

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held remotely on Tuesday, 14 July 2020 commencing at 4:30 pm

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor K J Cromwell
Councillor J W Murphy

and Councillors:

G J Bocking, C L J Carter, P A Godwin, H C McLain, P D McLain, H S Munro, J K Smith,
R J G Smith, P D Surman, S Thomson and P N Workman

OS.1 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1.1 The Chair advised that the meeting was being held under the emergency provisions of the Coronavirus Act 2020 and, specifically, the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. The meeting was being broadcast live via the internet, it was not being recorded by the Council but, under the usual transparency rules, it may be being recorded by others.

OS.2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.
- 2.2 There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

OS.3 MINUTES

- 3.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

OS.4 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT - QUARTER 4 AND FULL YEAR 2019/20

- 4.1 The report of the Head of Corporate Services, circulated at Pages No. 16-60, attached performance management information for quarter four of 2019/20. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was asked to review and scrutinise the performance information and, where appropriate, identify any issues to refer to the Executive Committee for clarification or further action to be taken.
- 4.2 Members were advised that this was the final quarterly monitoring report for 2019/20. Progress against delivering the objectives and actions for each of the Council Plan priorities was reported through the performance tracker, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, which was a combined document that also included a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). This was the last report in relation to the 2016-20 Council Plan; the next performance tracker would be based on the new Council Plan 2020-24 which had been approved by Council on 28 January 2020 and included two new priority areas in relation to sustainable environment and

Garden Towns. As set out at Paragraph 1.3 of the report, Members were reminded that, in business as usual times, the performance tracker was supported by a range of financial information; however, as a result of the response required to the COVID-19 pandemic, both internal and external resources had been redeployed and there had been an impact on timescales associated with the closedown of the Council's accounts. In addition, the valuations and estimations required to produce an outturn position had been complicated by the unknown impact of COVID-19, as such the national timetable for completion of the accounts had been moved from July to November and the Council's own internal timetable had been adjusted to allow the outturn report to be presented to the Executive Committee at its meeting on 8 July 2020.

- 4.3 Key actions for the quarter were highlighted at Paragraph 2.3 of the report and included the Council's commercial property portfolio being bolstered by the acquisition of a further two properties; the success of the Growth Hub in terms of providing support to the business community in tackling the impact of COVID-19; the submission of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan to government for examination; and the commissioning of a strategic review to look at the Council's tourism provision. The Head of Corporate Services reminded Members that, due to the complex nature of the actions being delivered, it was inevitable that some would not progress as smoothly or quickly as envisaged and the details of these were set out at Paragraph 2.4 of the report. It was noted that the latter period of the quarter also saw Council services being heavily affected by COVID-19 and resources being prioritised to deal with the response which had resulted in some actions being suspended.
- 4.4 In terms of the KPIs, Members were informed that the status of each indicator was set out at Paragraph 3.2 of the report. From the 17 indicators with targets, eight had been achieved and nine had not been achieved. KPIs where the direction of travel was down, and the indicator was below target, were set out at Paragraph 3.3. of the report and these included KPIs 12, 13 and 14 in relation to planning performance; KPI 27 regarding absence management and KPIs 28 and 29 with regard to waste and recycling. Key areas where KPIs were performing particularly well were included at Paragraph 3.4 of the report and specific reference was made to KPI 7 in relation to the number of visitors entering the Growth Hub and KPIs 21 and 22 in respect of the average number of days to process new benefits claims and change of circumstances claims.
- 4.5 During the debate which ensued, the following queries and comments were made in relation to the Performance Tracker:

Priority: Finance and Resources

P29 – Objective 3 – Action a)
Deliver the aims and objectives of the commercial property investment strategy – A Member sought clarification as to the number of properties that had actually been purchased as the information within this report conflicted with the financial report that had been considered by the Executive Committee the previous week.

The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that this was a timing issue - the information within the performance tracker reflected quarter four of 2019/20 and the commercial premises had not been acquired during the 2019/20 financial year. Since that time, the acquisition of an industrial park in Tipton had been finalised and contracts had also been exchanged in relation to a premises in Crawley. He believed these would be the Council's final two purchases given the impact of COVID-19 on various commercial sectors and due to restrictions on borrowing from the Public Works Loans Board.

P29 – Objective 3 – Action b)
Undertake a review of the discretionary trade waste service to ensure it is operating on a viable commercial level – A Member noted that the target date for this action had been changed numerous times and he sought assurance that the new date of September 2020 was achievable.

The Head of Community Services explained that the most recent delay was as a result of COVID-19 and a meeting had been held with the Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE), which had been appointed to undertake the review, to discuss the market analysis just three days prior to lockdown. All businesses had subsequently closed so it had been impossible to make contact with them in order to carry out the analysis. He confirmed that work had now restarted and would tie in with the business surveys being carried out on the High Street. Whilst September would be too early to bring forward the full business case as originally planned, an update would be provided to the Committee at its meeting on 1 September 2020.

P31 – Objective 4 – Action b)
Disposal of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (MAFF) site – A Member recognised that this was linked to the Parking Strategy Review and noted that the Working Group had not met since February.

The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that he had started work on a revised timetable for the review and it was proposed that a Working Group meeting be held in September to seek Members' views as to whether the work to date could be continued or if there was a need to start from scratch. As such, the timeframe for the review would be dictated by Members and the approach they wanted to take.

A Member expressed the view that the MAFF site was also connected to Spring Gardens and the regeneration of Tewkesbury town centre – both sites had been problematic prior to COVID-19 and he felt they could be even more of an issue going forward. In his view, it was important to find the right solutions and he raised concern that the new target date of October 2020 would not be achievable. The Head of Finance and Asset Management was in complete agreement and explained that the new target date had been set before Officers fully understood the impact of COVID-19 on resources; as such, Members could expect this date to change in the quarter one performance tracker once a realistic timescale had been established through working with consultants and Members.

Priority: Promoting and Supporting Economic Growth

P32 – Objective 2 – Action a)
Deliver employment land through the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and Tewkesbury Borough Plan – A Member noted that the date for the JCS had been revised again having previously been amended twice and questioned whether this was realistic. In addition, he asked how many employment sites would be changed to housing, as was the case in Longford where a site designated for employment land had now had an application approved for housing.

The Interim Head of Development Services explained that this action had initially been based around a less extensive review of the JCS; however, things had moved on and a full JCS review was now required. In addition, there had been an initial delay to allow recruitment to a key post within the Planning Policy team to enable the review to be undertaken. She had spoken with the Planning Policy Manager and JCS Manager who were confident that consultation would take place before Christmas. She explained that a lot of evidence-based research had been programmed to support the review prior to consultation so this target date was considered to be reasonable given the scale of the JCS and the amount of work that went into bringing the programme forward. Notwithstanding this, the national policy statement that was coming forward later in the month could have an impact on the timeframe.

In terms of employment land, she advised that this would be brought forward within the JCS review and would be underpinned by a significant amount of evidence-based research. The strategic sites had not been identified as yet although the Tewkesbury Borough Plan was due to be examined and significant weight could be attached to the policies within it. Planning applications coming forward were being dealt with on their own merits.

P36 – Objective 5 – Action b)
Review the tourism resources to maximise the tourist provisions in the borough – A Member questioned why the independent tourism review had not been commissioned given that the original target date for completion was April 2019 which had subsequently been changed several times and had last been reported as March 2020 therefore should have been relatively unaffected by COVID-19.

The Interim Head of Development Services explained that her understanding was that a significant amount of discussions had been taking place internally, particularly with respect to the Tourist Information Centres; however, she would provide a briefing note to update Members more fully following the meeting. The Deputy Chief Executive advised that the Community and Economic Development Manager was the lead officer overseeing this work; however, the review was a commissioned piece of work and the proposed consultants had a good amount of experience in the area having done similar reviews for Cheltenham Borough Council and other local authorities. He recognised this was a workstream prior to COVID-19 and would need to find out why the review had not been commissioned earlier and report

back to Members outside of the meeting.

Priority: Growing and Supporting Communities

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>P38 – Objective 1 – Action a)
Work with partners to undertake the required reviews to the JCS – A Member noted that the commentary stated that the target date had been amended from spring 2020 to reflect more up-to-date timescales and he sought clarification as to the reason for the timescale slipping.</p> | <p>The Interim Head of Development Services confirmed that the revised target date of winter 2020 was a realistic timescale and she reiterated her earlier point that the intention had originally been that this would be a review of the existing JCS as opposed to a full scale JCS review coming forward. She confirmed that the amendment to the timetable was not related to COVID-19 and was for programme management and resourcing reasons. The Member felt this should have been explained in the commentary and the Interim Head of Development Services undertook to ensure the tracker provided a more comprehensive explanation in quarter one of 2020/21.</p> |
| <p>P43 – Objective 3 – Action b)
Achieve the Council's affordable homes target by working with local housing providers – A Member noted that 191 affordable homes had been delivered within the year against a target of 220 and he queried whether affordable homes in urban extensions, such as Brockworth, counted towards Tewkesbury Borough Council's figures or Gloucester City Council's figures. He raised concern that if it was the latter, there would be less and less space within the borough for affordable homes and he questioned what the long term impact of that would be and if the target for this action should be reduced accordingly.</p> | <p>The Head of Community Services confirmed that anything being built within the urban extensions did count towards the figures for Tewkesbury Borough as its residents had equal status to bid on those properties. Longer term, he suggested there would be a need to report this as a separate KPI so that Members could easily see what had been delivered within the urban extensions and that was something which could be considered during the development of the new Housing Strategy.</p> |

P44 – Objective 4 – Action a)
Develop a programme to work with landlords to ensure residents have a supply of rented properties to meet their needs – A Member noted there had been three placements under the scheme but the information did not set out how many people needed rented properties, as such, it was impossible to know whether this action was being achieved and if the smiley face attributed to it was justified.

The Head of Community Services advised that six placements had now been made. The number of people on the housing register currently was 1,108 but not all of those people would be suitable for private rented accommodation. The pilot scheme was about providing incentives to encourage private sector landlords to accept more tenants and it was intended to bring a report on this to a future meeting of the Committee so Members would receive more detail in due course.

Key performance indicators for priority: Growing and supporting communities

P47 – KPI 10 – Total number of active applications on the housing register – A Member indicated that the breakdown of bands i.e. emergency, gold, silver and bronze totalled 1,676 which was not equal to the quarter four outturn which was stated as 1,775.

The Head of Community Services explained that this was due to a timing issue; banding changed on a daily basis so the information needed to be extracted from the system at the same time as the number of applications. He apologised that had not been done on this occasion and undertook to ensure the figures were extracted at the same time when producing future reports.

Priority: Customer Focused Services

P50 – Objective 1 – Action b)
To continue to proactively enforce against enviro-crimes including fly-tipping and dog fouling in accordance with the action plan – A Member wished to thank the Environmental Health team for their hard work during the lockdown period when there had been increased incidents of noise complaints and fly-tipping etc. The feedback he had received from the way Officers had been supporting people, particularly in respect of noise, had been very positive.

The Head of Community Services undertook to pass thanks on to the Environmental Health team on behalf of the Committee.

P50 – Objective 1 – Action d)
Review our Advice and Information Centres (AICs) - A Member expressed the view that the AICs were duplicating some of the services that were provided through other methods, for example, the Community team and Members, and he felt that a review needed to be carried out as quickly as possible.

The Head of Corporate Services advised that the AICs had been reviewed by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee Working Group on two occasions in the past and it was felt that another review was timely to establish whether they were providing value for money given that the landscape for customer engagement had changed significantly in recent years. He felt there was probably a difference in the role played by the Customer Services Advisers who worked in the AICs and that of Members and Community Services Officers and advised that some of their tasks included things such as taking payments and collecting housing benefit applications etc. but he took the point that there may be other ways to do this which offered more value for money. Whilst it had originally been intended to establish another Working Group to carry out a review, COVID-19 was likely to have a significant impact on the Council's budget going forward and the AICs may be one area where savings could be made, as such, it may now be more appropriate to consider the AICs as part of the revised budget proposals. The Head of Finance and Asset Management echoed these comments and advised that work on the new Medium Term Financial Strategy was due to start later in the month. There would undoubtedly be some serious financial pressures as existing budget pressures had been exacerbated by COVID-19 and the Council would have some difficult decisions to make over the next 12 months to three years.

P52 – Objective 3 – Action a)
Explore options to provide online public access to interactive planning policy information maps – A Member raised concern that the target date for this was now March 2021; given that it was an action to 'explore options' as opposed to actually delivering anything he was surprised that little progress had been made.

The Interim Head of Development Services accepted this point and undertook to clarify the wording so that Members understood what had been achieved to date and what was proposed going forward.

P52 – Objective 3 – Action b)
Introduce the option for
paperless billing for Council
tax and business rates – A
Member noted that, at the last
Overview and Scrutiny
Committee meeting,
Members had been informed
that this had been delayed
due to an issue with a third
party and he questioned
whether any financial costs
incurred would be recovered.

The Head of Corporate Services confirmed there had been an issue with the contract supplier and discussions were ongoing between One Legal and the supplier's legal team; he undertook to provide an update on the outcome of those discussions as part of the next performance management report. He went on to advise that an in-house solution was on the cusp of being launched for the ad-hoc billing prior to COVID-19 but those resources had been redeployed elsewhere. He was hopeful of a solution being in place in time for the main billing run in February 2021.

Key performance indicators for priority: Customer focused services

P54 – KPI 18 – Number of
reported enviro-crimes – A
Member was disappointed to
note the increase in fly-tipping
and abandoned vehicles and
questioned whether there
was a particular reason for
this during the quarter.

The Head of Community Services indicated that no intelligence had been received to explain the increase which had been experienced countywide, although closure of the Household Recycling Centres at the end of the financial year may have had some impact. He provided assurance that prosecutions and court cases were being advertised and promoted so he did not think this was a reason for the increase, although that did not make it any less disappointing. It was noted that the restrictions at the Household Recycling Centres were being eased with additional timeslots being introduced so they would soon be operating at full capacity.

P57 – KPI 27 – Average
number of sick days per full-
time equivalent – A Member
raised concern that the
average number of sick days
per full time equivalent for
2019/20 was 12.6 which
seemed quite high particularly
compared to the national
average of 4.4 per employee.
She noted that this had been
attributed to the amount of
long term sickness absences
but she sought assurance
about the amount of short
term absences and whether
next year's target could be

The Head of Corporate Services indicated that he could not comment on the national average but he understood that the average number of sick days within the public sector was eight in accordance with the Council's target for 2019/20. The situation was improving in quarter one of 2020/21 with the average number of sick days currently being reported as 2.09 per full-time equivalent; if COVID-19 related absences were removed this would be as low as 1.58 days per full-time equivalent. He reiterated that long term absences had impacted on the figures for 2019/20 and, unfortunately, there had been a lot of significant illnesses which could not have been avoided but he was pleased to report that a lot of the staff affected had now

more ambitious.

returned to work. All KPIs and their targets were being reviewed as part of the new performance tracker so the suggestion to set a more ambitious target for sickness absence would be considered as part of that.

A Member indicated that the biggest issue was actually short term sickness which had seen a 40% increase between 2018/19 and 2019/20. He questioned how much of this was down to sheltering due to COVID-19 and how short term sickness was controlled and monitored. In response, the Head of Corporate Services explained that the new HR Manager had been in post since December 2019 and had been tasked with looking into ways to improve short term sickness absence. He provided assurance that the Council had a robust Absence Management Policy and HR worked closely with Managers to ensure due process was followed if the triggers within the policy were hit. He advised that 29 days were attributable to COVID-19 and they only related to people who could not physically work; those who were sheltering or symptomatic but able to work were not included.

P58 – KPI 28 – Percentage of waste recycled or composted – A Member questioned whether the percentage was actually down or whether this could be attributed to the amount, for instance, if it was based on weight then things such as manufacturers making packaging lighter could be a contributing factor, and he queried whether it was being measured in the most accurate way.

The Head of Community Services confirmed that the KPI was based on the percentage of waste that went for recycling and was the standard measure used by the government to set targets. The national target for England was 50% and the average for Gloucestershire was 44% so Tewkesbury Borough Council continued to perform well comparatively; he pointed out that 43% more waste – both residual and recycling - had been collected during April and May 2020. He was unsure how helpful information on weight would be but was happy to include this in the narrative if Members so wished. He suggested that the sad face attributed to this KPI may be misleading as Tewkesbury Borough was within the upper quartile in the country and exceeded the national 50% target for 2019/20.

4.6

A Member noted that the financial information had been reported to the Executive Committee the previous week and he had been surprised to learn of the significant Ubico overspend. His understanding was that this had been addressed and he questioned whether other local authority partners were having a similar experience. In response, the Head of Finance and Asset Management confirmed that the Ubico overspend had been anticipated. He advised that £100,000 had been set aside within the Council's reserves as an extra resource for grounds maintenance and an additional £50,000 had been incurred on the depot allocation which had been agreed in the early part of 2019/20 after budget-setting and reflected the increased usage of the Swindon Lane Depot due to new vehicles and separating out of rounds

etc. In terms of the remainder, approximately £80,000 related to corporate costs which had been identified in year and was also an issue for other authorities within Ubico. The Managing Director of Ubico had attended Executive Committee to explain the reasons for the overspend and Officers were now happy with the way things were accounted for and reported. Once these issues had been removed, the overspend was actually quite small and reflected things such as a vehicle purchase in the autumn. The Head of Finance and Asset Management recognised that the overspend was disappointing but he provided assurance that a lot of it had been known about and taken care of, either within the budget or as a result of a much enhanced reporting regime.

- 4.7 The Chair asked that thanks be passed on to all staff on behalf of the Committee for their hard work during the COVID-19 outbreak; the way they had communicated and continued to carry out their jobs, alongside other tasks which were not business as usual, had been very impressive. The Deputy Chief Executive undertook to pass this on and he wished to thank Members for their ongoing support during this difficult time. The day to day contact and local intelligence that Members had fed back about community and voluntary groups etc. had been invaluable in aiding the COVID-19 response.
- 4.8 In terms of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme going forward, the Head of Corporate Services explained that COVID-19 had inevitably had an impact on future Agenda items and a revised Work Programme had subsequently been pulled together for consideration by the Corporate Management Team the following week. The revised Work Programme would be brought to the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting for approval. The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that there was a need to reprioritise key workstreams and a revised performance tracker would be presented to the Committee to illustrate the proposed changes. Going forward, the recovery plan tracker would be presented alongside the performance tracker on a quarterly basis so the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would have full oversight of the actions being undertaken and could monitor progress over the coming months. The Head of Corporate Services confirmed that the next performance management report would be brought to the Committee on 13 October, as opposed to 1 September, in order to allow adequate time to review the KPIs and to compile the new recovery tracker.
- 4.9 Having considered the information provided, it was
- RESOLVED** That the performance management information for quarter four of 2019/20 be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 5:40 pm