

CORPORATE SERVICES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

TUESDAY, 23 AUGUST 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Burbage (Vice-Chairman), Stuart Carroll, Dr Lilly Evans, Lynne Jones, Ross McWilliams, Eileen Quick and Colin Rayner (Chairman)

Also in attendance: Councillor Cox

Officers: David Scott, Simon Fletcher, Rob Stubbs and David Cook.

APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received, although Cllr Carroll reported that if there were any issues relating to Public Health in the IPMR then he would not take part in the discussion.

MINUTES

Resolved unanimously: that the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 15th June 2016 were approved as a true and correct record.

IPMR

The Head of Governance, Partnerships, Performance & Policy (Monitoring Officer) introduced the Cabinet report that recommended that Cabinet note the progress of Q1 2016 key performance indicators.

The Panel were informed that there would be further refinement to the report and thus it should look different by Q2 reporting. Paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 highlighted how Portfolio Members and officers were looking to improving the Council's performance management framework.

Of the 24 key performance indicators 42% were on target 29% were just short and 29% were off target. With regards to the secondary targets 70% were on target or just short. Full details were contained with appendix A and B of the report with remedial action being shown where required.

Cllr McWilliams reported that he would be taking the report to Cabinet and that he had been working with the new Strategy and Performance Manager on making the IPMR more accessible to Members and the public to see how the Council is performing.

Cllr Jones asked for it to be noted that she did not believe that Members who had a Cabinet role should be on Scrutiny Panels. Before the Panel voted on the item the clerk informed that although Cabinet Members could not be on scrutiny panels the Deputy Members and Principle Members could but it was advisable that they did not vote on items under their remit.

Cllr Burbage raised concern about the spend on agency staff, sickness levels and the level of staff turnover. The Panel requested that they be given more detail on staff turnover with the figure of leavers, additional explanations on these adverse trends and additional analysis split

by directorate in Q1 showing how long the leavers had been employed by RBWM and that the Head of HR present at the next Panel meeting.

Cllr Dr Evans was concerned that the table one Summary of Performance was not truly comparative over the quarters as the number and type of KPIs had changed and thus we were not comparing like for like and we did not know if the performance indicators that had been dropped had been good or poor performers. The table for the secondary indicator was also comparing different reporting quarters and thus not a true comparison. Cllr Dr Evans also felt that there should be less but more focused KPIs. It was requested that a revised table be prepared that analysed the same 24 PIs for both quarters. This was considered to be much more meaningful.

Cllr Quick made reference to indicator CS78 – Number of families supported through Troubled Families. There was concern that the indicator was off target and that it did not show the outcomes of the support given and it was recommended that the number of families completing the programme should be added. Cllr Burbage mentioned that there had been national concern in this area and how it should be measured.

Cllr Quick also mentioned that the permanent exclusion from school was reporting 'amber' when given 19 pupils had been excluded it should report 'red' it was questioned why there was no commentary as to why this was not so.

The Chairman raised concern as to why None was the comment on the Intervention Required for SG40 (Child Sexual Exploitation). The Panel were informed that all those young people on the tracker were subject to personalised intervention plans, the Chairman was very concerned and felt that more needed to be done to support these highly vulnerable young people in our community.

Cllr Jones mentioned that with regards to indicator PD12 Enforcement Cases that it was mentioned that there was a need for additional resources yet only a few months ago she had been informed that there was sufficient resources. There was also no mention of what the case load was for the team. The Chairman raised concern that there was an ongoing issue with Planning and officers informing residents that there was a resource issue; poor planning PIs had been reported for a number of quarters

The Chairman raised concern and was very disappointed about KPI LE8 Grounds Maintenance Contract Performance. Concern was raised that the contract had been awarded to the existing supplier but performance had significantly dropped, The Panel were informed that although it was the same contractor the new contract had increased performance levels and this had been difficult for them to achieve; officers were working closely with the contractors and performance was very slowly improving. It was not expected that this target would be met by year end due to the poor Q1 results. Members asked officers to report on what penalties, if any, had been imposed. It was suggested that the public or Ward Members could provide more feedback on none delivery in their local area.

Cllr Burbage raised concern about the drop of income from parking (SAMA04) and did not feel that this was all down to Windsor Coach Park as the report mentioned there had been a drop of income by 25% in one month against the target. Simon Fletcher agreed that it was suspect that one car park would have such an impact and he would look into that quarter's performance.

It was questioned if the installation programme for new parking payment equipment being delayed had effected Parking income and as it was perceived that on street enforcement was down was income being lost from car parks especially in Windsor in the evenings. The mayor had made complaints concerning the lack of enforcement on the Guildhall island in the evenings.

The issue of car park cleaning was also raised and Cllr Cox replied that he had been informed today of this issue and had tasked officers to investigate.

With regards to Planning the Chairman raised concern with other Borough Panel Members regarding the poor performance of the department delivering the Local Plan on time and that it was still reporting 'amber'. Concern was also raised that reasons given on some indicators still mentioned lack of resource and that this had been an ongoing issue for a number of years.

For PD12 Enforcement Cases it was questioned what type of cases were delayed and how did that compare to the same period last year. Panel Members mentioned that the public were claiming to Ward Members that it was taking too long for enforcement officers to respond to reported breaches.

Cllr Dr Evans mentioned that the explanation given for LA14, library and museum income was not helpful. The Panel supported that had there been better profiling of the target it may not be shown as such an issue.

The percentage of care leavers in education, employment or training (EET) it was questioned if the data given was correct as it was showing the percentage not EET rather than the percentage who were EET.

It was also noted that there was no comments provided for Delayed Transfers.

Resolved unanimously: that the Corporate Services O&S Panel considered the report and fully endorsed the recommendations to Cabinet (Cllr McWilliams refrained from voting due to his role as Deputy Portfolio Member). The Panel thanked Members and officers for producing the report but Members were concerned about the indicators reporting 'red'; particular concern was raised about:

- **CS78 – Number of families supported through Troubled Families.** The Panel were concerned that the indicator was off target and that it did not show the outcomes of the support given and it was recommended that the number of families completing the programme should be added.
- **SG40 Child Sexual Exploitation.** Although the indicator reported it was on target for Q1 there had been an increase of the number of young people on the tracker and thus concern was raised that the report showed no action being required.
- **Planning.** Concern was raised that reasons given on some indicators still mentioned lack of resource and that this had been an ongoing issue for a number of quarters. There was also concern that the Borough Local Plan was still reporting 'amber'.
- **LE8 Grounds Maintenance Contract Performance.** Concern was raised that the contract had been awarded to the existing supplier but performance had significantly dropped.

The Panel also discussed and raised concern about the drop of income from parking (SAMA04) and did not feel that this was all down to Windsor Coach Park, permanent exclusion from school was reporting 'amber' when given 19 pupils had been excluded it should report 'red' and percentage of care leavers in education, employment or training (EET) it was questioned is the data given was correct as it was showing the percentage not EET rather than the percentage who were EET. It was also noted that there was no comments provided for Delayed Transfers. Members would like to have a comparison of the types and numbers of enforcement cases currently open compared to the same period last year.

The Panel also recommended that Table 2 KPIs off target should have a column added showing the initials of the Portfolio Holders and Strategic Directors responsible for the

reported indicators and that the Panel would expect the Portfolio Holder and Strategic Directors to attend future Panel meetings if performance had not improved.

With regards to Table 3: Options, the Panel endorsed option 2 and 3 subject to seeing the new look IPMR at a future meeting.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Cox for attending the meeting to answer questions concerning his Cabinet portfolio. The Chairman was disappointed that no one from planning or the cabinet member for planning had attend the meeting to answer questions concerning their poor performance.

FINANCE UPDATE

The Head of Finance / Deputy Director Corporate & Community Services introduced the report that provided an update to Cabinet on the Council's financial performance in 2016-17.

Services were currently projecting a £145k under spend. An additional £75k under spend was reported on non-service budget lines. There was therefore an overall under spend of £220k on the General Fund.

The Panel were informed that the Council remained in a strong financial position with healthy reserves. The Council's Development Fund currently had a balance of £1.104m. Overall our combined General Fund Reserves sit at £6.278m in excess of the £5.27m recommended minimum level set at Council in February 2016.

The Chairman noted that under Corporate and Community Services the report mentioned the loss of commercial rent income was anticipated with two units of Waldeck House being let to charities and four units in use by the Council for storage. The Chairman asked for an update to be sent to the Panel on what charities let the properties.

The Chairman also asked for information to be circulated on what the funds being allocated on Forest Bridge School were for, as this was a free school.

The Chairman also raised concern that the budget for Early Help & Safeguarding continued to be under pressure and questioned if sufficient budget gets allocated each year and if there should be some built-in contingency fund for the challenging area so requests for additional budget did not have to be repeatedly made to Cabinet.

Cllr Carroll asked for clarification on the two classifications for the reserves and was informed that there was usable reserves and unusable reserves; the useable reserves could be used to support council services such as the General Fund whilst unusable funds (such as Schools Balances) were restricted to specific areas.

Cllr Jones mentioned that at the last Panel meeting it was requested that a Part II section be added to the report detailing known liabilities and risks; such a section had not been added.

Cllr Burbage questioned where the £455k balancing the Development Fund had come from and was informed that this was due to the receipt of the Transition Grant given by Government for the significant level of reduction in funding received for the 2016/17 financial settlement

Cllr Dr Evans suggested that the report would benefit from an additional column being added to show what the actual spend was to date.

Cllr Burbage mentioned that he had previously questioned how effective the authorities budget setting process was as there seemed to be a lot of amendments throughout the year. The Panel noted that where there were in year changes they would be reported in this update report.

Resolved unanimously: that the Corporate Services O&S Panel considered the report and fully endorsed the recommendations to Cabinet. It was recommended that as a new Head of Finance/Deputy Director Corporate & Community Services had been appointed that this was a good opportunity to review the report to make it clearer. The Chairman suggested that it would have been useful to have the report printed in colour with negative figures in red to make it clear.

After the meeting the following update was emailed to Panel Members:

At the last meeting of the Corporate Services O&S Panel Members asked for clarification on a couple of issues during discussing the Financial Update report, I have been provided with the following information:

- *For the units let at Waldeck House who were the two charities?*
 - *Unit 3b – Maidenhead Drama Guild*
 - *Unit 13a – Maidenhead Cycling Hub*
- *Why was the Council passing over funding to the Forest Green School?*
 - *Forest Bridge school was looking for a new location. A potential site was at Berkshire College of Agriculture. The council has agreed to share the risk with the EFA by match funding £100,000 for a planning application. Other potential sites are under consideration including Braywick Park, therefore the money is not yet being spent. The school is unable to take any more pupils after September 2016.*

REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE PANEL

The Chairman had requested that this item be considered to see if the Panel's recommendations to Cabinet had been implemented. The Chairman informed that he would like to see it clearly marked in reports when Panel recommendations had been acted upon and not just a note that they had been accepted.

The Clerk informed that it would not always be possible to add the Panel's comments to Cabinet reports as the Cabinet agenda was often published prior to the Panel meeting. It was noted that the Democratic Services Manager collated Panel comments and these were circulated to Cabinet and all Members.

Cllr Jones agreed it would be useful for Panels to get feedback from Cabinet on the recommendations that they make.

The Chairman said that Cabinet should make it clear when they have agreed with Panel recommendations, when they have not an explanation as to why not should be given. It was requested that the Democratic Services Manager raise this with Cabinet.

The Panel held a Part II discussion providing an update on the CCTV and community warden element of the June 2016 Cabinet report on Delivering Services Differently in Operations and Customer Services. It was recommended that an appropriate minute be added to Part I to note the discussion had taken place and that further details on these issues would be brought back to Cabinet and to the Panel as the Delivering Differently agenda was progressed during the year.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on items 8-9 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 6.35 pm, finished at 8.30 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....