

## Minute from Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting on 8 December

### Quarter 2 2022/23 Performance Report

The Committee received the Performance Reports for Quarter 2 2022/23 including the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Budget Monitoring forecasts Quarter 2 2022/23, both for revenue and capital.

#### Quarter 2 2022/23 KPI performance

Councillor Lewanski, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Policy & Resources, gave an overview of the KPI performance as set out in the report and at Annex 1. Of the ten KPIs reported on, nine were on target or within agreed tolerances. One KPI was red rated for Quarter 2, KPI 3 staff turnover, which had a rate of 16% compared to the target set of 12%. In recent years the Council had seen lower than expected levels of turnover, probably due to the pandemic, and levels had now increased.

Advance questions had been received on this item. The advance questions and responses can be viewed here:

[Document Advance Questions and Answers OS 8 December 2022 | Reigate and Banstead Borough Council \(modern.gov.co.uk\)](https://modern.gov.co.uk/Document/Advance%20Questions%20and%20Answers%20OS%208%20December%202022%20%20Reigate%20and%20Banstead%20Borough%20Council)

The Committee requested that the Member asking the advance question be identified on the advance question and written response document to enable the Chair to address the Member to establish whether there were any supplementary questions.

Members discussed and asked questions on the following areas:

**Planning Permission** – The written response to question 2 regarding planning permission was referenced. Members commented that the KPI did not show the number of projects which had received planning permission but where work had not yet commenced and asked for this data. It was commented that the commencement of building work was out of the Council's control and did not constitute a KPI, but that this data was reported to Planning Committee. It was confirmed that information on pipeline permissions is collected and published annually in the Housing Monitor produced by the Planning team. A written answer would be provided.

**Staff Turnover** – Members asked whether exit interviews were performed and whether there were any services where turnover was high. It was confirmed that exit interviews are undertaken by Human Resources. Staff turnover was interrogated regularly. The level of staff turnover was usually 10-12%; this level had decreased during COVID but was now increasing, due to several factors including migration; the ability of working remotely for London boroughs which offered higher salaries; an increase in early retirement and employees making different life choices. The level of staff turnover was not expected to decrease before the end of the municipal year. The Council extends a rounded offer for staff and is a stable local authority. Pay negotiations for 2023/24 were well underway. It was confirmed that there were no services with concentrated turnover.

**Food Waste** – It had been reported that more food waste was thrown away than was collected in the Borough and that approximately 6,000 properties did not have a food waste bin. Members asked whether the level of food waste recycling was due to lack of participation by those homes where a bin is provided and asked for data on this. A written answer would be provided.

## Quarter 2 2022/23 Budget Monitoring

Councillor Schofield, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Governance, gave an overview of the Quarter 2 Budget Monitoring set out in the report and at Annexes 2 and 3. At Quarter 2 the projected full year outturn is £19.113m against a management budget of £20.062m resulting in an underspend for the year of £948k (4.7%). The full year Capital Programme forecast at the end of Q1 of £31.86m is (53%) below the approved Programme for the year. The variance is as a result of £35.54m slippage and a £0.24m 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 the Council implements its strategies in these areas.

Advance questions had been received on this item. The advance questions and responses can be viewed here:

[Document Advance Questions and Answers OS 8 December 2022 | Reigate and Banstead Borough Council \(moderngov.co.uk\)](#)

Members discussed and asked questions on the following areas:

**Emergency Accommodation** – The written response to advance question 7 confirmed the range of costs for bed and breakfast accommodation; Members requested in addition confirmation of the average cost per night for this type of accommodation. A written follow up answer would be provided.

**Environmental Strategy Delivery** – The written response to advance question 11 explained that proposals for the Council's buildings and fleet would be funded from the £250k capital budget, where appropriate or via additional funding bids. Members asked for a breakdown of how the £250k would be spent. Officers confirmed this would be determined on the outcomes of the business cases, once prepared.

**Capital Programme** – Members expressed concern over the scale of slippage in the capital programme as there is a risk that costs would increase in the future, lessening the value of the Capital Budget and asked whether an assessment of net present value impacts of slippage had been carried out. It was confirmed that the Council was aware of rising costs but there was a balance to be struck between proceeding with haste and ensuring that business cases are robust.

**Refugee Support Grants** – Members requested a breakdown of the grants and expenditure for Syrian and Afghan refugees. A written answer would be provided.

**Capital Funds for New Affordable Housing** – Members noted that the continued slippage for this item. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Governance explained that slippage arises due to approved projects falling behind schedule or due to delays in bringing business cases forward for approval. The slippage reported for Affordable Housing Schemes is due to delays in identifying suitable business cases

**CCTV** – Members asked for an explanation of why the information in the Capital Budget Monitoring for CCTV was the same as the information for Community Partnerships. A written answer would be provided.

**Staff Vacancies** – There was a total of £190k in staff vacancies for Revenues and Benefits, Members noted that this was high and asked if the service provided was affected. It was confirmed that this related to four vacant posts, two of which had now

been filled and two would be recruited to in the new year. It was also confirmed that the service performed well and there were no issues with the service provided.

Members asked for an explanation for the cost of financial interim staff. It was confirmed that this cost had been incurred to bring in specialist support, for example to help administer the additional Government grants, for which some funding had been received, and for other specialist help in preparing for the end of year close down and progressing audit improvements.

Grants - It was also reported that the authority's UK Shared Prosperity Fund submission had been successful, and that the 2022/23 allocation would be £165k.

**RESOLVED** that the committee:

1. Noted Key Performance Indicator (KPI) performance for Q2 2022/23 as detailed in the report and at Annex 1 and made observations to the Executive.
2. Noted the Budget Monitoring forecasts for Q2 2022/23 as detailed in the report and at Annexes 2 and 3 and made observations to the Executive.