

Appendix 3

Extract from the Prosperous Communities Committee Meeting held on 4 December 2018

56 PROGRESS AND DELIVERY PERIOD 2 2018/2019

Members gave consideration to a report which assessed the performance of the Council's services through agreed performance measures, as at the end of Period 2. Members were asked to review performance and recommend areas where improvements should be made, having regard to any remedial measures already included within the report.

The report summary was structured to highlight those areas that were performing above expectations, and those areas where there was a risk to either performance or delivery.

Areas described as performing well included:

- * Contract Management and Procurement
- * Customer Services
- * Financial Services
- * Garden Waste
- * Trinity Arts Centre
- * Healthy District
- * Street Cleansing

Those areas described as risks included:

- * Asset and Facilities Management
- * Development Management
- * Enforcement
- * Markets
- * Regulatory Services

Further information was given on each of the above.

Debate ensued and with reference to performance indicators around Healthy Districts, a Member questioned whether the indicator measures were enough and provided the level of detail Members required. For example, some Members were keen to closely monitor the number of participants through the Health Hub, as its introduction had been controversial. Members would have also welcomed the opportunity to review the types of activity on offer, the programme of events and the level of take up. It was understood free memberships were being offered and it was suggested that this could be skewing figures.

In response, the Executive Director of Operations advised that the Committee were due to receive a report at their next meeting relating to the Leisure Contract and such information could be included within that.

Similar comments regarding the activity of the Trinity Arts Centre were expressed, with some Members expressing concern that the performance indicators were solely financial and profit orientated. It would be useful to understand the breadth of the activity being undertaken, how young people were being engaged, the variety of the offer and those attending the Centre.

In response the Executive Director of Operations acknowledged that the performance indicators did have a financial focus as ultimately the Centre covering its costs was a necessity. He undertook to request the Centre Manager to respond to the points raised and this information would be shared with all Committee Members.

The Chairman advised that the Leisure Culture Events and Tourism Group regularly looked at such matters and such information was readily available. Members spoke highly of the new Centre Manager's passion and enthusiasm for the Centre's success.

In responding to Members' questions, Officers advised that Development Management fees were difficult to predict and the introduction of the Local Plan had seen the number of large scale speculative applications reduce.

In response to a Member's question it was confirmed the take up rate for green waste collections in Market Rasen was 47.8%.

Members questioned why the cost of the average DFG appeared to be rising and were advised that costs in general were increasing together with the number of more complex applications. It was likely the target would need to be reviewed. Officers were in the process of developing a countywide framework for the commissioning of such contracts; this would address pricing consistency and provide greater stability around budgeting.

With reference to the Plough Inn, which had been a venture to support new small businesses, Members noted the report advised that there had been a number of recent "notices to quit", Members therefore enquired how the asset was marketed, and who the marketing was directed at, as they considered the units came with a number of attractive features, Officers undertook to provide this information outside of the meeting to all Committee Members.

Regarding homelessness and enforcement, both of which were in areas deemed to be "in the red" a Member enquired as to whether this was due to a lack of resources. In responding Officers advised additional resources were always welcome however there was strong sense that the measures were not accurately reflecting what was happening within the service. This was something that had been picked up in the recent audit into Enforcement. Members had been provided with some additional information which presented the data within context, noting that if long standing open cases (which were not been worked on) were removed from the data set, the time frame for all other cases was significantly reduced. However it was stressed that the demand, particularly in planning enforcement, was both consistent and continuous.

Having heard Members' comments throughout the debate, the Executive Director of Operations advised that all measures were reviewed annually. Measures would not be amended in year as this did not assist with comparative work. This review process

included meeting with every team manager to ensure their targets were still appropriate and providing meaningful data. There was also a small working group of Members convened annually to assist Officers in setting new targets. Members were encouraged to engage in this process, in order to ensure future targets were reflective of needs, whilst balancing the need to not over collect data.

RESOLVED that having critically appraised the performance of the Council's services and key projects through agreed performance measures, and having had regard to the remedial measures suggested in the report, and the information provided in response to Member questions, no further formal action be requested at this stage.