Leicestershire County Council

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2026

MINUTE EXTRACT

Corporate Asset Management Plan Annual Performance Report 2025/26

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources, the purpose of which was to present the Commission's consideration the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report, covering the period from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion the following points were made:

(i) Members expressed concern that performance had declined with 52% of indicators being achieved in 25/26 compared to 67% the previous year. It was acknowledged that performance had been mixed, but that the indicators covered a very broad portfolio, including normal property projects and improvements to energy performance projects and building schemes, some of which depended on factors outside the Council's control. Delivery was also sometimes dependent on services first defining their strategies before the property implications could be progressed resulting in the rephasing of projects which could also affect individual indicators being achieved. Members requested that future reports distinguish between indicators so that it could be more clearly identified where delivery had genuinely fallen short of targets expected.

(ii) The cost of identified maintenance liabilities had increased by approximately £3 million. It was questioned if this was fully funded within the MTFS and when it could be expected these works would be carried out. Members noted that £1.8m of this related to priority one works which would be carried out within 12 months and so were fully funded. The remainder would be reviewed and programmed as necessary. The Director explained that the estimate of maintenance liabilities represented a snapshot in time and was regularly reassessed before works commenced, as assets could remain serviceable for longer than anticipated or alternative interventions might become appropriate.

(iii) In response to a request for greater visibility of the underlying property maintenance programme, the Director explained that the Property Operations Team maintained a planned preventative maintenance programme. Items expected in years one and two were more certain than those in years three to five, and the programme was continually updated through inspections and liaison with the Strategic Property Team, including consideration of proposed disposals where the cost of maintaining a property might exceed its value. Members asked that the schedule of planned maintenance works be shared with members of the Commission. The Director undertook to provide this after the meeting.

(iv) Members highlighted the relevance of maintenance liabilities to Local Government Reorganisation, as significant future expenditure could affect decisions by successor authorities about which assets to retain. The Director agreed that an asset's maintenance burden would form part of the assessment of whether it represented a genuine asset or a liability and noted that anticipated consolidation of the property estate could justify deferring some works.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the report be noted;

(b) That future reports distinguish between key performance indicators so that Members could clearly identified where delivery had genuinely fallen short of targets expected;

(c) That the current schedule of planned maintenance works be shared with members of the Commission.