

**Minutes of the Future Council Scrutiny Committee  
Wednesday, 15<sup>th</sup> March, 2023 at 6.00 pm  
In Conference Room 1, Saltwells Education and Development  
Centre, Bowling Green Road, Netherton**

**Present:**

Councillor E Lawrence (Chair)  
Councillor A Davies (Vice-Chair)  
Councillors C Barnett, T Creed, P Dobb, J Foster, M Howard, I Kettle, A Lees  
(from Minute No. 47), M Rogers, T Russon and P Sahota.

**Officers:**

H Martin (Director of Regeneration and Enterprise), K Jones (Director for Housing and Communities), C Blunn (Corporate Performance Manager), S Haycox (Corporate Performance Support) and K Taylor (Senior Democratic Services Officer).

**Also in Attendance:**

M Anderson (West Midlands Metro Projects Director – Transport for West Midlands) For Agenda Item No. 6.  
Councillor D Stanley (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise).

---

41 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors S Ali and K Shakespeare.

---

42 **Appointment of Substitute Member**

It was noted that Councillor M Rogers had been appointed as substitute Member for Councillor K Shakespeare, for this meeting of the Committee only.

---

43 **Declarations of Interest**

No member made a declaration of interest in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct.

---

44 **Minutes**

**Resolved**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> January, 2023 be approved as a correct record and signed.

---

45 **Public Forum**

No issues were raised under this agenda item.

---

46 **Change in Order of Business**

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 1(c), it was:-

**Resolved**

That Agenda Item No. 7 - Major Regeneration and Town Centre Projects (including Funding Agreements, Future Projects and Borough Wide Vision) be considered as the next item of business.

---

47 **Major Regeneration and Town Centre Projects (including Funding Agreements, Future Projects and Borough Wide Vision)**

A report of the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise was submitted on major regeneration projects in Dudley town centre, Brierley Hill and other town centre proposals and projects in development.

In presenting the report submitted, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise gave a detailed overview on the status of the next phase of projects both in Dudley town centre and around the Borough, including the Dudley Interchange, Eton College and Brierley Hill Future High Street Fund Programme. It was noted that an update in relation to the Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension would be presented under Agenda Item No. 6.

Reference was made to the four Levelling Up Bids submitted in August, 2022 which had been unsuccessful, however it had since been confirmed that there would be a third round for Levelling Up Bids. Further details of the criteria and timelines had not yet been provided. It was anticipated that the Local Authority would submit one or more bids in the next round with focus primarily given on areas including economic development.

Members asked questions, made comments and responses were given, where appropriate, as follows:-

- a) Councillor P Dobb shared his concerns of the proposed relocation of the bus stops within Dudley Town Centre to Tower Street and Coronation Gardens during the construction programme of the Dudley Interchange and subsequent road closures, and the potential impact this could cause to the existing traffic congestion already experienced in that area.

In responding, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise acknowledged the concerns raised and agreed to refer comments back to Transport and Highways accordingly. The viability of Town Centres remained a priority for the Local Authority with support given and work undertaken to external projects, however it was acknowledged that any major works undertaken would cause some disruption. A number of options were available when developing programmes including implementing varied timescales in order to mitigate any disruption where possible.

- b) Councillor J Foster referred to the proposed Eton College academic sixth form college located within Dudley and queried the purpose as to why it had been included as part of the Levelling Up Agenda and raised concerns that the small cohort of Dudley children that would attend may then leave the authority to seek further opportunities.

The Director of Regeneration and Enterprise referred to the challenges faced in retaining qualified and skilled Dudley residents, and that this area had formed part of regeneration projects by enabling Dudley residents to achieve a master's degree qualification within the Borough and prioritising the need to improve higher skilled employment opportunities.

- c) In responding to a question raised by Councillor I Kettle in relation to the delays experienced with regard to the properties at Castle Hill, Dudley in order to progress with the Health Innovation Dudley project, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise referred to the extensive discussions undertaken with the owners of the properties regarding acquisition and the statutory process required by the Local Authority before the serving of a Compulsory Purchase Order. Members were advised that during the initial phase of the project, two scenarios had been developed taking into account a mutually agreed sale of the properties, and the Council using their Compulsory Purchase Order powers. The time difference between these two scenarios was 12-18 months.
- d) Councillor I Kettle referred to the Levelling Up Bid submitted for Stourbridge and the proposed conversion of the bypass in Lye to a two-way traffic system and considered that the surrounding roads were too narrow to support 2-way traffic effectively.

The Director of Regeneration and Enterprise confirmed that the Levelling Up Bid for Stourbridge had focussed primarily on the development of Lye and that some areas of Council owned land could be widened to support the proposed conversion, however further consideration would be given to the comments raised.

- e) In responding to a further question raised by Councillor I Kettle, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise undertook to provide a written response in relation to the impact to the number of funding opportunities available following the recent announcement of the £1 billion Devolution Deal to the West Midlands.
- f) It was confirmed that the business plan for the University Centre at Castle Hill proposed a smaller building than the building that had been granted planning permission in order to mitigate the cost increases to construction projects since the original submission in January, 2021. It was intended that further discussions would be undertaken in 2023/24 with the Alliance Board in order to drive out efficiencies and bridge the funding gap.
- g) In responding to a question raised by Councillor P Sahota in relation to an alternative use of the land should the proposed Eton College not be successful, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise stated that the area had been confirmed as an opportunity site and further consideration would be given to the potential future usage in the event that Dudley had not been confirmed as a location for one of the Eton College sites.

- h) Councillor P Sahota raised a further question in relation to the relocation of the Farmfoods premises in St Joseph Street, Dudley as a result of the Dudley Interchange Project, and whether there was opportunity for the premises to be relocated to other areas including the Portersfield Development.

In responding, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise confirmed that the Local Authority had supported the business and had identified and suggested possible locations for consideration without success. Further consideration could be given to a mixed-used residential development at Portersfield.

- i) Councillor P Sahota referred to the exclusivity agreement awarded to the vacant site of the former Dudley Leisure Centre in Wellington Road, Dudley, and questioned whether the Local Authority had considered sufficient parking availability to ensure that any further development would be sustainable.

The Director of Regeneration and Enterprise confirmed that the Local Authority had currently only awarded one exclusivity agreement (Wellington Road), which provided the opportunity for the developer to undertake due diligence checks. The Agreement would cease in early March, 2023 in which a decision would be made as to whether to market the site for disposal. It was noted that surveys undertaken during this period had been subsidised by the developer. With regard to parking, it was confirmed that during pre-application discussions, an agreement had not been reached, however further consideration could be undertaken by the developer during the acquisition of the site and consultation process.

- j) Following the announcement of a third round for Levelling Up Bids, Councillor P Sahota queried how the Local Authority would champion the bids and consider outcomes, and assurance was sought that officers would ensure that bids were effective and would focus on developing deprived areas throughout the Borough.

In responding, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise reiterated that the Local Authority would only submit one or two bids in the next round with particular focus on support for economic development alongside a framework on how this could be achieved.

- k) The Chair emphasised the need for the Local Authority to monitor and support regeneration in smaller communities and centres. In responding, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise acknowledged the comments made, however reference was made to the resource pressures within the Local Authority, and it was anticipated that masterplan proposals would be developed each year to include both strategic and local sites.
- l) In responding to a question raised by Councillor T Russon, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise undertook to investigate historic proposals in relation to the Colley Gate bypass.

(At this juncture, Councillor J Foster withdrew from the remainder of the meeting and Councillor A Lees joined the meeting).

- m) The Director of Regeneration and Enterprise undertook to provide a written response to a question raised by Councillor C Barnett in relation to measures considered by the Local Authority for sustainable connectivity and active travel across the Borough and whether there were any plans to improve the Pensnett to Wolverhampton Railway Path.
- n) Councillor A Davies sought clarification as to the reasons why the development brief for the vacant site at Wellington Road, Dudley had been prepared for a medium density housing scheme rather than a high scheme.

In responding, the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise stated that an average density for housing development consisted of 40 dwellings per hectare, and it was considered that medium density was appropriate for the Wellington Road site, in view of the existing and variety of properties within the locality. The number and type of properties however, would be determined by the developer once agreed.

- o) Councillor A Davies made further reference to the Levelling Up Bid for Stourbridge and the leveraging opportunity to bring forward four key parcels of land for housing development, which was not referred to in the report, amongst four regeneration opportunities under projects in development or proposed in Lye.

The Director of Regeneration and Enterprise confirmed that the four regeneration opportunities were strategic interventions that could guide investment and identify further development opportunities within the area.

- p) Reference was made to the Devolution Deal in the West Midlands and whether there were any implications for Dudley in particular in relation to 'Levelling Up Zones'. It was anticipated that the 'Levelling Up Zones' would benefit from enhanced and targeted fiscal measures, with the Dudley Metro Corridor being a possibility. Further consideration would be required by the Local Authority to determine the most suitable measures.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise welcomed and acknowledged comments made, in particular, in relation to the potential impact to traffic congestion within the Dudley Town Centre following the proposed relocation of bus stops within the Town Centre to Tower Street and Coronation Gardens during the construction programme of the Dudley Interchange. Although some disruption was inevitable, the potential investment opportunities to the area was emphasised.

### **Resolved**

- (1) That the update on the major regeneration projects in Dudley town centre, Brierley Hill and other town centre proposals and projects in development, be noted.
- (2) That the Director of Regeneration and Enterprise be requested to provide responses to queries raised in relation to:
  - (i) Temporary relocation of Dudley Town Centre Bus Stops during the Dudley Interchange construction works;
  - (ii) Proposals to convert Lye By-Pass to a two-way road.
  - (iii) The impact to the number of funding opportunities available following the recent announcement of the Devolution Deal to the West Midlands;
  - (iv) Sustainable connectivity and active travel throughout the Borough;
  - (v) Improvement works to the Pensnett to Wolverhampton Path;
  - (vi) Colley Gate By-Pass.

---

## 48 **Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension Presentation**

Members received a presentation by M Anderson (West Midlands Metro Projects Director – Transport for West Midlands) on progress with the delivery of the Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension (WBHE).

It was reported that the delivery of the WBHE had been split into two phases with main construction works ongoing as part of the first phase, with some works undertaken in strengthening and refurbishing the Parkhead Viaduct as part of the second phase.

A high level schedule outlined key works that were now completed and those that were ongoing, which included Castle Hill, Dudley, which had since been reopened to traffic in both directions, completion of Flood Street carriageway and all structures either refurbished or structural works close to completion. It was anticipated that the WBHE would be open to passenger service by Autumn 2024.

The West Midlands Metro Projects Director confirmed that a costing of £449m was accepted by the Transport for West Midlands, based on preliminary designs from Midland Metro Alliance, however in December, 2021, the West Midlands Combined Authority Finance had identified pressures on the funding model which put into question the viability of the model. The three drivers for the pressures predominately related to the cost of construction and subsequent inflation, an increase in operating costs including power supply costs, and reduction in revenue receipts from reduced Metro operation during the Covid pandemic. This had led to a decision by the West Midlands Combined Authority Board to separate the project into two phases.

An overview of the ongoing work during Phase 1 was outlined which included laying the track on the corridor and further consideration would be needed to ensure safe drainage of waste into the Canal on route. Assurance was given that delivering the full WBHE scheme remained a key commitment for Transport for West Midlands. It was noted that discussions were ongoing with Dudley MBC colleagues in identifying funding solutions to enable the delivery of the second phase of the project.

Members were informed of the Government's announcement of the region's Trailblazer Devolution Deal and subsequent additional funding of £60m which would be utilised as a springboard to secure the remaining funding needed to build and open the section of the route between Dudley and Brierley Hill. This provided a great opportunity in delivering phase two.

Reference was made to a possible Phase 2A which would deliver tram operations to Waterfront or Merry Hill Centre, however further consideration would need to be given as there was currently insufficient space for a turn back of the tram for a return journey.

Members asked questions, made comments and responses were given, where appropriate, as follows:-

- a) Councillor A Davies referred to the suggested Phase 2A and requested assurances that this was not being considered as an alternative to completing the full connection to Brierley Hill Town Centre.

In responding, M Anderson acknowledged the risks in progressing with Phase 2A, however should the additional funding only subsidise the delivery of 2A, this would be discussed further with the Local Authority. Further consideration would need to be given as to whether the Local Authority would be willing to postpone further works until additional funding was available in order to deliver the project in full.

In responding, Councillor A Davies acknowledged the difficulties and challenges faced however, reiterated that the priority was for the Metro Extension to be delivered within the Brierley Hill Town Centre which would further enhance the regeneration improvements being made, by delivering the project as previously agreed. He also queried whether the proposed technology college based in Brierley Hill would strengthen the bid moving forward.

M Anderson acknowledged comments made and considered that a new technology college in Brierley Hill could support the business case and requests for additional funding.

- b) Councillor I Kettle commented on the existing Metro facilities based in Birmingham and considered the Merry Hill Centre to be a fundamental asset to the Dudley Borough, however concerns were raised that a transport link to Birmingham could reduce footfall at the Merry Hill Centre. An update on the works completed to date against the agreed programme was also requested.

In responding, M Anderson acknowledged comments made and reported that a significant amount of groundwork had been completed but acknowledged that a large amount of work was still needed with critical works expected to finish mid-2024.

- c) Councillor C Barnett emphasised the importance of delivering the Metro extension to Brierley Hill Town Centre, and questioned why there had been no investment from the private sector including Merry Hill Centre despite the potential of delivering tram operations at the Centre. He also referred to the works undertaken at the Embankment near Merry Hill and loss of green space and queried why Merry Hill had been considered as a viable station.

In responding, M Anderson confirmed that the proposed station provided access and served the Waterfront, Merry Hill and Brierley Hill local area residents, businesses, retail and leisure facilities and was considered the most appropriate route.

The Director of Regeneration and Enterprise also emphasised the importance of connectivity between Town Centres and an accessible link between the Merry Hill Centre and Brierley Hill Town Centre. It was envisaged that accessible transport links could enhance further employment opportunities available at the Waterfront.

- d) Reference was made to a possible extension from Brierley Hill Town Centre to Stourbridge in the future.
- e) In responding to a question raised by Councillor P Sahota in relation to whether options route appraisals had been undertaken and completed during the planning process, M Anderson confirmed that a number of different routes and modes of transport had been considered during the early stages of the project and each stage had been analysed accordingly. Further analysis would be undertaken prior to the commencement of Phase 2.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise referred to the Metro Extension between Birmingham and St George's, Wolverhampton, and commented that the WHBE Project focussed primarily on Brierley Hill Town Centre, and that other options such as Merry Hill and Stourbridge had only recently been considered viable. The refurbishment and restructuring works undertaken to the Parkhead Viaduct to enable the structure to be safe and useable was also welcomed.

The Chair, on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee, thanked M Anderson for the presentation and expressed the Committee's full support on the delivery of the full WBHE scheme to Brierley Hill Town Centre as given.

### **Resolved**

That the progress on the delivery of the Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension be noted.

A report of the Chief Executive was submitted on the Quarter 3 Corporate Quarterly Performance report covering the period 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2022. Two Directorate Service Summary Documents had been appended to the report submitted, providing an overview of service delivery and achievements during the given quarter focusing on Digital, Customer and Commercial Services and Finance and Legal.

In presenting key information through presentation slides, the Corporate Performance Manager made particular reference to the thirteen performance indicators that were below target, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report submitted. Corporate key performance measures were also reported against key actions aligned to the Council Plan priorities and the outcomes the Local Authority wanted to achieve for Dudley residents. It was reported that 277 actions had been identified by directorate against 59 key performance measures, with the Directorate of Environment containing the highest proportion of actions and performance measures due to the level of customer services they delivered across all elements of the new Council Plan.

It was noted that the overall annual trend for the collective key performance indicators had identified that sixteen measures had improved performance, two remained consistent, and seventeen highlighted a downward trend in comparison to the previous year. A detailed account of the performance indicators was outlined in the appendix to the report submitted.

Reference was made to the key activities that had taken place across directorates during Quarter 3, including awards and accreditations that had been achieved, including Customer Services targets being met in relation to call handling times for the first time in the past year.

It was noted that performance indicators in relation to sickness absence had seen an increase in days lost per full time equivalent and an increase in long-term sickness which predominately related to a continued increase in long-term absence for Work Related Stress and Post Operation Recovery. It was further noted that the main reason for short term absence continued to be Covid related. In responding to the measures, the Chief Executive had issued some benchmarking data to be reviewed across the Board and considered by each Directorate.

In responding to a question raised by the Chair in relation to Covid impacting sickness absence, the Corporate Performance Manager confirmed that Covid related absences were recorded and discounted from the Bradford Factor, however managers continued to use their discretion for discounting. Further consideration of these measures would be undertaken by the Strategic Executive Board in April, 2023.

Reference was made to PI. 2079 Number of Customer Complaints Received, and it was noted that the number of complaints received during the quarter had reduced to the lowest level for over two years. However, it was recognised that there had been an increase in complex complaints for both Adults and Childrens.

At this juncture, the Director of Housing and Communities was in attendance provide some narrative and respond to any questions in relation to Key Performance Indicators PI.2027 Satisfaction – way your anti-social behaviour complaint was handled and PI. 1899 Rent loss: % of potential rent receipts lost (dwellings).

The Director of Housing and Communities referred to the increasing levels of anti-social behaviour during the Covid-19 Pandemic and subsequent delays and the backlog in court cases, with the Anti-social Behaviour Team working extensively to clear the backlog of cases within the service area during 2022.

Following a prolonged period of low staffing resources due to sickness absence and vacant posts, Members were advised that the Team was now stabilised and were now focused on developing and improving service delivery, reviewing policies and procedures, partnership relationships, professional advice and assistance with IT systems to ensure continuous improvement of services and customer experience.

It was noted that the restructure of Housing Services to deliver the community housing vision was almost complete, which would increase resources to respond to and manage incidences of anti-social behaviour in homes and communities. It was expected that initially, the anti-social behaviour and community housing teams would be working collaboratively to develop a future model for managing anti-social behaviour and neighbour nuisance, with community housing officers dealing with day-to-day issues that arise on estates. The benefits of the proposed approach would ensure community housing officers dealt with estate complaints more proactively to prevent unnecessary escalations of low level complaints and trained anti-social behaviour officers having more time and resources to case manage more complex cases.

External independent support had been secured during 2023/2024 which would be used to undertake independent case reviews, to provide advice and training to the team, and to advise on any changes in policy and practice which would improve or enhance service delivery and outcomes.

It was expected that during 2023/2024, the Anti-Social Behaviour team would transfer from the Community Housing area of the Directorate to the Head of Community Safety, to further improve relationships with key partners such as the police, and provide the opportunity to expand the current remit of the service.

The challenges faced in improving the measures was acknowledged however, assurance was given of the improvements already made within the last six months and measures implemented.

With regard to rent loss and voids, a full review of voids was being undertaken in order to reduce void turnaround times, and associated void loss, and to improve customer satisfaction with the void process. The review included re-evaluating the end-to-end process to identify blockers and actions to speed up the process, and highlighted issues in the process for the return and handover of keys and improving the timescales for void clearances through performance management of contractors. Regular fortnightly Director-led cross team void meetings had been scheduled to action plan and report against progress on current voids.

Current void performance confirmed that there were 453 voids as at 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2023, of which 227 were available to let, together with 104 high costs voids, of which 40 were currently awaiting an investment decision. Members were advised that the average re-let time for standard voids as at the end of Quarter 3 for 2022/23 was 66 days compared to 81 days at the end of Quarter 3 for 2021/22.

It was noted that the next steps included continuing the voids review and monitoring the impact of actions on void turnaround time, and the corresponding impact on void loss; implementing revised processes to speed up disposals; reviewing how long term strategic voids were categorised, and reported upon and developing a new investment strategy based upon stock condition data.

At this juncture, Members asked questions, made comments in relation to the summary provided by the Director of Housing and Communities and responses were given where appropriate as follows: -

- a) Councillor I Kettle expressed concern at the number of void properties within the Borough which resulted in the significant total cumulative rent loss in Quarter 3 of £1,334,158.58, and queried whether improvement works could be sub-contracted to a number of void properties to reduce the turnaround time in order to mitigate the financial loss.

In responding, the Director of Housing and Communities indicated that managing void properties was a complex matter. Whilst some void properties were re-let promptly, a number of properties required significant improvement work to bring them to modern day standard prior to re-let. It was acknowledged that some void properties were empty for longer periods than was necessary. Improvement work around voids was currently being carried out and improved figures would be observed moving forward. It was evident that some delays to re-letting properties was due to delays caused by contractors in removing rubbish, and that it was clear the Local Authority needed to ensure tenants understood their responsibilities in leaving properties in a clean and tidy manner in order to accelerate the process moving forward.

- b) In responding to a question raised by Councillor C Barnett in relation to project management and delays, the Director of Housing and Communities referred to the need to review existing Information Technology systems that were utilised that were not currently synchronised. An overview of the work undertaken once a property was vacant was mentioned including assessments of electrics and repairs, advertising, and shortlisting. Assurance was given that improvements were being made to the number of days taken to re-let properties.
- c) Councillor A Davies referred to a previous funding bid for Community Improvement undertaken two years previous, in particular that the consultation paper indicated that responses were not required should residents support the proposals, however the lack of response was determined insufficient and subsequently no further action had been taken. An update was requested as to whether improvements had been made in relation to consultations in order to prevent any delays in securing funding.

In responding, the Director of Housing and Communities provided an overview of the process undertaken before Covid-19 and confirmed that she would commence discussions to reinvigorate the process again. Reference was made to significant financial pressures within the Housing Revenue Account and insufficient resources throughout the Directorate. She apologised for the time taken in addressing the Community Improvement Bid mentioned and undertook to review further.

- d) Councillor P Sahota acknowledged comments made in relation to the improvements suggested and implemented however, considered that the evidence of this would not be available for at least a further six months. He expressed concern of the significant loss in rental income and queried whether the key performance indicators in relation to this area was challenging.

The Director of Housing and Communities acknowledged the comments made and assured Members that improvements were being made. Priority would be given to strengthening policies and procedures with focus given to being more proactive moving forward.

- e) The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Enterprise queried why articles such as carpets and household appliances that were in good condition could not remain in properties for new tenants in particular those that were vulnerable.

It was confirmed that void standards would be considered as part of the review and reference was made to the discussions undertaken with Providence House Charity with the potential assessment of any items that could be reused for people in need. It was noted that carpets would historically be removed and destroyed due to fire safety concerns.

Councillor I Kettle suggested that the wording 'optional' be included in new tenant agreements for the opportunity to retain any articles that remained in the property if considered acceptable and safe to use.

The Corporate Performance Manager then continued her presentation in relation to corporate performance and in doing so provided a summary of the Quarter 3 service highlights. Reference was made to the Directorate plans that were reviewed each year to update any service information to reflect changes made during the year and ensure that they continued to meet the current council plan priorities and that actions and performance indicators were correctly aligned to council plan priorities and outcomes. It was noted that corporate measures would be considered by the Strategic Executive Board in April, 2023.

Members were advised that training for Elected Members in relation to Corporate Performance was now available on the Members Portal, including videos in relation to the process and reporting in Dudley, Dudley's Corporate Performance Framework and Local Government Association resources.

Members then asked questions and made comments in relation to the presentation provided by the Corporate Performance Manager and responses were given where appropriate as follows: -

- a) Councillor A Lees, in his role as Chair of Audit and Standards Committee, shared his concern of the lack of correlation between the corporate performance management reports and annual audit reports presented to the Audit and Standards Committee, and that he would discuss further with the Head of Audit Services regarding correlating information between directorates. The Corporate Performance Manager also agreed to discuss further with the Head of Audit Services.
- b) Councillor P Sahota expressed serious concerns regarding the key performance indicators and again queried whether they were challenging and benchmarked against other local authorities. He considered that the performance indicators aligned incorrectly to the council plan priorities, in particular, querying the rationale as to why performance measures, such as safer routes to schools, was associated within the Borough of opportunity and customer complaints within Borough of ambition and enterprise. He suggested that in terms of ambition and enterprise, this should refer specifically to areas such as regeneration projects. He further suggested that there was insufficient narrative contained within the report to explain the reasons for performance indicators repeatedly being below target.
- c) Councillor P Sahota made specific reference to Pl. 324 No. incidents of fly-tipping and suggested that the increase in the number of fly-tipping incidents could have been attributed to the closure of Anchor Lane Tip and was shocked to see that no target had been set, and queried whether there had been any benefit to the Local Authority following the closure of the service given the financial impact of implementing a pop-up tip service. He considered that all Local Authorities were duty bound in ensuring value for money and suggested that key performance indicators should be reviewed by external auditors. Councillor P Sahota stated that he would e-mail his concerns to the Chief Executive.

The Corporate Performance Manager acknowledged the concerns raised and confirmed that although the Chief Executive considered and approved key performance indicators, it was the role of the Corporate Performance Team, in conjunction with performance leads within directorates, to challenge targets and assess whether they were focused, achievable and aligned with the council plan priorities and outcomes. It was further confirmed that the Chief Executive and Directors were currently reviewing placement of performance indicators in relation to sickness absence and customer complaints.

- d) At this juncture, the Chair reminded the Scrutiny Committee that any issues arising from the Quarterly Performance Report that were within the remit of another Scrutiny Committee could be recommended to consider further as part of their annual scrutiny programme.
- e) In responding to comments made, Councillor A Lees suggested that the future reporting of the Quarterly Corporate Performance Report be considered at the first meeting of the Municipal Year by the Future Council Scrutiny Committee. Councillor A Davies further emphasised the importance of the Scrutiny Committee focusing on matters that were within the remit of this Committee.

Following further discussion, the Committee suggested that the Housing and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee be recommended to consider the key performance indicators in relation to fly-tipping as part of their annual scrutiny programme.

### **Resolved**

- (1) That the Quarter 1 Corporate Quarterly Performance report covering the period 1<sup>st</sup> April to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2022, be noted.
- (2) That the future reporting of the Quarterly Corporate Performance Report be considered at the first meeting of the Municipal Year by the Future Council Scrutiny Committee
- (3) That the Housing and Public Realm Scrutiny Committee be recommended to consider the key performance indicators in relation to fly-tipping as part of their annual scrutiny programme.

---

## 50 **Future Council Scrutiny Progress Tracker and Future Business**

### **Resolved**

That the Future Council Scrutiny Progress Tracker and Future Business, as outlined in the report, be noted.

---

60 **Questions Under Council Procedure Rule 11.8**

There were no questions to the Chair pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 11.8.

The meeting ended at 9.00pm

CHAIR