

## **Appendix 1**

### **Excerpt of Minutes Prosperous Communities Committee 3 June 2025**

Members gave consideration to the Progress and Delivery Quarter Four Report and Summary of Year End Performance for 2024/25, presented by the Performance and Programme Manager. He highlighted to Members there had been some updated figures since the report had been published, those being under Corporate Health:

- COF01 - Budget variance -£1.126m
- COF03 - Overall Council budget forecast outturn -6.68%

The changes came from £56k from minor variances (each under £10k) and £175k windfall government grants. However, both figures were still subject to final audit of statement of accounts.

Additionally, further to the report having been presented for the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee briefing, a requested amendment was for Saturday market data to be included in the performance improvement plan alongside the Tuesday figures.

It was explained that with regard to the overall performance for the quarter, 87% of KPIs were either exceeding or within the agreed tolerance and this was compared to 83% in Q4 of 2023/24 and 78% in the previous quarter.

Members heard that, with regard to the performance improvement plan, there were six measures included. Two measures related to Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs), those being the average number of working days from DFG application to completion of work, and the percentage of DFG referrals completed within 120 working days. It was not expected the performance of those measures would change given the budget position. The third measure was HME07, the percentage of households spending more than 42 nights in bed and breakfast accommodation. This was also expected to remain in the performance improvement plan as the target was set at zero, in line with guidance and what was striven for, however, it was not achievable with the limited temporary accommodation available. Members heard the temporary accommodation project was now in motion which would provide eight additional units, with two of these being outside the Gainsborough area.

With regard to the measure for local land charges market share, it was explained that whilst it was reporting below target, it was accepted that this measure was outside the control of the council. As such, the approved measure sets for 2025/26 had it removed as a target data set, however the detail would remain as a visible statistic within the report. It was also confirmed that the team would continue to focus on maintaining high performance and service delivery.

In addition to markets figures being included in the performance improvement plan, the information had been updated to include updated stalls and layouts, which were due to be delivered in the summer, alongside the opening of the new cinema. A weekly breakdown of markets was included in the year-end report.

The final measure in the performance improvement plan was the Together24 savings delivered, which was an annual cumulative target which was being monitored against the current position.

Members were provided with the details of those measures which had been removed from the improvement plan, including the percentage of Freedom of Information requests (FOIs) completed in 20 days, which was now above target, and the percentage of food inspections completed which was within tolerance.

The Committee received details of the progress and delivery data broken down for each portfolio, highlighting those areas which had been covered within the performance improvement plan as well as those targets which were presenting above target. It was noted that where there had been turnaround in performance, such as council tax collection rates, significant work had been undertaken to achieve those improved results. Narrative summaries were included in the report to provide Members with additional background information.

The presentation was concluded with a summary of the year-end report, which showed that 84% of the Council's KPIs finished either within the agreed tolerance or exceeding their targets for the financial year. This was an increase on the previous year which reported at 81%. A total of 16 measures reported below the target at the end of the year, with six of those continuing to be monitored through the performance improvement plans.

A Member of the Committee raised several enquiries regarding staff absence case management, the average spend per head at the Trinity Arts Centre, the cumulative impact of grant funding for the recipients and associated communities, as well as the review process for targets and measure sets, in order to avoid complacency setting in. In response, Officers explained that information regarding case management processes could be requested alongside more specific information from the Trinity Arts Centre. The Communities Manager advised the Committee there would be a publicly available community impact report exploring the benefits of the grant funding schemes which had been implemented. This would include case studies and would be shared with Members as well as being available on the website. Members were also advised that the measure sets were reviewed annually, with the focus being to strive for continued improvement.

In response to a question regarding the additional eight units of temporary housing which would be made available, and whether that would be sufficient to meet demand, it was explained that whilst the need had fundamentally changed since the business plan for those eight units had been put in place, it was anticipated that as work continued there would be opportunities to review additional options such as working with partner organisations.

The Committee also drew attention to the reduced levels of employee satisfaction reported within the figures. Members heard that there was now a regular report presented to the Management Team from the People Services Manager and there had been areas of improvement noted within the outcome of the peer review, such as improvement to staff training plans. It was also explained that exit interviews were

being monitored, however the wider concerns across the public sector also had an impact on those working within it.

The percentage of abandoned telephone calls through customer services was commented on, with Members hearing that a new contact centre technology had been implemented which provided a fullness of data not previously available. There had been a higher demand through the customer services than anticipated, however there was a full review underway to ensure contingencies were in place to manage that demand. Members acknowledged that communication lines with all local authorities tended to be an area of frustration for residents, it was not only a West Lindsey District Council concern.

A Member of the Committee welcomed the retention of Saturday market figures in the performance improvement plan, noting the level of investment in the marketplace and the desire to continue the growth of the markets and associated local businesses.

In considering the data regarding DFGs contained within the improvement plan, it was enquired whether there could be a further breakdown of information for example the numbers of people on the list and how that impacted both the data sets but also the individuals involved. Additionally, it was suggested that information regarding the location of individuals awaiting DFGs would be useful in building a case for more funding, with the example of delayed hospital discharges or the need to use costly respite care being cited. In response, it was explained that whilst Officers could provide the real time data regarding how many people were on the waiting list, the wider picture often was not available to West Lindsey District Council as the data was held by other organisations such as Lincolnshire County Council. It was acknowledged that there had been membership changes at a county level and as such, it was timely to revisit the debate through the Housing, Health and Care Delivery Group, which oversaw the social elements of the DFGs. Whilst the concerns with DFGs had been a longstanding issue, it was recognised to be an opportunity to address the matter again at a county level.

Further debate regarding DFGs focused on the personal impact to those individuals on the waiting list, with a diminished quality of life being an almost unmeasurable impact, and whether case studies could be used to add weight to the approaches at a county level. It was confirmed that case studies had previously formed a significant part of the data shared when seeking a funding review, however in recognising the changes at Lincolnshire County Council, this was something which could again be revisited.

With no further comments or questions, the Chairman read aloud the recommendations contained within the report. Having been proposed, seconded, and voted upon, it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that

- a) the performance of the Council's services had been assessed through agreed performance measures and areas where improvements should be made had been indicated, having had regard to the remedial measures set out in the report; and

- b) the Progress and Delivery Performance Improvement Plan for Quarter Four (January-March) 2024/25 be approved; and
- c) the Progress and Delivery Year End 2024/25 Report be approved.