

Present: Councillor Pat Vaughan (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Alan Briggs, Councillor Thomas Dyer,
Councillor Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor
Laura McWilliams, Councillor Donald Nannestad,
Councillor Lucinda Preston, Councillor Christopher Reid
and Councillor Loraine Woolley

Apologies for Absence: Councillor David Clarkson and Councillor Helena Mair

66. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

67. Portfolio Holder under Scrutiny - Quality Housing

Councillor Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing:

a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee covering the following main points:

- Homelessness
- Tenancy Services
- Housing Repairs
- Voids
- Housing Investment
- New Build/Allocations
- Decarbonisation
- Private Sector Housing
- Health

b) invited members' questions and comments.

Question: Members asked how many people were currently in temporary accommodation and how many of these were not within Lincoln.

Response: There were currently 66 households in temporary accommodation, and none were outside the city. Other authorities were using properties in Lincoln which reduced the amount available to us.

Question: Members asked what effort was being made to get money back from void properties.

Response: If it was possible to recharge then we did but this was not always possible.

Question: Members asked whether the target value could be put on the targets, so they knew where we needed to get to.

Response: This was being added for Q1.

Question: Members asked what the main issue was with Housing nationally.

Response: The main issue was down to how many trades people could enter a property at the same time.

Question: Members asked if there was a delay in offering houses due to energy efficiency works taking place.

Response: There was no delay.

Question: Members asked for some buy-back data.

Response: We purchased 8 properties and were in the process of buying another 4 which should be completed by the end of March. We were up to date with spending our receipts so no money would be lost.

Question: Members asked for the presentation again next year as they found it really useful and wanted to know when the data was gathered.

Response: The deprivation data was the most up to date and was from 2019.

Question: Members asked for a breakdown by ward for where the buy backs were and what type/size of properties these were.

Response: This information would be forwarded onto the committee.

Question: Members asked what impact the new fleet provision would have on the reduction of Co2 emissions and what we were hoping from this.

Response: We would benefit from a more efficient fleet as the vehicles were newer. Driver styles were looked at and work took place with operatives to see if there was further scope for improvement or any training needed. If scheduled repairs were working efficiently then this could help improve production and reduce journeys around the city which would then reduce carbon emissions.

Question: Members asked if anything could be done with empty properties that had been empty for a long time.

Response: A lot of the problems were down to executors and wills which made it difficult as we needed to be sensitive given the circumstances. Sometimes owners move out but want to keep their homes.

Question: Members asked how many children were in temporary accommodation and how long it took to help those families with children. Also did we measure how many were classed as disabled.

Response: Peoples needs were addressed before temporary accommodation was offered as we tried to house them as best we could. The allocation model had changed and there were a number of facilities that we no longer used as we felt they were not suitable. There were 52 children in temporary accommodation (not B&B's). There were laws that we must follow that specify the amount of time people should be in temporary accommodation for.

Question: Members commented that Lincoln had the highest suicide rate in the country and asked how we signpost people that may need help and whether we did anything as an authority.

Response: There had been a lot of work carried out to try and find out why Lincoln had a high suicide rate but it hadn't been possible to find out why. This was part of the councils' corporate plan and staff have had suicide awareness training along with knowledge of where to signpost people when needed.

Question: Members asked whether suicides in the prison counted in our figures.

Response: No these were not part of our figures.

Question: Members asked how many void garages we had in the city and how much revenue was lost from these (broken down into wards).

Response: This information was to be forwarded onto the committee.

RESOLVED that:

1. Information regarding locations of buy-back by ward to be forwarded to the committee along with the type/size of the property.
2. Information on how many void garages we had (by ward) to be forwarded to the committee.
3. The report be noted.

68. Interim Christmas Market Outturn Report 2021

Simon Colburn, Assistant Director (Health and Environment):

- a) presented Performance Scrutiny Committee with the financial performance of the 2021 Lincoln Christmas Market
- b) highlighted that the 2021 Lincoln Christmas Market that was held from the 2nd to the 5th of December 2021 was visited by around 270,000 over the 4-day period
- c) explained that there was not an estimate of the economic impact of the 2021 market yet but according to the economic assessment and visitor surveys previously carried out by the University of Lincoln on our behalf:
 - total visitors spend from the event had been estimated in the region of £13m with the direct estimated economic value to the city of £2.5m
 - 42% of the audience were from the local area, compared to 58% being visitors
 - It was roughly an equal split between those that have attended the market before and those attending for the first time
 - Average visitors spend at the market was around £55 – normally split fairly equally between spend in the market and spend elsewhere in the locale
 - The market attracted visitors across a wide range of ages and income levels.
- d) invited members comments and questions.

Question: Members asked whether the impact from the market on car parking revenue was monitored.

Response: Currently we don't have two years of continuous data due to Covid so there was nothing to benchmark. This would be looked at for future.

Question: Members asked what feedback had been given from residents as members had less complaints than they normally did.

Response: A residents briefing took place in August before the market took place which turned out to be a busy event. This briefing seemed to iron out some queries/complaints that may have arisen after the market had taken place. There are some residents that complain every year and we try our best to improve this every year.

Question: Members commented that the price of items was a lot higher than previous years and asked whether this is monitored by us.

Response: We don't set a price limit or any guidelines as the stallholders decide what they charge. There were comments made that items were priced higher than before.

Question: Members asked whether there was a loss in income due to the rain at the park and ride site and what was being put in place this year to avoid a similar incident.

Response: This did cause a loss in income as the park and ride shut at around 11am. Some tickets had to be refunded and we used a company to help motorists out of the mud which cost around £200. The costs were minimal. As the contracts were procured for this year, a specialist parking company will be used.

Question: Members asked whether there could be signs outside car parks when the next market was on to notify motorists that there were no spaces, especially in the central car park.

Response: More work needed to take place around parking, but staff would be put on place to monitor car parks. The Park and Ride is always pushed for as this helped pay for the infrastructure of the market. There were only two streams of income for the market, and these were the park and ride and stallholders.

Question: Members asked for data regarding how many people were impacted by the train issues.

Response: It was too early to say as data wasn't available as of yet. We got a lot of visitors from the Northwest and Yorkshire etc. Data could not be sought from LNER as they only tell us how many extra carriages they put on for the market.

Question: Members asked if the Council was open to sponsorship for the market.

Response: Sponsorship was constantly looked for and a consultant was to be procured to look at sponsorship options. Any sponsorship deals found would be brought before members.

Comment: Members commented that an excellent job had been done with regards to pathways and matting around the Lawn. Members didn't hear any complaints regarding the one-way system this year.

Comment: Residents didn't notice that there were less stalls, but they did notice that they were more spread out, which they liked, as you could see the stalls instead of being overcrowded.

Question: Members asked how much it cost to have the Police and Fire Brigade at the market.

Response: It cost £5500 for the Fire Brigade, Police was £30,270 and Ambulance was £5000.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

69. Section 106 and CIL Contributions Update

Nicola Collins, Heritage and Planning Enforcement Team Leader:

- a) presented Performance Scrutiny Committee with an annual update on Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that had been collected in the last 12 months to December 2021
- b) highlighted that a report was last brought before the committee in June 2021 outlining the Section 106 Agreement amounts for the year up to December 2020
- c) explained that the table in paragraph 4.2 of the report illustrated Section 106 contributions and CIL secured for 2021 up to and including December as a result of new planning applications submitted during that period
- d) explained that the table in paragraph 4.6 of the report illustrated the Section 106 and CIL contributions received during the period from development that had already commenced and met the trigger for payment
- e) invited members' comments and questions.

Question: Members asked whether paragraph 4.3 related to money that had not yet been collected.

Response: The officer confirmed that the money had not yet been collected.

Question: Members asked why money from Riseholme Road was used at Boultham Park as they were not close to each other.

Response: Money always tries to get awarded within the allocated areas but there wasn't always a green project taking place. As Boultham Park was used by all people no matter where they lived in Lincoln it was agreed that this money would be re-allocated.

Question: Members asked whether Section 106 monies that had been collected had been spent.

Response: Historic spends were spent. The Section 106 group make sure that money is spent within the allocated time frames and make sure the spend threshold was not breached.

Question: Members asked whether there would be a Section 106 element for the Western Growth Corridor.

Response: All the development obligations would come through as reserve matters.

Question: Members asked whether Section 106 could be used towards parking at Hartsholme Park.

Response: Funding from Section 106 monies for parking would be difficult as the money had to be for local green infrastructure. There was an aspiration for a project at Hartsholme Park, but this had not been started as yet.

Question: Members asked whether the money allocated to Whitton's Park was nearly lost as it took a long time to come to fruition.

Response: The project was not close to the expenditure date. A number of sites were being evaluated for the funding which took time and in the end, Whitton's Park was selected.

Question: Members asked whether there was limitation of what the money allocated to Boultham Park Medical Practice could be spent on.

Response: There were restrictions, and it must be spent on capital expenditure which was normally the expansion of the practice. Money was kept by us until it is asked for and they must provide evidence that the money would be used correctly before it was released.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

70. Lincoln City Profile 2021/22

Pat Jukes, Business Manager – Corporate Policy:

- a) presented the updated Lincoln City Profile for 2021/22 to Performance Scrutiny Committee
- b) invited members comments and questions.

Question: Members asked how this document was advertised and whether it could be made easily available.

Response: The Lincoln City Profile was put on our website and could also be sent out as a link on the Councillors Briefing.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

71. Targets for 2022/23

Robert Marshall, Business Intelligence Analyst - Corporate Policy:

- a) presented Performance Scrutiny Committee on proposed performance targets for 2022/23
- b) explained that Appendix A detailed the measures chosen to have targets monitored. The targets were developed by the Assistant Directors in consultation with their Service Managers and then confirmed by Directors and Portfolio Holders
- c) invited members' comments and questions.

Question: Members asked whether there was a long-term intention to get the target for voids back to pre-covid levels.

Response: Going forward the pre-covid voids target would be worked towards. As a Council we were performing better compared to other authorities.

Question: Members asked how data was being collected for the new measure added for Customer Services.

Response: An automatic text system was being used for customer feedback rather than the Customer Services Team phoning customers as in previous years.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

72. Work Programme for 2022/23

Clare Stait, Democratic Services Officer:

- a) presented the draft work programme for 2022/23 as detailed at Appendix A of her report
- b) advised that the work programme for the Performance Scrutiny Committee was put forward annually for approval by Council; the work programme was then regularly updated throughout the year in consultation with the Performance Scrutiny Committee and its Chair
- c) reported that items had been scheduled in accordance with the existing work programme and officers' guidance regarding the meetings at which the most up-to-date information could be reported to the committee; the work programme also included the list of portfolio holders under scrutiny
- d) requested any relevant comments or changes to the proposed work programme for 2022/23.

RESOLVED that the work programme 2022/23 be noted.