

Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 October 2022

Draft Minute 24 – Agenda Item 4 Quarter 1 2022/23 Performance Report

The Committee received reports on the Council's performance for the first quarter of 2022/23 including Key Performance Indicator (KPI) reporting, as well as revenue and budget monitoring. The reports were due to go to the Executive on 20 October 2022.

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Policy and Resources, Councillor Lewanski, introduced the KPI report by noting that the report outlined the performance of the Council from April to June 2022. Nine out of the ten KPIs were on target or within the agreed tolerance, the remaining red-rated KPI being recycling, which is reported one quarter in arrears. 52.4% had been achieved against a target of 60%, which had been set by the Joint Waste Management Strategy as a stretch target. However, the cumulative 21/22 performance of 55.6% was the highest recorded.

Members discussed and asked questions on the following areas:

Recycling – it was noted that the report stated that a reduction in residual waste per household continues to decrease to pre-pandemic levels, which may indicate that life is returning to normal. It was felt that this was an assumption, and the decrease could be attributed to residents' increased awareness of recycling. It was confirmed that the report says, "may indicate" and so could possibly be due to an increased awareness of recycling and levels would be monitored and reported on in future quarters.

Street Cleaning – Members noted that the levels for street cleaning and detritus were lower than other categories of local environment quality surveys. It was confirmed that all categories were on target at Grade B, but that graffiti, fly-posting and fly-tipping were exceeding the targets and were at Grade A.

Affordable Housing – Members requested a distinction between social rent and affordable rent. It was reported that there was no reliable information on a quarterly basis splitting social rent and affordable rent, as this was reconciled at the end of the year.

Homelessness – Members asked for a KPI for the cost of living. It was confirmed that this committee has the ability to review and recommend additional KPIs to the Executive annually and that data on this issue is currently monitored. The Executive Member for Corporate Policy and Resources and Managing Director would consider reporting on the cost of living issues following the meeting.

Members asked what steps are taken to support those who do not meet the support threshold for homelessness. It was confirmed that there were categories for prioritising need for homelessness support and those that did not meet the support threshold were supported in other ways including signposting, housing plan, help into private rented accommodation and other information and assistance.

The Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Governance, Councillor Schofield, outlined the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme performance for Q1 2022/23. The projected full year outturn for the Revenue Budget was £19.558m against a management budget of £20.062m resulting in an underspend for the year of £504k (2.5%). Details of the more significant budget variances were set out as usual in the report.

The full year Capital Programme forecast at the end of Q1 of £37.42m was (45%) below the approved Programme for the year. The variance is as a result of £30.18m slippage and a £0.05m net underspend.

The reasons for the significant forecast slippage at this stage is purely because, while substantial budgets have previously been allocated for investment in Housing developments, the related business cases have not yet been developed. These will follow in due course as strategies are implemented in these areas. Details of other scheme variances were set out in the report. Councillor Schofield drew the Committee's attention to a typographical error on page 16 item 18 where "overspend" should read "underspend" regarding treasury investments.

An advance question had been received. The question and response can be viewed here:

[Document Advance Questions OS 13 October 2022 | Reigate and Banstead Borough Council \(modern.gov.co.uk\)](#)

Members discussed and asked questions on the following areas:

Investment income – Members noted that forecast investment income had decreased to £3.9 million compared to £4.3 million in the previous year due to expired leases and asked whether the forecast would increase in the next quarter due to renewed leases. It was confirmed that the decrease had been due to voids many of which had now been filled.

Service budgets – Page 16 mentions lower staff costs for car parking and an underspend due to vacancies in the Planning Policy and Development team, Members asked what the impact on the budget will be when these vacancies are filled. It was reported that vacancies are not automatically filled and that there is a thorough vacancy approval process in place. In addition, Surrey County Council would be taking over responsibility for car parking on the highway in April 2023 and any staff in post at the transfer date would be TUPEd to Surrey County Council. The Council is therefore keeping some roles vacant or covering them on a temporary basis to ensure that these transfers are kept to a minimum.

It was also reported the bulk of the underspend for car parking was due to an increase in car parking revenue. Members noted that the budget for car parking income had been set on a precautionary basis, reflecting the uncertainty of recovery from COVID.

Members commented on the forecast shortfall of approximately £0.620 million in rental income and asked for a breakdown of the properties this relates to. It was reiterated that the data in the report was based on the situation at the end of June 2022; since then the situation had improved and currently there was

only one significant vacant asset. It was confirmed that a breakdown would be provided to Members following the meeting.

Government funding distribution – Members asked whether the £415k grants balance would need to be repaid to the Government. It was confirmed that these funding streams, such as COVID-related funding and Ukrainian refugee funding, had been forward funded based on Government estimates and the unspent sums would need to be repaid to Government, following reconciliation. There would be some treasury income benefits from interest on holding this funding balance, however administering the funding was demanding on staff resource.

Members asked for an update on the approximate £1million energy rebates still to be paid to residents at the end of the quarter. It was confirmed that 95% of rebates had been paid to date and that the remaining outstanding payments were due in part to non-response from a small number of residents that were proving difficult to contact. A written update would be provided to Members following the meeting. Members further asked whether this performance included the discretionary payments. It was confirmed that this information would also be provided to Members following the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Committee:

1. Noted Key Performance Indicator (KPI) performance for Q1 2022/23 as detailed in the report and at Annex 1 and made observations to the Executive.
2. Noted the Budget Monitoring forecasts for Q1 2022/23 as detailed in the report and at Annexes 2 and 3 and made observations to the Executive.
3. Noted the update on the Financial Sustainability Programme (FSP) at Annex 4.

Advance Question

Agenda Item 4 – Quarter 1 2022/23 Performance Report

Question 1

Budget Monitoring Summary 2022/23 Page 32 on street cleaning

The budget amount has stayed the same for some time, but the streets / not including the town centres, should ideally be cleaned more often, especially when the leaves fall. RBBC have an elderly population, many disabled, so ideally the paths and road areas at the edges should be kept clear to prevent falls on the wet leaves and prevent blocked drains.

Firstly can RBBC increase the budget to help with this.

Secondly how often is this done.

The street cleaning used to be done on a regular basis, so hopefully you can tell us when the cutbacks occurred, as residents do complain about this.

Written Answer

To increase the budget for any activity, a growth bid would need to be submitted and approved by Executive and Council as part of the annual budget setting process.

Growth bids are considered each year.

No reduction in service has taken place and the frequency of cleansing is unchanged. This is evidenced by the KPI's relating to Local Environmental Quality surveys (LEQ's) reported to this committee.

Each autumn, sweeping routines are adjusted to take account of leaf fall and resources are deployed accordingly. Details of the enhanced leaf sweeping schedule appear on the Council's Website and priority is given to areas of high pedestrian use, road junctions and those roads on hills.