANCE PANEL

Monday, 23 August 2021

Attendance:

Councillors
Horrill (Chairperson)

Cook
Craske

Ferguson
Becker

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Achwal, Clear, Cutler, Thompson and Tod

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Williams who was replaced by Councillor Becker.

1. **REVIEW OF QUESTIONS PRE-SUBMITTED FROM PANEL MEMBERS (20 MINS)**

Questions that had been pre-submitted had been circulated to panel members with initial responses ahead of the meeting (these questions and responses were attached at appendix 1).

Officers had been invited to attend this meeting to respond with any supplementary points. It was agreed that these questions would be considered as part of item 2.

2. **DETAILED REVIEW OF DRAFT Q1 PERFORMANCE MONITORING (70 MINS)**

Report Ref CAB3312

The panel reviewed the draft report as follows (any page numbers referenced relate to the page numbers of the panel's report pack.)

Page 9. As a follow up to the pre-submitted question regarding the Vaultex site, it was asked if the intention was to continue with the works on site and whether there would be a financial consequence for the council of the Judicial Review (JR). Councillor Cutler and Lisa Kirkman responded that the current planning permission remained valid. An award of costs could flow were the decision of the High Court to go against the council. **Action. Officers to confirm the date for the planning committee meeting for the 2nd planning application on this site.**

Page 11. Regarding the report statement “*We continue to work with Project Integra to understand the impact of introduction of food waste recycling which is governments preferred direction of travel by 2023 for every local authority.*” It was asked whether this could be 2022 rather than 2023? Richard Botham and Cllr Cutler explained that the council was exploring options for a food waste collection trial, but that clarification was needed through the national waste strategy to avoid unnecessary work.

Page 12. Regarding the report statement “*Winchester City Council continues to work through the Project Integra partnership and submit data to support the review of options for a single MRF in Eastleigh and is looking at the option of moving to a twin stream or kerbside sort system to greatly increase the range of material being collected.*” It was asked when the council would be outlining proposals on this, and would there be any impact to the current collection contract? Richard Botham informed that it was anticipated that further details on the national waste strategy were expected this year and once received, communication with members either via briefings or committees would take place. Any impact to the current contract would also be considered as part of this and as part of the future direction members wished to take.

Page 13. Regarding the report statement “*Demand for Citizens Advice services remains high, with approximately 1,279 clients supported during the quarter*” It was asked whether it was known what percentage of these clients were either WCC tenants or Housing Association tenants and where was the crossover between support that the council’s housing support team provided, and the support provided by the CAB? Richard Botham and Susan Robbins responded that they would contact the CAB to obtain the requested data they held regarding the number of WCC tenants and Housing Association tenants. Regarding any overlap of service provision, it was explained that through cross working and close liaison that duplication was to be avoided where possible, however it was important that residents receive the appropriate help at whichever service they present at. **Action. Officers to obtain breakdown of data as above.**

Page 14. Regarding the report statement “*Work to upgrade the fitness facilities at Meadowside Leisure Centre will commence later in 2021*”. It was asked if the timescale for this upgrade was known and what if any implications would there be for existing membership holders? Andy Hickman advised that the works would be starting shortly, and the intention was for the upgrade to result in increased membership however he would respond with further detail on both points. **Action. Officers to follow up on these two points as above.**

Page 18. Housing Company. Following a question, Richard Botham confirmed that the current route map for the proposal involved discussion with members of the Business & Housing Policy Committee in September and then to Cabinet.

Page 19. Pre-submitted question “*Are we planning to support the Night shelter with their additional beds? If so, what are we prepared to do?*” Richard Botham responded that officers were currently in discussions with the Night Shelter who had asked for council support for their “move-on” service. Any

proposals for support would likely be brought forward through a cabinet member decision day.

An additional question was asked about West View House and possible Hampshire County Council (HCC) budget cuts and subsequent impact to residents. Richard Botham advised that an option to cease grant funding had been put forward by HCC as part of their recent budget cuts consultation to which WCC had made representation on. If this proposal was agreed, then this may have implications to the service operator and WCC who may need to look at available funds and grants to address any issues.

Page 22. Regarding the report statement “*A second accommodation survey was sent to businesses at the end of April to understand future demand for accommodation bookings. 60% said forward bookings were much worse than 2019*”. A question was asked as to how this figure compared with similar comparator cities? Susan Robins informed that she needed to take that question away and respond in writing. **Action. Officers to respond to these points**

Page 23. As a follow-on question to the pre-submitted question regarding the high street priorities plan and in particular the change of use from retail to residential, it was asked whether the Economic Development team were looking at opportunities to help support high streets across the district. Susan Robbins explained that her team do work closely with officers from the development management team, particularly looking at temporary uses for underused buildings to minimise vacancies and that she would pick this issue up with Simon Finch and provide an update to a future panel meeting. **Action. Officers to respond as above.**

Page 20. Following a question regarding Business Support Services provided across the district, members were referred to the table provided in response to a pre-submitted question. In addition, Susan Robbins advised that the data on page 24 was provided by IncuHive, and she would endeavour to provide a split of this data in the same way. **Action. Officers to provide data as above.**

A further question was asked that whilst the figures displayed the spread of support across the district, did officers know what percentage of all eligible businesses were in the city area? Susan Robins replied that a general rule of thumb was that the split of businesses was as follows: 30% in the City area, 30% in the wider rural area and 30% in Whiteley.

Page 27. Regarding Organisation Chart and the pre-submitted question, Lisa Kirkman confirmed that recent changes to the organisation chart had been completed within MS Teams. The changes this week with the arrival of a new Strategic Director were being actioned and would be finalised this week and confirmed to members via the DSU. **Action. Officers to action as above.**

Following this, a question was asked regarding the communication to councillors of staff leavers and new starters. Lisa Kirkman explained the current processes around the communication of new appointments and staff leaving and that where this involved senior officers these would be communicated to members.

Page 28. A question was asked regarding two statements on this page “*The full year forecast for 2021/22 is £0.8m favourable compared to the base budget approved in February.*” And “*Excluding the additional park and ride subsidies, income in Q1 was lower than budget by approximately £1.1m with £0.9m relating to lower than budgeted car parking income.*” Councillor Cutler and Richard Botham responded explaining the reasons for the two figures, the forecast reduction in parking income, government grants, the income from HM Courts Service and the differences in demand between city parking and commuter parking. Further questions were asked regarding the potential for future government payments in the event of future Autumn or Winter lockdowns

Page 28. Pre-submitted question “*What is the forecast for the bus subsidies for the full year?*”. Andy Hickman explained that there was no commitment to government bus subsidies post quarter one. As previously mentioned, whilst City centre car parks were performing well, car parks more associated with commuter use were not.

Page 32. It was asked what “Housing Management Special” related to on this page. Richard Botham explained that this mainly related to specific housing services for only certain groups of residents. For example, the running of communal housing or sheltered housing.

Page 33. Pre submitted question “*What has not happened to allow us to reduce the HRA capital programme?*” Richard Botham advised that this concerned changes previously agreed to the capital programme. This related to a reprofiling of the projects which had impacted on the programme for 21/22, for example some schemes would cost less in 21/22 than originally expected. However, all projects remained in the overall programme.

Page 35. Question regarding TCE02 and TCE03. It was asked whether plans were in place to reduce the overall amount of residual waste collected as well as increasing the amount recycled. Councillor Tod and Andy Hickman responded and provided an update on the latest figures concerning grass, batteries, and electrical item collections. Councillor Tod advised that as part of project integra, an active work strand was how to reduce residual waster. **Action. Officers to confirm waste and recycling rates once figures from HCC confirmed.**

A follow up question was asked about combining food and garden waste collections and Councillor Tod replied that he understood the issue to be that there were not the facilities locally to compost food waste and garden waste together and that it was generally environmentally beneficial to collect and compost these separately. He would confirm this with officers at project Integra. **Action. Cllr Tod to confirm the above point.**

Page 35. A question was asked concerning previous issues with the supply of green waste collection bins. Councillor Tod informed that several events had combined to cause these issues, significantly relating to the availability of raw materials. Measures were being taken to avoid a repeat.

Page 36. A question was asked regarding VLE13 (b) and why this figure was so much higher in Q1 compared to previous periods. **Action. Officers to respond.**

Page 40. Following a question regarding VLE02, Susan Robbins explained that the reported figures show the difference in average earnings of residents versus those that work in the district. This data was drawn from NOMIS national data sets.

Page 41. A question was asked regarding VLE006 and whether the data which was currently due in April 2022 could be available sooner because of the Green Economic Development Strategy. **Action. Officers to confirm if the April 2022 date could be brought forward.**

Page 43. Pre-submitted question "*Bar End Depot report page 43 are we able to meet the September deadline?*" The following statement was read out in response "Cabinet delegated the decision of when the site should be marketed, to the Strategic Director. The pandemic created a level of uncertainty over demand from developers which means that the original indicative programme had not been achievable. Furthermore, delay has also been incurred while the Estates team endeavour to resolve several important site constraints and investigate development options for the site. "

In addition, Richard Botham advised of outstanding issues and constraints and that whilst September was not achievable, it was felt that the current calendar year was. **Action. Officers to update timelines in highlight report.**

Page 47. Use of electric refuse freighters. Further to the written response provided, Councillor Tod added that the key issue was vehicle range and that discussions were being had with other authorities to gain an understanding of the practicalities before any plans were put in place.

Page 48. A question was asked regarding staff homeworking arrangements from September 2021 onwards. Lisa Kirkman advised that officers were currently finalising arrangements and would be discussing with the trade union and then confirming with staff early in September 2021. Staff are aware the review was happening in September to respond to changes and updates in July and August relating to office workers.

Page 48. Regarding the statement on this page "*The majority have now been converted to LED lighting.*" It was asked whether the actual percentage converted could be provided? **Action. Officers to report back a more specific figure.**

Page 51. A question was asked about other potential Park and Ride projects. Councillor Tod referred members to the Movement Strategy Stage 2 reports which laid out possible engineering studies for Park and Ride sites including two sites on the Andover Road and two options for proposals on Eastern Lane, Junction 9.

Page 53. Regarding the report statement "*Local Plan update with an emphasis on low carbon housing development*" A question was asked as to why this

element was highlighted as amber whilst the overall Local Plan status was red.
Action. Officers to respond to panel members to explain this variance.

Page 59. CWR. The response to the pre-submitted question refers to the archaeology panel reconvening in September/October 2021 and a subsequent question was asked whether members of the council and/or public would be able to participate in that session? **Action. Officers to respond to panel members on this.**

Page 66. Local Plan. A question was asked that whilst the overall timescale and status was highlighted as red, the individual upcoming milestones were green. Lisa Kirkman responded regarding the differences regarding timescales but would respond to panel members after the meeting regarding the red status for the budget item. **Action. Officers to respond to panel members on this.**

A follow up question was asked on how confident officers were that the Local Plan budget was adequate. Lisa Kirkman informed that resources and budget in connection to the local plan were under regular review and if additional support was required then this could be added to the budget.

Further questions were asked whether the list of development sites would be tabled at a future meeting of full council. Lisa Kirkman advised that the constitution specified which development plan documents were in the remit of council and which were for cabinet and that she would advise members of this. Councillor Cook asked that the minutes record that she felt that the proposed list of development sites should be tabled at a future full council. **Action. Officers to action as above.**

Page 74. Pre submitted question “*Why does the report on the Movement Strategy not indicate the decision in Q1 to not progress with the proposed bus hub detailed in the SPD for CWR?*” Andy Hickman and Councillor Tod responded that he would review the wording used in the quarterly report to align closer with the wording used in the Movement Strategy documents.
Action. Officer to action as above.

Page 77. Sport and Leisure Park. A question was asked regarding the post implementation risk assessment/review, especially concerning aspects of the car park. Andy Hickman advised that officers were currently producing an end of project implementation report and of the ongoing contract management monitoring. The council’s car parking team were currently looking at the car parking feedback including “give ways” and “priorities”. Councillor Clear provided an update and asked that if members of the public had any queries or issues then the simplest route for resolution was to raise these at the time with reception. She also hoped that the initial advisory board meeting would take place in October 2021.

A follow up question relating to a post implementation “lessons learnt” review was responded to by Cllr Clear who confirmed that she would take the issue away.

Following a further question regarding the Wilmot Dixon claim, Andy Hickman advised that two meetings had taken and several issues relating to both contract issues and COVID issues were discussed and were being worked through. The final spend of the project would be reported through future performance panel meetings.

Page 81. Pre-submitted question "*Please can we update the last measure on page 81 for bags and bins?*" Richard Botham informed that this measure related to the previous garden waste collection scheme. Councillor Tod informed that he would take this question away and discuss with officers.

Action. Cllr Tod to action as above.

3. **PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE 14TH JUNE 2021 (15 MINS)**

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed, and no actions were required. It was agreed that the previous minutes and the update to actions be provided to the September Scrutiny meeting.

4. **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING (15 MINUTES)**

Members of the panel agreed on the actions as outlined above. It was agreed that any further updates would be circulated to panel members. The panel did not have any further matters that it wished to bring to the attention of the Scrutiny Committee.

The meeting commenced at 4.00 pm and concluded at 6.20 pm

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank