

Present: Councillor Gary Hewson (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Pat Vaughan, Councillor Thomas Dyer,
Councillor Adrianna McNulty, Councillor Lucinda Preston,
Councillor Anita Pritchard, Councillor Emily Wood and
Councillor James Brown

Also Present: Councillor Naomi Tweddle, Leader of the Council and
Portfolio Holder for Climate and Corporate Strategy
Councillor Bob Bushell. Portfolio Holder for Remarkable
Place

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Natasha Chapman and Councillor Neil Murray

28. Confirmation of Minutes - 15 August 2024

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 August 2024 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as an accurate record.

29. Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee Minutes - 8 August 2024

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Housing Scrutiny Sub Committee held on 8 August 2024 be received.

30. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Pat Vaughan, in the interests in transparency, wished it be noted that his grand-daughter worked in the Finance Department at the City of Lincoln Council.

31. Related Matters

Councillor Gary Hewson, Chair of the Performance Scrutiny Committee advised Members that Councillor Naomi Tweddle, Leader of the Council was in attendance at the meeting.

As Climate Change would be included within her changed responsibilities from the former Portfolio Holder for Our People and Resources to Portfolio Holder for Climate and Corporate Strategy from 2025, she was in attendance to offer contributions and answer questions regarding future Climate Change strategic projects.

32. Portfolio Holder under Scrutiny - Remarkable Place

Councillor Bob Bushell, Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place:

- a) presented a report to give an update on the Council's current progress towards the Vision 2025 strategic plan, together with updates on each service area under the Portfolio of Remarkable Place
- b) presented his report regarding activity and achievements within his portfolio, covering the following main areas:

- Introduction
- Parks and Open Spaces – General
- The Arboretum
- Boultham Park
- Hartsholme Country Park/Swanholme Lakes and the Camp Site
- Commons
- Hope Wood
- Allotments
- Equipped Play Areas
- John Dawber Gardens
- Events and Activities
- Education
- Volunteering
- Arboriculture
- Travellers
- Local Landscapes, Hidden Histories
- Street Scene
- Infrastructure
- Waste/ Recycling
- Street Cleansing
- Graffiti
- Compactor Bins
- Shopping Trolleys
- Public Toilets
- Food, Health and Safety
- Licensing
- Community Centre and Recreation Grounds
- Sport and Leisure
- Lincoln 10K
- Local Air Quality Management
- Bereavement Services

c) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

The Chair offered his thanks to Bob Bushell, Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place, for his extensive and thorough report. As a result of discussions, the following points were made: -

Bob Bushell, Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place: Offered his thanks to officers, particularly Steve Bird (Assistant Director, Communities & Street Scene) and Simon Colburn (Assistant Director Health & Environmental Services), for the remarkable work carried out and took the opportunity to champion the work of such an extensive portfolio.

Comment: Performance Scrutiny Committee had previously requested that the Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place report be presented later in the year and as such, this was the reason why the first quarter data only, was available.

Bob Bushell, Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place: Wished the Chair of the Arboretum Advisory Group well in advance of his departure from his post His hard work and commitment had been very important and was recognised with gratitude.

Thanks were also offered to two recently resigned members of Boultham Park Advisory Group. Thanks were offered to them both for their work and dedication. Successors to the post were wished well.

Comment: Thanks were offered for an excellent report and congratulations given for the green flag awards for Arboretum, Boultham Park, Hartsholme Country Park and Hope Wood.

Question: How many ordinary burials apart from cremations had there been, in particular green burials?

Response: The city did not have the facilities for green burials and as such, there had not been any. Individuals could be referred to green burial areas.

Question: Was the Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place responsible for taxi drivers and hackney carriages?

Response: Yes.

Question: Was it possible to remove UBER drivers from operating in the city?

Response: UBER drivers were legal operators, and although more prevalent within the city were within regulations. It was noted that a lot of UBER drivers were licensed from Birmingham or Wolverhampton and the City of Lincoln Council (CoLC) did not have close oversight although there was communication between Birmingham, Hull and Lincoln.

Question: The presence of UBER drivers within the city affected local operators who had struggled. Could something be done nationally? The system was not a fair system as Lincoln taxi drivers underwent a knowledge test within the city.

Response: Discussions nationally had been ongoing regarding the regulation of UBER. UBER drivers operated within the free market and local operators may be required to reconsider their pricing if UBER drivers had undercut them. Reference was made to the local knowledge test in Lincoln and it was confirmed that the element would form part of the national debate.

Question: Reference was made to food take away deliveries carried out in cars and on motorbikes. How was it ensured that food remained hot and safe when it was delivered?

Response: Food was regulated up to point of sale however when food was placed into transport containers, there was no control over that. As a professional body, the City of Lincoln Council (CoLC) pushed for regulations with regard to deliveries to be considered. The preparation of the food fell under the regulations, not the delivery.

Comment: The report was fantastic, very detailed and thanks were given to officers. Members commented that the work within the parks had been very positive and the support offered to volunteers of the John Dawber Gardens was wonderful.

Response: The success evidenced was owed to staff and volunteers. Individuals worked with enthusiasm and were proud of their job/vocation.

Question: Thanks were given to officers for the speed in which reports of abandoned trolleys had been dealt with. They were clearly not belonging to a specific individual given the branding. What action could be taken to tackle the issue?

Response: The company that owned the trolley was responsible for it. It was not possible for officers to enter a garden to remove a trolley. The preference was for

supermarkets to take responsibility and for their trolleys not to be removed from site in the first instance. Anecdotally, it was not in the supermarkets interests to recover trolleys. The Council retained powers within private dwellings. If a trolley was within the public domain, it could be removed and a number of different notices could be served.

Question: Reference was made to compactor bins on page 50 of the report. Was there a commitment to roll additional compactor bins out in the city? If so, where would they likely be situated and what was the basis of any commitment in terms of data and statistics?

Response: The compactor bins had been a very successful trial. The future of additional bins was dependent on the outcome of the trial and would likely be located in areas of high litter levels. The city had a total of ten compactor bins that ran through the main strip of the city. The bins were very expensive; it was not cost effective to go right across the city.

Supplementary Question: Was there a guarantee on the bins? How long were they expected to last?

Supplementary Response: The bins were on a 5-year rental programme and were intended to be insitu long term. They had proved extremely popular and worked well.

Question: Reference was made to the new offer of a separate food waste service planning for all households in the city by April 2026. There was no mention of paper waste. Were there plans to roll out paper waste collections within the city? Other districts had already implemented paper and card waste collections.

Response: Discussions had taken place regarding a future paper and card collection offer. A report would be presented to the Executive by the end of the year.

Supplementary Comment: A date for the report had not been confirmed which appeared vague.

Supplementary Response: It was a part of the decision-making process and was a matter of timing with multiple factors. It was important that the scheme was a success once implemented. Lincoln and South Holland had not implemented the scheme, and it was widely understood that implementation was different for Lincoln due to tight urban areas. There were many areas to consider which would be drawn out in the report which would be ready later in the year.

Comment: Lincoln was one of the last tranche of Council's to implement the scheme which presented an opportunity to consider situations in other areas, things that had worked well and things that could be improved.

Response: Lincoln had an opportunity to ensure that the scheme was introduced in the correct way for its success to be ensured.

Comment: It was noted that there was a policy review underway in regard to Long Leys for memorials. A large number of memorials made maintenance difficult.

Response: A report in relation to Long Ley's memorials would follow later in the year. Consideration would be given to how some facilities had been extended and how that impacted the maintenance of the site. The site was built on a hill with clay grounds.

Comment: Members were pleased the County Council appeared to be taking responsibility for bus shelters. It was hoped that facilities would improve.

Question: Members welcomed the review carried out further to the sad issues experienced at Lincoln Crematorium earlier in the year. Was a time frame known for when the report would be available for members to view? People were anxious that the issues did not occur again. A tour of the crematorium whereby implemented changes could be viewed and reassurance offered, would be positive.

Response: There was currently both an internal and external investigation. Until both investigations had been completed, the report would be awaited. An action plan had been written up and was implemented.

Question: Did supermarkets pay for the recovery of abandoned trolleys?

Response: Yes.

Question: Was an estimated timeframe known for the County Council agreement in regard to bus shelters?

Response: Proposals had been submitted to the County Council and were with their legal department for consideration and agreement.

Question: Was there anything specific that could be done to see an improved rate of recycling?

Response: Education was important to ensure that contamination was prevented which was better for the environment and cost the CoLC less. Enforcement was important as well as one contaminated refuse lorry contaminated the entire lorry load. There were certain areas more likely to put out contaminated bins and those areas needed to be targeted to ensure that residents acted responsibly.

Comment: Fly tipping seemed to occur in the same places. Reference was made to the BIFFA contract on page 29 of the report. It would be positive for members to assess what would be included in the contract in 2026. It was a good idea for a meeting of all members to be arranged whereby members could be informed what would be included within the new contract.

Response: Workshops had been prepared and members input sought. There were three monthly meetings with contractors where issues could be raised and reported. The contact documentation was weighty, and plans had been made for the preparation of a summary report which could be circulated to members to include pertinent day-to-day issues.

Comment: Reference was made to the percentage waste recycled and composted on page 44 of the report. Recycling rates had deteriorated over the years. It was not always easy to ensure that people placed the correct waste in the correct bins however it was a poor reflection on the contract.

Response: The contractor had not changed. The issue resulted from what individuals placed into their bins. The Council did not have a recycling officer anymore, but recycling encouragement continued. Strict enforcement would be necessary for an improved rate.

Comment: Reference was made to rewilding of the city on page 30 of the report. Wild flowering at Maxwell Avenue was a concern. There were substantial green areas that backed up from Maxwell Avenue to Tritton Road, areas used for exercising dogs etc. Consultation with local residents should take place prior to any works being carried out. The green areas were vital within the city.

Response: Consultation had taken place previously and the responses were positive; individuals wanted to see rewilding. Areas and paths would be cut for them to be used in the widest possible sense. Feedback received would be reported.

Comment: Tree maintenance had previously been a difficulty, but trees appeared to have prospered well this year. We had a duty of care to maintain trees and it was hoped that maintenance had improved from the first quarter of the year.

Response: The contractor had been challenged. There had been staffing difficulties which continued to be improved at regular management meetings.

Question: Reference was made to the play equipment within the Yarborough area. It was hoped that the equipment would result in improved lifestyle and health. Would any money be received by CoLC from the contractor at Yarborough?

Response: The equipment was purchased upfront and Active Nation planned to pay it back over the next 5-year period. The contractor would not receive full ownership until the last payment was made.

Comment: There had been a great deal of fantastic work. The portfolio was a difficult portfolio to measure performance. The report was fantastic.

RESOLVED that the annual report be noted with thanks.

33. **Addressing the Challenge of Climate Change - Vision 2025 Progress Update**

Councillor Gary Hewson offered his thanks to Kate Bell, Climate Change Manager for her hard work during her years employed by the City of Lincoln Council. It was highlighted that Kate Bell had been an asset and would be deeply missed. She was wished well in future employment opportunities.

(Note: Steve Bird left the meeting at this point in proceedings).

Councillor Bob Bushell, Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place:

- a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee with an update towards addressing the challenge of the Climate Change Strategy Priority contained in Vision 2025
- b) explained that Appendix A of the report provided an overview of the current and live projects for this strategic priority
- c) highlighted that there were 12 projects that were currently being monitored in the work programme for Climate Change and these were listed within the report
- d) invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Question: Thanks were offered for a fantastic report. Was it possible to increase media coverage on the work that had taken place on Lincoln Climate Commission? It was useful for people to be aware of the important initiatives.

Response: It would be positive to raise the profile of the Commission through communications and media which included work from University of Lincoln and Bishop Grosseteste University.

Question: Reference was made to electric vehicle infrastructure on page. 79 of the report. Had specific areas been targeted to ensure sufficient future provision?

Response: On street electrical vehicle points were something funding had been hoped for years ago. Sadly, that had not happened however the Council endeavoured to add charging points to car parks within the city in order that individuals that lived in terraced houses could access those at a particular rate without paying for parking. Additional provision would likely take place in more densely populated areas.

Question: Reference was made to the Air Quality Management plan on page. 81 of the report. Was the 3% increase of transport carbon associated with post Covid-19? Was it possible to benchmark against similar sized cities?

Response: Air quality and benchmarking was useful. It was difficult to achieve figures, like for like. The Eastern Bypass and the increased level of electric vehicles on the road helped figures. Busy roadways in the past with standing traffic had been shifted in order that traffic moved and didn't pump out as much pollution. The 3% figure included green gases.

Comment: Reference was made to nitrous oxides, O₂ and particulates. Whilst one increased, the other decreased. Nitrogen Dioxide was harmful when inhaled however the rate had improved which resulted in the proposal of the removal of the air quality area. Figures had been low for four consecutive years. There was a legal requirement to report air quality management data. Broad data was achievable as monitoring took place across a number of pollutants.

Question: Reference was made to work with partners on the Lincoln Climate Commission and Lincoln Climate Action Plan on page 78. of the report. Confirmation was requested that the information referred to the city geographically and not the CoLC as an organisation. Were there figures available for the organisation?

Response: An environmental performance report was published yearly, audited externally and published on the Council's website. A new baseline was set in 2018 and since then, emissions around transport and electricity usage as an organisation, had reduced.

Supplementary Question: Where had the organisation gone from the baseline?

Supplementary Response: Approximately 40% since the baseline.

Question: What challenges had to be overcome between the present and 2030 in order for net zero to be achieved? How confident was the organisation that net zero would be achieved as a wider city, by 2030?

Response: There was a lot of work to be done, and retrofitting was expensive. The previous Government had not been committed to climate change in the same way that the new one was. The original motion for net zero 2030 had not included work with Government and Lincolnshire County Council for the vision to be achieved. It was hoped that central Government would provide funding further to their commitment to climate change.

Question: What had been put in place to ensure that the housing stock reached net zero?

Response: The housing business plan contained information in regard to retrofitting and vehicle stock would be replaced as and when possible.

Question: How likely was it that the target of net zero 2030 would be achieved?

Response: The CoLC remained committed to net zero by 2030 and it was a positive target.

Supplementary Question: What steps had been taken to ensure that the target would be met?

Supplementary Response: The policies that had been put in place would help the target to be achieved.

Comment: In terms of funding, it was disappointing that the previous Government had not demonstrated its commitment to climate change. Overall numbers had reduced however the CoLC building was very old and inefficient; there were also complications the way the build had been constructed and its location. Net Zero 2030 was a target within the original motion and the CoLC remained committed to the achievement of the target. The Climate Commission work was excellent. It was disappointing that Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) voted against the local plan however movement in the right direction at speed was visible. It was not possible to guarantee that the 2030 target would be met however an assurance was offered that it was a commitment and ambition. It was hoped that other partners such as LCC would work collaboratively. Climate ambitions had been evidenced within the Western Growth Corridor development. The Leader of the Council would work with the MP for Lincoln to ensure the creation of a greener future for Lincoln.

Question: Thanks were given for such a detailed report. What sort of projects were expected to come out of the community energy scheme and if successful, would it be rolled out?

Response: Funding had been secured for the initial feasibility study. Testing capacity considered what businesses were in the area and what land was in the area that could be used to generate energy. The idea was that stage 2 funding would do further works to ensure it was brought forward to the planning stage. The third stage was a capital funding announcement expected imminently. What happened in Sincil Bank and Long Leys could be replicated in other areas because of the geography.

Question: What did social housing decarbonisation entail?

Response: A recent announcement had been made about a new funding scheme. The name would be changed to 'More Homes Local Grant,' for old privately owned and rented properties to retrofit fuel inefficient homes. Individuals with an income under £36K a year would be eligible. The second announcement was a scheme for retro fitting social housing and discussions with consultants would take place. The target was to get to a C rating. Most Councils and Housing Associations had D, E and F ratings however we were a lot further ahead.

Supplementary Comment: A lot of houses in the St. Giles area were 1930's builds.

Supplementary Response: There was a mixture of C and D rated homes. Prefabricated homes were likely to be D rated.

RESOLVED that the report be noted with thanks.

(Note: Kate Bell and Councillor Naomi Tweddle left the meeting at this point in proceedings).

34. Portfolio Holder under Scrutiny - Reducing Inequality

Councillor Sue Burke Portfolio Holder for Reducing Inequality:

a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee regarding activity and achievements within her portfolio, covering the following main areas:

- Welfare and Benefits Advice

- Welfare Reform and Cost of Living Support
- Housing Benefit/Council Tax Support
- Discretionary Rate Relief Policy
- Financial Inclusion
- Safeguarding
- Skills and Training
- Allocations, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping
- Asylum Seekers and Refugees
- Neighbourhood Working
- Equality and Diversity
- Public Protection and Anti-Social Behaviour Team (PPASB)
- CCTV Service
- Lincoln Community Lottery
- Lincoln Social Responsibility Charter

b) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

The Chair offered his thanks to Sue Burke, Portfolio Holder for Reducing Inequality, for her extensive and thorough report. As a result of discussions, the following points were made: -

Question: Reference was made to Safer Streets Funding at paragraph 12.3 of the report on page 110 of the agenda pack, and CCTV installed on the way into the Scampton site. Were there any plans for the CCTV to be moved to a location where it could be used?

Response: Consideration would be given to the suggestion and information provided further to the meeting.

Question: As a percentage, how much had inequality reduced?

Response: A percentage figure was not known however the CoLC remained extremely dedicated in the name of serving residents well.

Comment: It was difficult to measure performance within the portfolio in the absence of performance data.

Question: How many visits through the door of Sincil Bank neighbourhood working had taken place?

Response: The information was contained within the report and was approximately 4000.

Supplementary Question: Were visits direct visits to City Council services?

Supplementary Response: Advice was given by CoLC but also facilitated other services such as Citizens Advice.

Question: Many years ago, a discussion had taken place with regard to neighbourhood working in Sincil Bank. When was the review due to take place?

Response: The Rose Regeneration report was awaited further to an evaluation of the scheme which considered what had worked well, what lessons could be learnt and what was transferable. The report was key and once received, a Members workshop would be arranged in order that it could be considered.

Question: Reference was made to Enforcement Action within Appendix A of the report. Was that a direct results of the work within the Portfolio or city wide?

Response: A great deal of work had taken place on fly tipping within Sincil bank and CCTV had been installed. Consideration had been given to enforcement action in Sincil Bank.

Comment: It would be useful for figures to be presented to Performance Scrutiny Committee in order that comparisons could be made and improvements seen.

Response: It would be helpful for officers to be given a clear definition of the period data required for each Portfolio Holder report.

Comment: Data would be included within the quarterly performance reports for each area, and in November, side by side comparisons could be made.

Question: Reference was made to CCTV installed for fly tipping hotspots. Could a similar scheme be introduced in other areas of the city. How successful had it been?

Response: CCTV had helped however it was no fail safe solution. There had been some success and it would be kept under review. When there was a future opportunity for funding, plans would be considered.

Comment: As a Committee, statistics were important as they were a measure of how well the Council had performed.

Response: There were some issues which were difficult to directly measure with numbers. Officers continued to find ways of demonstrating differences. It was difficult for the change in quality of life and people's wellbeing to be measured, although not impossible. If an improvement in health of an area e.g. life expectancy was seen, it was difficult to evidence via data in the short term but was better longer term.

Comment: The issue was about measurability. The average processing time for benefits was one measure and the CoLC were approximately 6/7 days ahead of the national. We had a small cost of living support team and there was no target on phones calls, some of which were difficult conversations. However, a one-hour call had the potential to lead to an improved quality of life although that was difficult to measure.

Comment: Reference was made to safeguarding figures on page 102 of the agenda pack and the dramatic rise over the years was noted.

Response: Figures had increased however it was evidenced that recognition of problems and intervention of appropriate support, had improved.

Supplementary Comment: Officers were successful in the identification of individuals that required support and signposting effectively.

Comment: There were elements that lent themselves to qualitative data which could include testimonials from people. A narrative at the beginning of the report would be helpful. Performance could be measured in a variety of ways and some statistics could be skewed.

Question: Reference was made to microchipping under Enforcement within Appendix A of the report. Could further information be provided?

Response: If the CoLC became aware that a dog was not microchipped, the owner would be serviced with a notice but it had not become necessary. A dog would be microchipped at a kennel further to collection. Cats were not collected as strays as it was not a statutory responsibility however the action taken would be the same if a cat came into possession.

Comment: A discussion had taken place previously in regard to qualitative and quantitative data. It was important that a customer continued to receive the best possible service, and it was not possible that calls be rushed.

Comment: Safeguarding figures had been introduced for the first time on a quarterly basis. It was not possible for the outcome of calls to be shared in a public forum. However, many of these calls were dealt with and supported by officers.

Question: Reference was made to childhood obesity. There were only 5 local authorities in the country worse than Lincoln in regard to childhood obesity. Was there anything more that could be done?

Response: Childhood obesity was a very important issue and links could be drawn between obesity and poverty. It was often cheaper to buy poor quality food and education around food nutrition was important. The issue required closer consideration. The Community Grocery carried out fantastic work.

Comment: Through various grants, the 'Go Grow' scheme had been supported which taught individuals how to cook healthy food at low costs, approximately feeding a family for £1. The scheme had been a real success.

Comment: Performance measure fell under a national public health profile. Councillor Donald Nannestad, Portfolio Holder for Quality Housing, sat on the County excessive weight group which fed into the LCC Health and Wellbeing Board. There was a wide stream of work delivered by Public Health and Children's Services etc. There was a physical activity strategy, and football pitches, cricket pitches and green areas had been provided. Statistically, there was strong correlation with obesity and lack of physical activity.

Comment: Themed work around poverty and an anti-poverty strategy agenda was considered at recent meetings of the Community Leadership Scrutiny Committee (CLSC). Poverty and Health and Education would be considered by CLSC in the future.

Question: Reference was made to Rough Sleeping at paragraph 8 on page 102 of the agenda pack. Rough sleeping had increased within the city. Was the rise caused by early prison releases?

Response: Within the first tranche of the early release scheme, four individuals had been released into Lincoln. Officers worked with The Probation Service prior to their release. The next tranche of early releases would take place in October, for individuals that had served more than 5 years. Officers had not been informed that any individuals under the second tranche would be released into Lincoln. It was hoped that individuals released early from prison could be assisted into supported accommodation on the day of release. In order to be counted as a rough sleeper, as per Government guidelines, individuals had to have been bedded down, and Lincoln had approximately 12-13 rough sleepers. There was a fine narrative of what a rough sleeper actually was.

Question: Reference was made to Lincoln Embracing All Nations (LEAN) at paragraph 10.7 on page 105 of the agenda pack. Who had paid for the three newly appointed members of staff?

Response: LEAN was not a CoLC organisation and as such, there was no cost to CoLC.

(Note: Councillor Bob Bushell left the meeting at this point in proceedings).

Comment: Reference was made to Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) at paragraph 12.5 on page 111 of the agenda pack. There were no figures for achievement of enforcement.

Response: There was a city centre team that worked wider than only the city centre. Dedicated staff concentrated on the city centre. If behaviour were to be identified, individuals would be signposted however enforcement powers were retained.

Comment: Figures would be circulated further to the meeting.

Comment: Staff were well coordinated to ensure that behaviour such as aggressive begging and the public consumption of alcohol were dealt with. Some of the lifestyles were chaotic and at times, it was difficult for individuals to be engaged with. The Drug and Alcohol Treatment Team, CCTV, Anti-Social Behaviour Team and the Police were engaged and continued to work collaboratively on the issues.

Comment: Reference was made to the number of live cases open at the end of the Quarter (across full PPASB service) on page 120 of the agenda pack. It was disappointing that figures had worsened with 2 additional staff members.

Response: Employment of additional staff resulted in the identification of more issues, and it was a part of improved reporting. Businesses within the city centre and Bailgate had been encouraged to report into the Council. Therefore, additional reporting activity had been generated. Some cases were not closed quickly as they could be very complex.

RESOLVED that:

1. Figures in relation to the enforcement of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO) be circulated further to the meeting.
2. Feedback in respect of potential relocation of CCTV installed on the way into the Scampton site be provided to members.
3. The contents of the annual report be noted with thanks.

(Note: Councillor Thomas Dyer left the meeting at this point in proceedings).

35. Vision 2025 - Remarkable Place Progress Report for Year 5

Simon Colburn, Assistant Director Health & Environmental Services:

- a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee with an update on the *Let's Enhance our Remarkable Place* strategic priority within Vision 2025
- b) confirmed that the strategic priority fell within the remit of two Portfolios - Economic Development (Heritage and Culture) and Remarkable Place
- c) added that there were a number of key projects that the City Council had progressed over the last year or were in the process of delivery. The timescales of some projects were such that they would be continued beyond the current Vision 2025 period

d) highlighted the main projects as follows:

- a. Consolidation of an entirely new events programme for the city
- b. Hope Wood
- c. Heritage Action Zone (Complete)
- d. Leisure Strategy Work
- e. Preparations for New Refuse Collection, Street Cleansing and Grounds Maintenance Service
- f. Greyfriars
- g. Harlequin
- h. Local Landscapes, Hidden Histories (formerly called Lincoln's Green Museum)

e) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

The Chair offered his thanks to Simon Colburn for the report and update.

RESOLVED that the content of the update be noted with thanks.

(Note: Paul Carrick and Matthew Hillman left the meeting at this point in proceedings).

36. Protecting Vulnerable People Update

Emily Holmes, Assistant Director - Strategic Development:

- a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee with a summary of the key issues, trends and statistical data associated with Protecting Vulnerable People in the city
- b) confirmed that the performance information demonstrated the Council's continued compliance with statutory safeguarding requirements
- c) added that the report provided a means by which statutory compliance could be monitored and provided an opportunity to impart key information on current and emerging public safety concerns within the city and surrounding areas

d) highlighted the key topics which included:

- a. Training
- b. Key Service Changes in 2023/24
- c. Safeguarding Children and Young People
- d. Safeguarding Adults
- e. Domestic Abuse
- f. Internal Safeguarding Referrals
- g. Prevent
- h. Audit
- i. Corporate Safeguarding Policy
- j. Service Priorities in 2024/25

e) welcomed comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

The Chair offered his thanks to Emily Holmes for the report. As a result of discussions, the following points were made: -

Comment: The section 11 Audit was important as the screen rating received was 100% which was fantastic. There was a real breadth of spread of knowledge of referrals received across services. The Housing Repairs Team reported issues, and the level of awareness was very good as it demonstrated that reporting had taken place.

Question: Thanks were offered for the detailed and thorough report. Was it possible to email further questions into officers.

Response: Questions further to the meeting were welcomed.

RESOLVED that the content of the report be noted with thanks.

37. **Work Programme 2024-25**

The Chair:

- a) presented the draft work programme for 2024/25 as detailed at Appendix A of the 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 2024/25.

Comment: It was difficult for two Portfolio Holder reports to be considered during one meeting. It would be best avoided where possible in the future.

Comment: Consideration should be given to reporting on agency workers which came with an associated cost. The preferred approach was the retention of Council staff.

(Note: Councillor Sue Burke left the meeting at this point in proceedings).

Comment: Both the CoLC and the Development Group had carried out considerable reviews across services, training needs and succession. The reviews would be summarised in a report that would be presented to Performance Scrutiny Committee and agencies, retention, and 'growing our own' would be included within the report. Lincoln was not alone in the challenges faced with recruitment and retention, particular those with technical skills and qualifications.

RESOLVED that the work programme 2024/25 be noted.