

**Present:** Councillor Gary Hewson (*in the Chair*),  
Councillor Pat Vaughan, Councillor David Clarkson,  
Councillor Thomas Dyer, Councillor  
Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Adrianna McNulty,  
Councillor Clare Smalley and Councillor Loraine Woolley

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor Lucinda Preston and Jaclyn Gibson

**69. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were received.

**70. Performance Measure Targets for 2023/24**

Graham Rose, Senior Strategic Policy Officer:

a) presented to Performance Scrutiny Committee for review the performance measure targets for 2023/24 in advance of the targets being presented to Executive

b) advised that the council currently had a set of strategic performance measures in place used to monitor the performance of the Council, these measures included a mix of targeted quarterly and annual measures, together with a number of volumetric measures which were used for contextual purposes

c) stated that those measures performing above or below target were highlighted within the quarterly Operational Performance Report as success stories or measures of concern requiring further monitoring/action

d) highlighted that for 2023/24 target setting; some measures had seen their targets reduced due to increasing financial pressures on the council, resource impacts, recruitment pressures and the cost of living crisis - all of which would inevitably continue to impact on performance, however, in some cases the targets had been increased where some improvement in performance was expected.

e) welcomed questions and comments.

Question: With regards to the new measures, was the Central Car Park included in the income figures as a percentage of budget requirement even though it wasn't a pay and display car park?

Response: Officers advised that they would check this information and feedback to the committee.

Question: Were the Hykeham Road allotments included in the percentage occupancy of allotment slots?

Response: Yes, they were quoted at 94% occupancy but usually this figure was 96%. There were always allotment plots being re-let so it was never 100%.

Question: With regards to waste, could it be measured volumetrically instead of percentages? In the past KG was used as an indicator.

Response: Officers advised that they would check this information and feedback to the committee.

Members queried why percentages were given as a response from the Citizens Panel rather than figurative measures and felt that this would give a more accurate reading.

Response: Officers advised that going forward a breakdown would be provided to give members a clearer view of responses. It was confirmed that a review would be undertaken in the new municipal year and it had been added to the work programme for June 2023.

RESOLVED that:

1. A figurative breakdown of responses from the Citizens Panel be provided at future Performance Scrutiny meetings.
2. Information be sought on whether the Central Car Park was included in income calculations as a percentage of budget requirement even though it wasn't a pay and display car park.
3. Information be sought on whether waste could be measured volumetrically instead of in terms of percentages.
4. The performance measure targets for 2023/24 be noted.

## **71. Christmas Market Outturn Report 2022**

Simon Colburn, Assistant Director for Health and Environment:

- a) provided Performance Scrutiny Committee with a report on the performance of the 2022 Lincoln Christmas Market
- b) explained that the Lincoln Christmas Market was held from Thursday 1st December to Sunday 4th December 2022 and was visited by around 320,000 people over the 4 days, making it the busiest Lincoln Christmas Market in history
- c) stated that there continued to be challenges post the covid pandemic in securing the number and variety of stalls required for the event
- d) referred to the budget outturn for the 2022 market outlined at 2.4 of the report
- e) welcomed members comments and questions.

Question: Unbudgeted costs weren't necessarily unplanned. Could the planned unbudgeted costs be adjusted to reflect overspends?

Response: Officers to source this information through the Finance team.

Question: Were negative comments only received from visitors who attended the market on Saturday?

Response: The responses that were received were mixed as a lot of people who went on Saturday complained on the Sunday.

Question: Was there any data to show the increase in car parking over the period of the Christmas Market?

Response: In the week following the market car parking numbers were down by 20,000 based on the weekend of the Christmas Market and the following week remained at the same level. Overall parking figures for all 3 weeks following??? the Christmas Market were positive.

Question: Was the one way system around the market a common occurrence?

Response: The one way system wasn't enforced unless it was really busy but due to the volume of people visiting the market this year the one way system was put into place even on the Thursday night.

Question: How did the calls and complaints at this year's Christmas Market compared to previous years?

Response: Officers to seek out this information from the team and feedback to the committee.

Members made the request that aside from only hearing negative comments following the Christmas Market, that all positive comments be circulated also.

RESOLVED that:

1. Information be sought from the Finance team with regards to the planned unbudgeted costs
2. Information be sought showing the comparison of calls and complaints that were received this year against previous years of the market.
3. Positive comments received by members of the public be circulated to the committee.
4. The content of the report be noted.

## **72. Work Programme 2023/24**

Jess Cullen, 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, subject to the following addition for the 2023/24 municipal year:

- Citizens Panel Review – June 2023