Pre-Scrutiny Questions and Answers – Cabinet Agenda 4 September

Report title: Tenant Satisfaction Survey Results 2023

Report Author(s): Lisa Barker- Head of Housing, Health and Communities & Paul Smith- Business Development and Change Manager

Councillor Russell:

1. The TP09 Complaint Handling satisfaction was around 40%. Please can you elaborate on how much of the complaint process 'handling' comprises of? Is it just the initial reporting and recording or does it include all steps to the conclusion of the problem and the outcome?

   Response: Tenant Perception question 9 is intended to measure a landlord's approach to handling a complaint and this is intended to cover all steps to the conclusion of the problem and outcome.
   The approach should provide a positive experience for the complainant even where their complaint may not have been upheld. The key areas to the approach would be.

   - That there is easy access to the complaints procedure and ensuring tenants are made aware of it, including their right to access the Housing Ombudsman Service.
   - That the complaint is responded to within the timelines set out in the Councils Complaints Policy. Complaints policy - Compliments and complaints - Warwick District Council. (warwickdc.gov.uk)
   - Ensuring fairness in complaint handling with a tenant focussed approach.
   - Taking action to put things right and appropriate remedies and advising of what will happen and when and ensuring the actions are followed up.

2. Given that the response rate of the survey was 29.5%, what can/will be done to encourage an increase in engagement in future surveys?

Response: We are currently in the process of reviewing the 2024 Tenant Satisfaction Survey which is scheduled to be undertaken before the end of the year. Part of this process will be consulting involved residents to understand how we could increase the response rate from tenants. One of the key areas we are considering is if we can collect the responses in different ways such as increasing the amount of responses via the website, facilitating email or text returns or complete the survey over the phone. Whilst the Housing Regulator has set clear rules on the questions and the format, we still have flexibility on how we receive the responses.

Councillor Milton:

There is a recurring theme about poor quality workmanship. What are our current processes for monitoring standards of work and how will this be improved?

Response: See Private and Confidential Pre-Scrutiny Questions and Answers.

A number of issues relate to neighbourhood problems like drug dealing. What are we doing to work with other partners (e.g. local police) to improve this on our estates in particular?

Response: We currently work very closely with a number of community safety partners including CGL (Change Grow Live) who are a drug and alcohol support service. On a case-by-case basis we work with mental health charities like MIND, the NHS. Also, P3 support agency and Social Services in terms of ensuring support is in place to our tenants. In addition to these partners, we work very closely with the safer neighbourhood police teams to proactively address drug dealing and other ASB issues on our estates. We regularly attend case management meetings and a wider group known as the "Vulnerability meeting" which focuses on known County Lines activity across the district.

Where we can identify any drug dealing that is emanating from our stock, we work with partners to gather the necessary evidence and take action to immediately disrupt this activity through the use of enforcement action or Closure Orders which effectively shut a property down for a 3-month period, making it an illegal activity for anyone to enter.

If the address is not council stock, Police take the lead in obtaining one of these orders as we do not have the necessary legal powers to do so, in line with legislation. When closure orders are obtained against a council property, we then take the necessary legal action to enforce our tenancy conditions which effectively results in an eviction. Over the last 12 months there have been 9 successful closure orders and 10 Evictions for Anti-Social Behaviour.

In addition to the above we partner with our community safety wardens and PCSO's to try to ensure regular uniformed patrols of any known hotspots to offer reassurance to our residents. To assistant in preventing ASB or drug activity our high-rise blocks have CCTV in most of the communal areas for monitoring purposes and to be able to identify perpetrators.

We have identified further areas of improvement required to meet the Housing Regulators community standards:

- Approval of an updated Warwickshire wide Tenancy strategy
- Development of a Neighbourhood management strategy
- Revisions to the existing ASB Policy and strengthen procedures and the provision of further training.

Whilst we're scoring above average (which is good to see) what is the target that we are seeking to achieve?

Response: Generally, the target is to progressively improve the satisfaction levels, certainly those that score the lowest. In the 24/25 Service Area Plan performance measures we have set incremental percentage increases. Specifically, we need to understand further what drives up satisfaction levels and work with the Resident Involvement Group (RIG) to understand how we could achieve higher scores and to develop an action plan balancing the levels of service, implementing the new Housing Regulators consumer standards with the challenges and demands and resources available.

What plans are we putting in place to improve some of the areas of challenge like communal areas and complaint handling?

Response: Overall, as set out in the cabinet report we will incorporate the three recommendations presented by Housemark in their Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM) Report 23/24 into the work being undertaken to ensure the new consumer standards are met. Specifically for the two areas of challenge, service improvements are currently being delivered to help drive up satisfaction levels.

Communal Areas.

In terms of cleanliness of the communal areas, there is a now a new cleaning contract in place to ensure all our High-Rise blocks are cleaned daily, other stock identified as having a high footfall are cleaned weekly and all other areas twice a month. In addition, all communal windows will now be cleaned twice a year.

In addition, our Estates Officers undertake regular inspections of our stock containing communal areas and will ensure that areas are clean and sterile and improve satisfaction levels by keeping the estates communal areas clean and well

maintained. The estates officers also are working in conjunction with Housing Officers to take action against known tenants who are in breach of any tenancy conditions with an emphasis on support to change any poor behaviours.

Complaints.

Effective complaints handling is an essential element of any service offer due to the importance of quickly resolving service failures for Tenants whilst presenting opportunities to learn from them and make changes that improve services.

Improvements in complaints handling are ongoing and started with Cabinet approving a new complaints policy in February 2024 and the subsequent improvements being introduced to ensure that the Housing Ombudsman Service Complaint Handling Code 2024 is complied with. This code became statutory on 1 April 2024, meaning that landlords are obliged by law to follow its requirements. The code aims to achieve best practice in complaints handling and ultimately to provide a better service to residents.

Improvements currently being delivered.

- Reviewing the last completed self-assessment which measures compliance with the code and identifies areas for improvement. This was published on the council's website in June 2024. Housing complaints self-assessment June 2024 - Download - Warwick District Council. (warwickdc.gov.uk)
- Addressing the areas for improvement identified in the self-assessment.
- Reviewing complaint information on the website ensuring Policy and processes are clear and residents can make complaints with ease.
- Briefing and training Housing, Heath and Communities staff on the call handling code.
- Embedding a specialist team set up in Housing, Health and Communities to investigate complaints to ensure consistency and provide some independence from the service delivery teams
- Setting up processes to learn from complaints and make the necessary service adjustments or changes.

Councillor Syson:

Question 1: Do the results have to be reported back to the Regulator of Social Housing at any stage?

Response: Yes, annually by the end of June for the reporting year 1 April to 31 March. June 2024 is the first year that registered providers must submit to the regulator information relating to the Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM's) as specified by the regulator.

Question 2: What is the timescale for the implementation of the 3 recommendations? Particularly for the action plan? It is particularly important considering one of the risks you have identified is *"Ensuring that tenants receive feedback and see change in response to the views that they have taken the time to provide to mitigate against reputational risk."*

Response:

Recommendation 1: Clearly communicate the TSM findings to both staff and tenants. Publish the TSM scores alongside a summary of future actions (e.g. on a single webpage). – **We have committed to the regulator we will communicate the TSM's via the website by the end of October 2024.**

Recommendation 2: WDC should develop a clear action plan based on the TSM findings, and the impact of actions taken should be assessed over time…….

Recommendation 2 is codependent on completion of recommendation 3 and the involvement of tenants, staff and stakeholders to shape the action plan. We aim to have an action plan in place with an agreed governance process to provide monitoring and assurance by the end of January 2025.

Recommendation 3: As part of the creation of an action plan, involve tenants in a small number of focus groups to better understand the context of their feedback and develop suggestions in a co-created manner. A similar approach could also be considered by involving staff and close stakeholders (e.g. repairs contractors) in this process. – **See response at recommendation 2.**

Question 3: How did the outcomes from this survey correspond to any previous surveys? Does this one show improvement or the opposite?

Response: An accurate or meaningful comparison with the 23/24 outcomes against the 22/23 outcomes has not been undertaken. The reason for this, is that whilst we asked the regulators TSM's perception questions in 22/23 we are unable to give the same assurance as we can with the 23/24 outcomes that the approach fully met the regulators requirements.

Question 4: Given that a greater proportion of those tenants who had made complaints (1 in 6 of the respondents) were dis-satisfied rather than satisfied, with the way WDC handles complaints what specific action will be taken to improve the system?

Response: To be consistent with the response to the question, set out below is the response given to a similar question asked by Cllr Milton.

Complaints.

Effective complaints handling is an essential element of any service offer due to the importance of quickly resolving service failures for Tenants whilst presenting opportunities to learn from them and make changes that improve services.

Improvements in complaints handling are ongoing and started with Cabinet approving a new complaints policy in February 2024 and the subsequent improvements being introduced to ensure that the Housing Ombudsman Service Complaint Handling Code 2024 is complied with. This code became statutory on 1 April 2024, meaning that landlords are obliged by law to follow its requirements. The code aims to achieve best practice in complaints handling and ultimately to provide a better service to residents.

Improvements currently being delivered.

- Reviewing the last completed self-assessment which measures compliance with the code and identifies areas for improvement. This was published on the council's website in June 2024. Housing complaints self-assessment June 2024 - Download - Warwick District Council. (warwickdc.gov.uk)
- Addressing the areas for improvement identified in the self-assessment.
- Reviewing complaint information on the website ensuring Policy and processes are clear and residents can make complaints with ease.
- Briefing and training Housing, Heath and Communities staff on the call handling code.
- Embedding a specialist team set up in Housing, Health and Communities to investigate complaints to ensure consistency and provide some independence from the service delivery teams
- Setting up processes to learn from complaints and make the necessary service adjustments or changes.

Question 5: Was there any way of identifying on the form which areas the respondents came from? I ask because it would be useful to know if people in some areas respond far more favourably than other areas, and where there were complaints about poor grounds maintenance or service cleaning, would you know where these were?

In particular with the additional question "Perceptions of the Neighbourhood Improving, declining, or remaining the same" are you aware which neighbourhoods were identified as declining? Will you be able to address some of the problems identified?

Response: We are able to identify which areas respondents came from using postcode data. There is a current piece of work being undertaken to analyse this information. This will assist us in producing further data and information from the survey responses based on areas/neighbourhoods. This will give valuable insight when developing the action plan and identifying priorities which could potentially make the most effective impact in increasing satisfaction levels.

Question 6: The report states "when the final data was gathered in February 2024, it was noted that the feedback gained required weighting to ensure it was representative of the WDC tenant profile." Is it possible to let us know which parts of the profile were under-represented or indeed over-represented.

Response: Four areas were identified where the respondent sample was not representative of the tenant population

- Household Composition
- Stock type (Sheltered or not)
- Ward
- Age

See Appendix 1 for more detailed analysis. The table shows for the tenant population the percentage breakdown of number of tenants sent a questionnaire in the four areas. For the survey respondents a breakdown of the percentage returned questionnaires in the four areas.

Question 7: One in 6 respondents are either "Fairly dissatisfied" or "Very dissatisfied" with the repairs service they have received in the last 12 months, and 1 in 5 are dissatisfied with the time taken to complete the repair after it was reported. Do you do any follow up to repairs, to check that repairs have been carried out satisfactorily? Is there any log following repairs to note if contractors have to return, and if so, would this tally with 1 in 6 of these respondents saying repairs are not satisfactory?

I note that when identifying the 3 highest ranking items which reflect the greatest influence on overall satisfaction this includes TP04 "Satisfaction that the home is well maintained."

I understand that Overview and Scrutiny are planning to scrutinise repairs on 24 September 2024.

Response: see Private and Confidential Pre- Scrutiny Questions and Answers.

Councillor R Dickson:

The overall TP01 result is good news and the recommendations definitely should have health and wellbeing implications (Section 9) because, intuitively, satisfaction with their housing is a contributor to both the mental and physical health of our residents. I'm aware too that, in the interest of 'finding a better way', others have already asked what the target is that we're striving to achieve by the time of the next survey in 12 months' time.

The benchmarking results make particularly reassuring reading. However, for our residents the quality of local authority housing services in other parts the country is probably of less relevance than the quality of housing services provided by other RSLs/housing associations in Warwick district. Do we have any comparable tenant satisfaction figures from these providers?

Response: We do not have comparable tenant satisfaction figures based on the final Tenant Satisfaction Measure (TSM's) submissions by providers operating in Warwick district. All registered providers which include housing associations were required to submit the TSM's to the regulator by the end of June 2024 for the reporting year 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024. June 2024 is the first year that registered providers must submit to the regulator information relating to the TSM's as specified by the regulator. The regulator has indicated that they will publish the results for all providers in the autumn so assured comparisons can be made at that point.

The absence of an Equality Impact Assessment is noted. However is there any breakdown of the respondents by age and type of property? Are those aged 75+ more/less satisfied than those aged under 75? How do satisfaction measures differ between tenants in flats, houses and bungalows?

Response: Yes, we can breakdown the respondents by age by type of property.

Below is a breakdown of the responses for the over and under 75's for the question Taking everything into account, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the service provided by Warwick District Council, Housing Services (WDC)?

Response	75+	Under 75
Very satisfied	46.84%	34.53%
Fairly satisfied	36.65%	41.00%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	8.50%	13.03%
Fairly dissatisfied	4.13%	7.16%
Very dissatisfied	3.88%	4.28%

Bands	75+	Under 75
Satisfied	83.50%	75.52%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	8.50%	13.03%
Dissatisfied	8.01%	11.44%

Breakdown of types of property.

Taking everything into account, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the service provided by Warwick District Council, Housing Services (WDC)?

Response	Bungalow	Flat	House
Very satisfied	41.72%	35.69%	38.01%
Fairly satisfied	38.85%	42.77%	37.64%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10.83%	12.05%	12.18%
Fairly dissatisfied	4.14%	5.72%	7.56%
Very dissatisfied	4.46%	3.77%	4.61%

Bands	Bungalow	Flat	House
Satisfied	80.57%	78.46%	75.65%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10.83%	12.05%	12.18%
Dissatisfied	8.60%	9.49%	12.18%

Finally, whilst the satisfaction of our tenants should be a concern for all councillors, is there easily available a breakdown of the number of tenants and tenanted properties by council ward?

Response: In terms of the number of tenants and tenanted properties by council ward, this data can be extracted from our IT system and will be provided to you by the 9 September 2024.

Report title: Q1 Budget Update 2024/25

Report Author(s): Steven Leathley- Strategic Finance Manager

Councillor Milton:

1.1.2.1 In terms of the housing benefit that we're paying out for hotel accommodation, how much of this is to people who would qualify for social housing if we had properties available. And what's the split between single people, couples and families.

It appears that every line relating to housing, both in the HRA and the General Fund is adverse. Is there a more general problem that we should be aware of.

Response

Councillor Syson:

Question 1: I note that "Senior Leadership is working with Officers to review ways of reducing the projected overspend " I take it that this is for this year. Is there planning for longer term more drastic plans should they be necessary?

Question 2: Reserves have been built up in times past by the Business Rate Retention Scheme surplus which won't last for ever. What is happening to this year's Business Rate surplus and how much is it estimated to be?

Response: The Business Rate Volatility Reserve is being held at £2.0 million, additional funds received in year are held in the GF Volatility Reserve or allocated during Budget Setting in year whilst we await decision on the Rates reset.

Question 3: 1.1.4.2. states "Funding from Stratford for P3 is expected in the next quarter." I thought P3 was under contract to WCC to provide homeless support services throughout the district? Do we now fund this with Stratford? What time period will the funding from Stratford cover – is it paid in arrears?

Question 4: Waste management. "It is therefore expected that the rebate will be £780k under-delivered in 2024/25." "For Q1, £500k of the adverse variance has been met through in-year contract contingency budget approved at budget setting"

This obviously a big blow. What allowance has been made in the MTFS figures going forward - are we being pessimistic/realistic enough?

Response: See Comments below (Q2 Councillor Dickson)

Question 5 : "1.1.7.4 Royal Pump Room - income forecast based on previous year's outturn." Will the forthcoming roof works affect the use of any of the rooms, which might drive down income?

Question 6: 1.1.9.3. Shared legal services. "However there is also significant demand with the legal team working at above capacity to meet the demands from WDC commercial work at this time." Was this not foreseen? We are only looking at Q1, not far into the year.

Question 7: relating to the HRA but it applies elsewhere too - 1.2.1 "As part of the Vacancy factor process for Q1, A full year forecast of all Salary budgets has been completed and the Vacancy factor calculations have been made. This forecasts that 63.56% of the for HRA Vacancy Factor (£1.012m) has been met. This leaves the remaining £0.580m to be completed for the current year."

I know that every year there are vacancies, and the Council is never fully staffed so this is built into budgets. I do find it strange though that the Vacancy Factor has to be met. I know that Housing in particular, but is not alone, is coping with vacancies and too many current competing priorities. To expect them to meet the Vacancy Factor in this situation seems ridiculous. I would be interested in your comments.

Response: All Salary Budgets are create at full establishment, to ensure Managers can budget correctly for their services to protect budgets in the future. Looking back on previous financial years, we always have staff turnover in year generating an underspend. The Vacancy factor is used to predict this underspend in year so we can fully utilise the base budget available. The Vacancy factor is then calculated each quarter based on the current know establishment and reduction in costs due to 'slippage' in postholders leaving / starting. The alternative (which was used in previous years) is to apply the vacancy factor across all teams equally, this can make forecasting salaries difficult as in many cases the budget will start less than the team requires. By centralising the Vacancy factor, we can forecast more efficiently and accurately during the year, If the vacancy factor was not take, it would be difficult to see to actual picture of staffing throughout the authority.

Question 8: 1.2.3. "Warwick Response – Forecast for general fees and charges predicted yearly reduction resulted from private customers leaving with only Warwick council customers in properties, income generated from sales of sundry item is not as much as pre-covid."
The budget for this is significant, am I right in thinking it is £1.8m or thereabouts? How much of this is covered by fees and charges?

Question 9: It is noted that Housing has been unable to respond to several of your queries; are you aware why? I am wondering if there is a particular problem.
I note that 4.1.1. "Officers review current year budgets against outturn on a monthly basis at the same time as considering their implications for the medium term. …… Further reviews and changes to this process will be implemented through utilisation of the new Financial Management System (FMS)."

Response: We are continually developing the FMS to provide easier and accurate reports for managers to use to understand their services financial position. This is a continual development and is supported by the Accountancy Team meeting with managers, providing data and support for their services. A new training programme for Cost Centre Managers is in development to further support their understanding of their financial responsibilities and tools to support them, and will be rolled out to all managers in the near future.

Question 10: 1.5 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFS)
What inflation rate is being used for future planning for 2025/26, 2026/27 and 2027/2028 ? Also, what % is being built in to allow for projected wage settlements?

I appreciate none of us have a crystal ball but as Grant Thornton pointed out in their recent Audit Report we were not using the latest available figures in the past, to our detriment.

Response: An inflation increase of 4% for 2025/26 and 3% thereafter has been included in the MTFS, this is based on published predictions at the time of setting the budget, and will be reviewed at budget setting again. The report from GT highlighted a time where inflation rates where extremely volatile and did not factor in the additional funds held as contingency to easy and upward change in inflation during the year, For the last few years alongside inflationary increases, we have set aside a salary and contracts contingency to ensure budgets are sufficient.

Question 11: 1.7 Reserves. Has the time come to raise the minimum General Fund Reserve balance from £1.5m?

Response: The General Fund reserve is our minimum level of reserves, and in additional we hold the General Fund Volatility reserve to support variations. The minimum level for GF can be discussed further during the budget setting process for 2025/26 due to start next month.

Question 12: 10. Risk Assessment, mentions
10.2.8 Scrutiny by members of the Council's finances, including Budget Reports, and the financial implications of all proposals.

I would echo Cllr Dickson comments/question. Are you satisfied that sufficient members do sufficiently scrutinise everything mentioned above?

Response: See comments below (Q3 Councillor Dickson)

Councillor R Dickson:

1) Reserve movements – the additional and unexpected £243K required for the Kenilworth School & 6th Form project is noted with concern. My understanding is that WDC did have representation on the project board through both the previous Deputy Chief Executive and the previous Finance Portfolio Holder so it would be useful to know a bit more about how this liability got missed.

   Response (Darren Knight): From Darren Knight: WDC acted as guarantor for the 278 highway works. The highway works cost more than the project expected – due to design changes, inflation, additional professional fees etc. I can provide more detail and background if needed.

2) Reserve movements – the under-delivery of £780K on the Waste Management contract is also noted with concern. Presumably the anticipated income from WDC's involvement with the WMIZ Board will help here but are there knock-on consequences for funding of other WDC projects e.g. Abbey Fields Swimming Pools?

   Response (Darren Knight): Group Leaders, Chair of Audit and Chair of O&S had a confidential briefing on this last Wednesday. This will be covered as part of a confidential O&S this week and relates to the MRF.

3) Risk Assessment – at the recent Audit & Standards Committee the new Strategic Risk Registers (non-confidential and confidential) were scrutinised. These are a very welcome development. However, this was done in absence of this Q1

Budget update, so – aside from this scrutiny of Cabinet papers - I wonder how (as stated in 10.2.8) members are scrutinising the Council's finances and budget reports? Is this considered acceptable governance?

Response (Darren Knight): We have been focusing our efforts to start to improve our risk management processes and approach. As this progresses, we will ensure improved co-ordination.

4) External Communications – how is it proposed that residents be kept informed about the current state of the Council's finances? It's appreciated that throughout a financial year things change, stuff happens, and we don't want to alarm residents unnecessarily, but on the other hand we have a duty of candour and openness and we don't want to present residents with surprises when it comes to setting the 2025/26 budget.

Response (Darren Knight):

With regard to additional expenditure for Kenilworth school: WDC acted as guarantor for the 278 highway works. The highway works cost more than the project expected – due to design changes, inflation, additional professional fees etc. I can provide more detail and background if needed.

With regard to waste management: Group Leaders, Chair of Audit and Chair of O&S had a confidential briefing on this last Wednesday. This will be covered as part of a confidential O&S this week and relates to the MRF.

Risk Assessment: We have been focusing our efforts to start to improve our risk management processes and approach. As this progresses, we will ensure improved co-ordination.

Report title: Solar RCVs Exemption

Report Author(s): Katie McAuley-White – Project Officer

Councillor Kohler:

As the solar mats will be installed on the roof of the RCV, would low hanging low branches, etc., present a potential risk to them?

Have officers received any peer-to-peer feedback from other Council's that have installed the technology on their fleet? Have they performed in line with expectations? Have there been any unforeseen issues?

Regarding the 4 new vehicles due in 2025, can you confirm that these will be diesel? Have we created a the business case (both £ and CO2) to test if one or more of them could be EVs?

Response: I have checked with the supplier and have been told the panels utilise a self-healing/self-cleaning polymer resin so general branch strikes are not a problem and haven't been an issue to date.

Officers have made enquiries with other Councils that have had the technology installed on their fleet and any feedback received will feed into the due diligence process should Cabinet approve the recommendations within the report, before any contracts are signed.

It is believed that these vehicles will be diesel as the arrangements were in place prior to any exploration of the solar mats, but further information can be provided when the relevant officers are back from leave.

Report title: Solar Photovoltaics Loan Proposal

Report Author(s): Tim Hornsby – Building Climate and Energy Manager

Councillor R Dickson:

1) In connection with all of the proposed sites, what reassurance is available that there will be no disruption to service users whilst the work is undertaken?

   Response (Dave Barber): Disruption associated with the installation of solar panel is expected to minimal as the installations will be on the roof. Where associated works need to be done (such as to the roof or electrical supply) there may be some minimal disruption. However, works will be planned in association with the building managers and/or tenants.

2) As far as Castle Farm Leisure Centre is concerned, will the solar pv also be provided for the adjacent Kenilworth Scout & Guide Centre, and the financial benefits shared with this community group?

Response (Dave Barber): The proposed additional solar will be provided on the leisure centre roof to provide energy to the main leisure centre. The roofs of the scout and guide centre are not well orientated and are (at least partially) overshadowed by trees. As a result they are not currently considered to be value for money.

3) Paragraph 10.1 states that the proposal has been discussed with the Low Cost, Low Carbon Programme Board but it would help to know what was their assessment of it?

   Response (Dave Barber): The Programme Board were strongly supportive of the scheme. The notes of the July meeting say "The LCLC Energy PB supportive of the solar installation." It is understood that the Head of Governance will be making the notes of the Board meeting available to all members soon.

4) Whilst it is accepted that the report is focussed mainly on the funding structure for the project, how has the risk associated with WDC's capacity to manage this eight-site project been assessed (as both a standalone project and as part of an existing large suite of existing projects) and what mitigating actions as far as project management have been identified? Has the Community of Practice for Project Management had any input to these proposals?

   Response (Dave Barber): The Buildings Energy Manager who has prepared the proposals will be overseeing their delivery and, with the Programme Director for Climate Change, has planned the work to take account of his workload. The delivery risks have been considered and as a result the works will not all be delivered at the same time. The COP for Project Management (PMCOP) has not had any direct input in to the proposals (it should be noted that the PMCOP is a project managers support and networking group, not a decision-making body through which projects are ever considered). The Buildings Energy Manager who will be overseeing the delivery of these schemes is part of the PMCOP.

Councillor K Dickson:

I seem to remember a planned programme in the past for solar panel installation at Jubilee House which attracted grant monies. Is this correct? And if so, what was the reason that the grants were not used to provide these improvements.

Response (Dave Barber): I think the scheme you are referring to related to the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS) bid made in 2021 which included a £401k scheme for Jubilee House. PSDS focuses on replacement of heating systems rather than solar. For that reason, proposal did not include rooftop solar.

Also, the report in appendix 1 acknowledges that the energy usage for Jubilee House is difficult to estimate because the supply is shared with neighbouring properties. When considering the cost of electricity, what measures are taken to recharge the clinic and library owners and is there potential, if this arrangement is to continue, to utilise the rooves of the neighbouring buildings to increase the array of solar panels supplying electricity at this site?

Response (Dave Barber): At present there are no recharges in place. However, a proposal has been developed to install separate metering so that recharges can be made. This will be presented to the Change Programme Board once the detail costings have been provided. There is potential to utilise the roofs of neighbouring buildings, although the costs and benefits will fall on the NHS and County Council. We will seek to coordinate with them on this but are also keen to ensure that WDC progress plans for Jubilee House with minimum delay.