

Performance Scrutiny Committee – Member request monitoring table

Date of committee – 8 December 2022

Action No.	Name of committee report	Information requested / question asked	Member name	Officer responsible for providing response	Date response provided	Response
1	Addressing the Challenge of Climate Change	Members asked what work was included in the £30k to improve the efficiency rating in council housing.	Cllr Clarkson	Kate Bell	9 Dec 2022	<p>£30k is the likely cost to upgrade a C or D rated home based on a review of costs provided by EQUANS, who have delivered the Social Housing Decarbonisation Scheme (SHDS) for Leeds City Council. In addition we now have a good understanding of energy efficiency costs as a result of the Home Energy Upgrade scheme which we are delivering in the private sector and has included several former council homes. Typical measures include external wall insulation, top up loft insulation and Solar PV which can raise the EPC to a B but at the moment are costing between £20-£30k. For a D and above rated property the SHDS will only cover 30% of total costs so the LA has to provide 70% match.</p> <p>The next step is to carry out a retrofit assessment of a sample of council homes to understand the exact measures and costs in more detail. Matt Hillman is dealing with this and I am available to offer any further support required.</p>

2	Portfolio Under Scrutiny: Customer Experience and Review	Members commented that it caused concern that 18k of the working population were students in the city and asked if this effected the resident population with regard to how many jobs were available. How did we compare to other university cities.	Cllr Clarkson	Simon Walters	12 Dec 2022	<p>As requested, please find attached spreadsheet which shows the breakdown of age population for 18-24 year olds (student population) and 18-65 year olds (working age population) for Lincoln compared to our CIPFA nearest neighbours that are classed as university cities together with the additions of Nottingham and Derby.</p> <p>Conclusions to be drawn from this data are as follows:</p> <p><u>18-24-year-olds (student population) – Please see first chart in the attached</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincoln’s highest age group in this selection is 20 year olds making up 4.1% of the population (4,283 people) Lincoln’s lowest age group in this selection is 24 year olds making up 1.6% of the population (1,629 people) Nottingham has the highest figure in this selection with 4.4% of the population being made up of 19 year olds (14,134 people) Overall out of the 8 cities, Lincoln, Exeter and Nottingham are considered to have a higher student population. Student population in Norwich is lower than these 3 areas however sits above Worcester, Gloucester, Preston and Derby which all appear to have very low
---	--	--	---------------	---------------	-------------	--

						<p>percentage levels of student age residents</p> <p><u>18–65-year-olds (working age population) – Please see second chart in the attached</u></p> <p>Due to the volume of data in this selection, it is difficult to plot this clearly however the chart does provide some useful visualisations of the key differences and similarities in the data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As shown in chart 1, the student age population in Lincoln, Exeter, Norwich and Nottingham is of a higher percentage than student age population in Worcester, Gloucester, Preston and Deby • Focusing on the full age range of 18-65, the ages 18-24 have a significantly higher percentage of residents than any other ages within this data set in the cities Lincoln, Exeter, Norwich and Nottingham • From the age 25 onwards across all 8 cities, the population levels in each age group appear to show a similar pattern
3	Portfolio Under Scrutiny: Customer Experience and Review	Members raised concern regarding the Lincoln Project Management Model (LPMM) across the council and quoted extracts from Audit Committee on 19 July 2022	Cllr Clarkson	Simon Walters	13 Dec 2022	<p>In response to these concerns I can confirm that :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Vision 2025 Theme groups have been re-established and are monitoring the projects

		which stated that the LPMM was not being followed.				<p>within each theme group area, including ensuring compliance of the project managers with the LPMM. At the last two Performance Scrutiny Committee meetings, Members will have seen reports from the theme groups covering Economic Growth, Remarkable Place and Sustainability</p> <p>b. There has been, and continues to be, reduced corporate capacity to assist with the continued embedment of LPMM. The Policy unit, due to resignations and retirements, is currently operating well below usual staffing levels. A new Asst Director takes up her post in early January 2023 and a new Manager has been appointed and will be in post late winter/early Spring 2023. In addition, we will then be bringing a number of teams together to create a new effective single Policy team with the capacity to deliver a range of support functions across the council.</p> <p>c. We have a list of staff who require training on LPMM and this will be progressed in the new year. The training will emphasise the role of 'Agile' techniques within the overall LPMM model.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>d. Due to capacity issues, the project register is not being updated but as covered in (a) above, almost all projects are assigned to a Vision Group or a One Council theme group and hence there is visibility of the projects and their progress. This also assists with the final point raised above regarding alignment and efficiencies</p> <p>So overall, projects are managed consistently, and with the advent of the new Corporate Policy Team in the new year alongside additional training being rolled out on the LPMM, this will go some way to addressing the concerns raised in both Audit Committee and Performance Scrutiny Committee</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---