

	COUNCIL DELIVERY PLAN Corporate scrutiny comments.	Officer response comments
1	A Member said that she felt that, as a new Member, she found the delivery plan clear, well formatted, and easy to understand.	Good to hear some positive feedback – the plan has been developed following the engagement of Cabinet in two workshops, and informal prior consultation with the opposition political groups/members.
2	A Member asked whether the reports back to the Committee would be judged against Key Performance Indicators in this document or the lower-level departmental performance indices. He was concerned that if the latter, this might obscure things from the Committee that had previously come before them. The Head of Human Resources advised the reporting will be against indicators in appendix 2. He set out the logic behind this and how it would operate.	<p>The reports back to the Corporate scrutiny committee would be against the indicators in the Appendix 2 of the report. There has been a deliberate reduction in the indicators previously reported to the scrutiny committee when compared to the previous Council Delivery Plan to make the CDP a genuinely strategic document.</p> <p>During the preparation of the CDP, attention has been paid to the developing government guidance on Best Value (currently in draft form for consultation) which states that the corporate plan for a well-functioning authority - “. is evidence based, current, realistic and enables the whole organisation’s performance to be measured and held to account.</p> <p>Strategic priorities are aligned with the authority’s financial strategy and delivery arrangements, and respond appropriately to local need, including the plans of partners and stakeholders.”</p> <p>The guidance also advises against Council plans having too many unrealistic priorities – the number of priorities and performance indicators have been reduced considerably when compared to the previous plan to ensure there is a real focus on what is able to be resourced and achieved given the current information about the Council’s future resources. It also focuses on issues that are in the gift of the Council to deliver.</p> <p>The lower-level performance indicators will be monitored at officer level in the Directorate and Head of service business plans and information on progress will be shared with the Portfolio holders and shadow portfolio holders.</p>

3	<p>A Member found the new Key Performance Indicators, for example in Housing and Leisure but he felt his point could be applied more widely, concerning as they did not go into enough depth nor have a wide enough scope.</p> <p>He also found some unoriginal.</p>	<p>As explained above the detail and depth will be provided in the lower-level plans. It is recognised that not all the performance indicators in the proposed plan are original – some have been retained from the previous plan where they remain current and relevant – in some cases they are related to national targets, which is the reason they have been retained. This also applies to those monitored through the Business Plans.</p>
4	<p>A Member wanted more information from housing to be gathered. She also felt the benchmarks seemed unambitious and the report gave no contextual information on what they had been based, she feared they were simply set near to current benchmarks.</p>	<p>The Strategic Director of Communities advised that in the example given, regarding Housing complaints, the plan was scaled to work up to 100% over the plan period, this was also the case for most of the targets in the plan. These are a subset of the national indicators that the service is judged against by the regulator.</p> <p>Previous background information had also been presented to this committee through past monitoring reports, therefore the background is published.</p> <p>Other indicators are monitored via the Business Plans (for the reasons set out above), and those regulatory returns. The proposed approach is not to include every metric available only those most pertinent to the delivery of the CDP as a whole</p>
5	<p>The Member still felt that the first-year benchmarks were too low. Key Performance Indicators should be aspirational and benchmarked against peers.</p>	<p>The first-year targets have been reviewed by Officers in consultation with the portfolio holder and changes have been made where it is considered the targets are not sufficiently challenging. Benchmarking information is still being sought for some areas and where available will be included within future reports to Cabinet and the Scrutiny Committee.</p>
6	<p>A Member expressed concern with both the form and content of the report.</p>	<p>A request was made at the previous meeting of the corporate scrutiny committee for the (opposition) political groups to be consulted on the draft Council delivery plan when a more formed version was available. The Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure provided the political groups with a draft version of the plan in the first week of August 2023, and invited comments.</p> <p>A response was received from the Labour group, which was attached to the CDP report at Appendix 4 along with officer commentary on their proposals.</p>

	The member wanted to consult with the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development again outside of the meeting.	Officers advised that the formal process of Scrutiny meant this committee needed to comment in the meeting prior to the report going forward to Cabinet and then Council.
7	The Portfolio Holder welcomed Members feedback so far and would work with Officers to reflect Scrutiny comments. The Portfolio Holder intended the Delivery Plan to be a costed and achievable document which synthesised the thoughts of Officers, the Alliance, and Opposition Members. The Chair concurred that the Delivery Plan must be costed and targeted and success should be clearly defined and measurable.	(This box is deliberately left blank.)
8	A Member expressed concern that Key Performance Indicators may have unintended consequences which needed to be considered. He listed some ways which he felt that overly simplistic metrics may lead to undesirable outcomes.	This comment was particularly related to the indicator around enforcement case numbers. This indicator has been clarified in the directorate business plan to ensure there are no unintended consequences.
9	Then he asked what had happened to net-zero Council houses by 2030 and why had this been pushed back to 2050. He dismissed budgetary concerns as they could and should be allayed by central government grants. The removal of this target removed any incentives to raise this money and pursue the matter with appropriate zeal.	The movement of Council housing directly from the 2030 target is a combination of: the anticipated cost for achievement by 2030 is outside of the available funds to the HRA at the current time, and whilst piecemeal funding is being announced there is no clarity or predictability from government regarding further funding. It is also reflecting the work level required to be completed to achieve such a change to the Council's stock, and the ability of the industry to achieve this within that time frame. Finally the Council does not fully control all elements of the use of our housing stock (i.e. the Council cannot control how tenants make certain decision on how they use their homes). As such there is no certainty on deliverability, and as with most councils this a scope 3 issue to address.

		<p>This does not mean that work is stopped, the EPC C target in 2028 is being retained even though this has been removed by government, and this provides a step towards zero carbon. Work is commencing on the HRA Business Plan and Asset Management Plan which will provide the data supported backbone to enable a clear and costed case for moving towards zero carbon of the housing stock, and following this a plan for our housing stock will be developed which takes account of this new data and available finance. This is a specific piece of work identified in the Business Plan for the Communities Directorate. It is also clear from the CDP that this is a 'by 2050' date and is operating as a final stop date not a target for completion.</p>
10	<p>Performance Indicator 9 regarding private rental tenants and minimal energy standards also seemed in his view both immeasurable and unambitious.</p>	<p>We have updated the indicator to pick up this comment</p>
11	<p>Expanding on the point of unsophisticated metrics and unforeseen outcomes, another Member felt that decreased crime rates would be a more sensible measure of success with regards to what was hoped to be achieved by CCTV. Another Member suggested that wider community cooperation was necessary to combat crime and should be reflected in the appropriate Key Performance Indicators however accepting that this was not fully in the Councils control.</p>	<p>The CCTV indicator / action was chosen because it is one of the only direct influences the district council has around crime rates. It is recognised the crime rates are rightly much more significantly influenced by the actions of the Police and other stakeholders. Consequently this indicator has been moved from the CDP to the Business Plan</p>
12	<p>A Member referred to the waste management Key Performance Indicators and requested more specificity around food waste recycling.</p>	<p>The targets have been set based on the information currently available. There is considerable uncertainty around future collection arrangements while governments guidance is awaited, particularly in relation to food waste collection. This has been further complicated by very recent announcements from Government.</p>

		The targets are likely to be reviewed following a better understanding of the government guidance and/or when the outcomes of the waste review are known, and if needing updating will be done so via the formal reporting process
13	A Member expressed concern that a Key Performance Indicator which detailed how successful the Council had been at getting landlords to sign up to the housing charter had been omitted from the document.	This indicator was discussed in the context of a related report at the Community Scrutiny Committee on the 28 September 2023 and has been modified in the Directorate Business Plan.
14	The Chair felt the document was unclear and ought to be restructured. He felt that the drafting process was failing, and the final document would not achieve what it hoped to achieve. Several Members felt that, with the critical importance of what was being discussed, it was imperative that the granular and complex nature of the discussion be accurately recorded in the minutes. No alternative measures or metrics were provided by the Committee.	The comments of the committee have been recorded in detail in this document and further responses made to hopefully address some of the Committee's concerns.