

Q4 Additional Information for Councillors

Councillor Mclean

All requests from meeting with Lisa Beckett that have been noted have been investigated/rectified.

Finance and Resources

MK1430 provide more information on the performance? For info: Total spend for 20/21 - 4.87%. The spend with Opus is good news in so much as we have spent considerably less on agency staff in the last year than in previous years. This is attributed to the pandemic and a huge drop in the first few months of the pandemic when many services (Children and Adults noticeably) stopped operating in their usual manner. Examples include Day Services and Children Centres that shut for a time. As things eased, we saw an increase in spending but overall finished in a better position.

Adult Social Care

MKC1475a,b,c for context could we present the information grouped together? – These are for the different Sheltered Housing sites. In year it has been useful to see a representation of the scoring of the different centre's performance figures.

1475A – Courteney's Lodge - Milton Keynes Sheltered Housing (with onsite care)

1475B - Flowers House - Sheltered Housing (with onsite care)

1475C - Kilkenny House Milton Keynes Sheltered Housing (with onsite care)

MKC1543 should this be amber? Target is 97.5% not 98%. Added decimal place for clarity.

Housing and Regeneration

MKC102 conversion data? 25% out of 32 ie 8 out of 32 responded to on time.

MKC103 conversion data? 0% out of 23 ie 0 out of 23 responded to on time.

Planning, Strategic Transport and Placemaking

MKC1602 More information in the comment on this? The level of housing completions in Milton Keynes has exceeded the Local Plan target for a third year in a row, which is despite the impacts of the pandemic. This shows a continued commitment from housing developers in the Milton Keynes housing market and will help to contribute towards meeting our housing needs. Q4 outturn has increased as figures have been finalised.

Policy, Insight and Communications

MKC1652 explanation on the spot checks? If a new contract is set up with a supplier, the procurement team will let us know if it involves representation of the council brand, eg Serco with waste lorries. We'll speak to the relevant council manager to check how MK Council is being represented and help design artwork where needed. We ask to see any joint publications, signage etc.

Other instances where we reach out to check if branding is being used properly include where we provide funding for an organisation to carry out work on behalf of the council, or where we're

working on joint projects with partners. It happens several times a month. Increasingly, managers contact us to check things are being done as they should.

Environment and Property

MKC 1336 how were people visited or was it done in a different way? There were 105 reports of scams where all complainants/victims were either spoken to or visited (only if necessary, in the last year) within the month.

Children's Services

MKC324, 325 data missing? This is because there were no adoptions in Q4. 3 children were matched for adoption in Q3 whose timescale for placing for adoption impacts the performance. 2 were siblings who were placed for adoption with their foster carer and the other was an older child. During Q4 there were 24 children placed for adoption of which 11 had adoption order applications submitted to court pending hearing dates where orders are expected to be granted in Q1 of 21-22.

Councillor Ferrans

MKC 1601A - where is the commentary? Performance was smaller than the set target (RAG rated green) and so commentary was not requested on the Planning, Strategic Transport and Placemaking Dashboard for this indicator.

NI 193 - the target last year was unrealistic to start with. what target has been set this year? This is another KPI which is smaller is better and we are within target (RAG rated green) we want more waste going to be recycled this indicator is talking about the waste that is sent to landfill and are looking for a lower figure.

PH021 - its concerning that the service is only now reviewing its model due to Covid-19 that has been going on for 18 months

The Stop Smoking Service is committed to delivering excellent and effective support through a range of proven interventions. The review of this Service has been under way for some time and was in response to a previous Service re-modelling, as well as to challenges brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. It is hoped that the review will be completed in the next month and present a robust and evidence-based case for improving delivery to all our residents who want to quit smoking.

The Stop Smoking Service moved to a model delivering digital/telephone support for the majority of clients prior to the pandemic and has adjusted to meet changing needs throughout this period. This has included increasing clinic capacity within the specialist service, as soon as it identified issues with reduced delivery through Primary Care providers. The Service has also delivered digital training programmes for health professionals and targeted text and leaflet campaigns specifically for individuals living in areas of high deprivation.

The impact of the pandemic on Primary Care – the Stop Smoking Service's main provider of Level 2 support in the community - has been significant, both with restrictions on its ability to deliver services and as its resources have necessarily been focused elsewhere. This has reinforced the need to review the Service more fundamentally, not least with a view to addressing health inequalities. In order to deliver effective and equitable services we needed to undertake a full and considered evaluation of the Stop Smoking Service, including 'customer insights work', all of which has taken

considerable time to complete. Any delay has been compounded by the time lag on 'performance data' which is inherent to Stop Smoking Services, and which has meant that we have needed to wait for the availability of accurate and up to date information to make informed decisions about how the service will be commissioned and delivered in future.

MKC 1550 - Please explain how the reduction in homelessness % prevented is due to a reduction in evictions? That appears counter-intuitive! - Our preventions have reduced due to the lack of movement in the private sector market, and reduction in footfall due to the ban on evictions.

MKC 1347 - resolution of cat 1 hazards. Have we proceeded according to the correct procedure and timescales? (ie are delays or optional leniency contributing to this)

In both cases we have followed the correct protocols. We have direction over informal time periods providing satisfactory progress is being made or there is a very valid reason for not meeting the deadline. Delays in appointing contractors were a contributing factor plus in one case the personal circumstances of the landlord. Some discretion was therefore permitted as temporary/partial works were completed to reduce the cat 1 hazards. The cases are still being monitored but the risks have been reduced.

The Landlord has engaged a roofing contractor; they have done temporary works to stop water ingress – reducing the cat 1 hazard. The whole flat roof needs replacing the Landlord is awaiting a start date from the contractor. This will continue to be monitored until the full roof is replaced. Formal action is no longer being considered as the hazard has been reduced from a cat 1.

The Landlord has engaged a local contractor. The work has been partially completed – reducing the cat 1 hazards to an acceptable level. The outstanding works are being followed up. Formal action is no longer being considered as the hazard has been reduced from a cat 1. **(update: all works now completed)**

Councillor Bradburn

MKC 1751 - Has the new enforcement officer been employed yet?

The new Senior Enforcement Officer post has not been filled yet. A role profile has been created and evaluated and Agency CV's are currently being assessed with a view to filling the role on a short-term contract basis, whilst the role is advertised alongside the permanent Enforcement Team Leader post. The Planning Service is also working with colleagues across the Human Resources and Communications team on a recruitment campaign to run in the early summer. This will be targeted at planning roles currently occupied by agency staff and will provide a second opportunity to recruit to the enforcement roles if we are initially unsuccessful.

MKC 1550 - Could I have a clearer response on these figures?

Our preventions have reduced due to the lack of movement in the private sector market, and reduction in footfall due to the ban on evictions.

MKC 1401 - Do we issue fines to Anglia Water for overstaying?

In respect of your query regarding whether AWS are served FPNs for overstays, any overstays are subject to S74 charges. The charges for these are shown below and are calculated depending on the designation of the carriageway. These are charged at more than an FPN (£80) so we issue these first

and then review whether an FPN can be served for a valid reason (usually a breach of the permit conditions). If there is a valid reason, we will serve the FPN. In the case of serving an FPN for an overstay, this can be done when a valid works stop is added, and the works continue into the S74.

MKC 147 - What are cat 1 hazards?

The below is from: “Milton Keynes Council Private Sector Housing Strategy 2020-2025” found on our website.

The HHSRS (The housing health and safety rating system) as set out in the Housing Act 2004 is the principle means of assessing housing conditions across all tenures. The HHSRS lists 29 hazards that are risk rated as either a category 1 (serious) or a category 2 (less serious) hazards. The Authority has a duty to deal with category 1 hazards, and a discretionary power to deal with category 2 hazards. More information is available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/housing-health-and-safety-rating-system-hhsrs-guidance>

MKC 102&103 - The numbers are not transposed as %.

The report does show percentages, as per below. The target for both was 90%, the result for 102 was 25%, and for 103 was 0%. In the comment, the team provided detail on how many cases that was, just to make things a little bit clearer. (Following Cllr Mclean’s request above)

MKC 102	Right to Buy 2 issued on time	The RTB2 form is the notice that the Council is required to inform the tenant whether or not they have met the criteria to purchase the property. It must be responded to within 28 days from the receipt of their application.	Bigger	Quarterly	90%	90%	N/A	100%	100%	25%
MKC 103	Right to Buy 125 issued on time	Otherwise known as the offer notice. It contains the valuation, discount amount, purchase price, structural defects (if any), estimated service charges and proposed major works for the next 5 years. Once the RTB has been admitted, the Council has up to 8 weeks for the purchase of houses (Freehold) and 12 weeks for Flats (Leasehold) to service this notice on the tenant.	Bigger	Quarterly	90%	90%	N/A	100%	100%	0%