

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

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor Thomas Dyer, Jaclyn Gibson and  
Simon Walters

**73. Confirmation of Minutes - 3 March 2022**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2022 be confirmed.

**74. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Pat Vaughan declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Financial Performance - Outturn 2021/22'. Reason: His granddaughter worked in the Finance Department of the City of Lincoln Council.

**75. Lincoln's GEO-Sense Footfall Data**

Graham Rose, Strategic Senior Policy Officer:

- a) presented Performance Scrutiny Committee with an insight into the Geo-sense footfall data available to City of Lincoln Council and partners
- b) invited members comments and questions.

Question: Members asked whether the range of the sensors would reach the opposite side of the road if they were placed on the other for example.

Response: The sensors had a good range and could cover a large area. For example, the sensor located outside Boots would cover the area to the railway crossing on the High Street up to M&S.

Question: Members asked if the sensors could recognise if a person had left an area.

Response: The sensors did know when a person had left an area so data could be gathered on how long people were spending in certain areas.

Question: Members asked if the system would know if each person was a new visitor or a repeat visitor.

Response: The system has the functionality to determine whether an individual had been detected before or whether they were a new visitor.

Question: Members asked how repeat visitors could be checked as the only way to recognise repeat visitors was by their MAC address.

Response: Once the MAC address was received by the supplier's cloud servers it was logged into a database and the MAC address was instantly masked - masking means the address was converted into a new unique ID only known by the database. At 3:00 AM everyday all masked addresses were re-masked again using AI and a set of randomly generated alphanumeric characters meaning the MAC address could never be recovered. Officers would forward further information onto Committee Members as to how the system detected new and repeat visitors if their MAC address was not retained.

Question: Was it possible to see where people had travelled from to arrive in Lincoln?

Response: No, we were not able to tell anything about the person.

Question: Members asked the life expectancy of the sensors.

Response: The sensors were purchased with a maintenance agreement attached to them so if one of them failed then it would be replaced straight away. The cost of the system was low.

Question: Members asked if there was any chance of an income stream from this.

Response: No as the data was owned by Lincoln Big.

Question: Members asked whether the system would pick up multiple people if one person walked down the street with a smart phone, smart watch and a tablet.

Response: Yes, this would pick up three people as the system would pick up three MAC addresses from the different devices.

Question: Members asked if signs needed to be put up to say that visitors were entering an area which was monitored.

Response: No as it was no different than providing free WIFI within the City. It was very hard to track a MAC address back to an individual.

RESOLVED that:

1. Information be forwarded to the committee regarding how the system would know that a visitor was a repeat visitor.
2. The contents of the report be noted.

## **76. Operational Performance Report Q4 2021/22**

Robert Marshall, Business Intelligence Analyst:

- a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee with an outturn summary of the council's performance in Quarter 4 of 2021/22
- b) explained that the full report was attached as Appendix A of the report, with the Strategic Measures Dashboard attached as Appendix B and the Annual Measures as Appendix C

c) invited members' comments and questions.

Question: Members asked whether customers arrived at City Hall without appointments booked.

Response: Yes, customers did turn up ADHOC, but we were able to accommodate these customers and there had been no incidences of customers being turned away.

Question: Members asked whether there was still a part-time officer that dealt with allotments to check that they were not overgrown and were being used. Members also asked if residents could apply for an allotment city-wide or just in their catchment area.

Response: Officers would forward this information onto Committee members.

Question: Members asked how the fixed-term post in the Communications team was being funded.

Response: The post was to be funded 50% from the Lincoln Town Deal Fund and 50% from the Western Growth Corridor budget. Lindum were having their own communications post put in place.

Question: Members noted that call waiting times had increased and asked if customers were told to call back or go online.

Response: Customers were pointed while waiting on the phone towards online communication. It was then the customer's choice to wait on the line until an officer became available to answer the call.

Question: Members asked if was recorded when staff left jobs where they moved onto to so that trends could be looked for.

Response: Everyone that left the authority had an exit interview, but they were not obliged to tell us where they were moving to. In the data that we had; trends were looked for.

Question: Members asked for the term 'house refusals' to be explained.

Response: Customers on the housing waiting list had three chances to refuse a property before they were removed from the property list. Our refusal level was quite high.

Question: Members commented that 1400 people were on the housing waiting list and that an incentive to downsize could release three-bedroom homes to be re-let.

Response: Lifetime Tenancies were offered by us which caused some difficulties. Incentives were offered and we were looking at an enhanced package to help tenants move more easily. Sheltered accommodation needed to be reviewed to establish what we could offer.

Question: Members asked if anything could be done to help improve recycling.

Response: Officers would forward this information onto Committee members.

Comment: Members commented that it would be interesting to see the uptake for green bins this year compared to the previous year due to the cost-of-living crisis.

RESOLVED that:

1. Information on whether allotments were checked to make sure they were not overgrown and being used/could residents apply for an allotment city-wide or just in their catchment area/incentives to improve recycling be forwarded to committee members under separate cover.
2. The report be noted and forwarded to Executive for approval.

**77. Treasury Management Stewardship and Actual Prudential Indicators Report 2021/22 (Outturn)**

Colleen Warren, Financial Services Manager:

- a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee on the Council's treasury management activity and the actual prudential indicators for 2021/22
- b) explained that the Council held £49.85million of investments which was £15.95million higher than at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021 as detailed within the investment profile at Appendix A, and section 4.3.
- c) highlighted that the Council's total debt (including leases and lease-type arrangements) at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 was £125,177million as detailed within Appendix A, and section 4.4.
- d) invited members' questions and comments.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**78. Financial Performance - Outturn 2021/22**

Colleen Warren, Financial Services Manager:

- a) presented a report to Performance Scrutiny Committee with a summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the revised budget and how any surpluses had been allocated to reserves
- b) provided information on the Council's:
  - **General Fund Revenue Account** – for 2021/22 the Council's net General Fund Revenue Budget was set at £978,410, including a planned contribution from balances of £477,240, resulting in an estimated level of general balances at the year-end of £2,193,359 (Appendix A provided a provisional General Fund Summary. There were a significant number of provisional year-end variations in income and expenditure against the approved budget. Full details of the main variances were provided in Appendix B.

- **Housing Revenue Account** – the financial performance quarterly monitoring report for the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter predicted an underspend of £31,226. The provisional outturn for 2021/22 now indicated an underspend of £19,339. This would result in HRA balances as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 of £1,025,202. There were a number of forecast year-end variations in income and expenditure against the approved budget. Full details of the main variances were provided in Appendix D.
- **Housing Repairs Service** – the provisional outturn for 2021/22 showed a trading deficit of £427,757, a movement of £286,119. The movement was as a result of the delay in billing of void jobs as highlighted at Q3, which made forecasting the outturn position difficult. Appendix E provided a forecast summary, with full details of the main variances provided in Appendix F.

c) provided information in the following areas:

- **General Investment Programme** – the last quarterly report approved a General Fund Investment Programme for 2021/22 of £11,328,427. Movements in the programme since revised budget approval decreased actual capital expenditure in 2021/22 to £6,631,409. A summary of the budget changes were shown at paragraph 7.2.

The overall cumulative spending on the General Investment Programme excluding externally delivered schemes for 2021/22 was £6,399,908.43 which was 64.21% of the revised 2021/22 programme as per the MTFS 2022-27.

- **Housing Investment Programme** – the last quarterly report approved a Housing Investment Programme for 2021/22 of £19,667,939. Movements in the programme since approval of the revised budget decreased actual capital expenditure to £15,263,968 in 2021/22. A summary of the changes was shown in paragraph 7.9 with a detailed breakdown of the Programme being shown at Appendix L.

d) invited members' comments and questions.

Question: Members asked whether Yarborough Leisure Centre was insured and what the potential loss on income was from disruption during repairs.

Response: We had tried to claim off the insurance companies but were not successful as they didn't cover loss of income. We couldn't claim for leisure centres as they were not part of our income, they were managed by Active Nation. Every avenue that could be explored had been to help mitigate the cost to the Council. We did not pay a management fee to Yarborough Leisure Centre or Birchwood Leisure centre any more as agreed in the contract.

Question: Members asked what money was invested in the Hospitality and Tourism Institute from the Lincoln Town Deal Board money.

Response: This project known as HEAT (Hospitality, Events, Arts and Tourism) was to be developed in Lincoln City. This project was being run mainly through

Lincoln College. The City of Lincoln Council was an accountable body, so it was responsible for passporting the Lincoln Town Deal Fund to projects once the terms and conditions were met. Projects were monitored to make sure that funding was spent correctly.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and forwarded to Executive for approval.

**79. Work Programme Update 2022/2023**

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.

**80. Strategic Risk Register - Quarterly Review**

Jaclyn Gibson, Chief Finance Officer:

- a) presented Performance Scrutiny Committee with a status report of the revised Strategic Risk Register as at the end of the fourth quarter 2021/22.
- b) reported that the strategic risk registers currently contained twelve risks as follows:
  - 1) Failure to engage & influence effectively the Council's strategic partners, council staff and all stakeholders to deliver against e.g., Council's Vision 2025
  - 2) Failure to deliver a sustainable Medium-Term Financial Strategy (that supports delivery of Vision 2025).
  - 3) Failure to deliver the Towards Financial Sustainability Programme whilst ensuring the resilience of the Council.
  - 4) Failure to ensure compliance with statutory duties/functions and appropriate governance arrangements were in place.
  - 5) Failure to protect the local authority's vision 2025 due to changing structures and relationships in local government and impact on size, scale and scope of the Council.

- 6) Unable to meet the emerging changes required in the Council's culture, behaviour and skills to support the delivery of the council's Vision 2020/2025 and the transformational journey to one Council approach.
- 7) Insufficient levels of resilience and capacity exist in order to deliver key strategic projects & services within the Council.
- 8) Decline in the economic prosperity within the City Centre.
- 9) Failure to deliver key strategic projects.
- 10) Failure of the Council's key contractors and partners to remain sustainable and continue to deliver value for money
- 11) Failure to protect the vulnerable in relation to the Council's PREVENT and safeguarding duties.
- 12) Failure to mitigate against the risk of a successful cyber-attack against the council.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Risk Register as at the end of the fourth quarter 2021/22 be noted.

**81. Exclusion of Press and Public**

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item(s) of business because it is likely that if members of the public were present there would be a disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

**82. Strategic Risk Register - Quarterly Review**

Jaclyn Gibson, Chief Finance Officer:

- a) provided members with the revised Strategic Risk Register as attached at Appendix A.
- b) invited members' questions and comments.

RESOLVED that the Strategic Risk Register as at the end of the fourth quarter 2021/22 be noted.