Public Document Pack Bridgend County Borough Council Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr



Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend, CF31 4WB / Swyddfeydd Dinesig, Stryd yr Angel, Pen-y-bont, CF31 4WB

Legal and Regulatory Services / **Gwasanaethau Cyfreithiol a Rheoleiddiol** Direct line / Deialu uniongyrchol: 01656 643 387 Ask for / Gofynnwch am: Sarah Daniel

Date / Dyddiad: 12 January 2016

Dear Councillor,

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Community, Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be held in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices Angel Street Bridgend CF31 4WB on **Monday**, **18 January 2016** at **10.00 am**.

AGENDA

- <u>Apologies for Absence</u> To receive apologies for absence (to include reasons, where appropriate) from Members/Officers.
- <u>Declarations of Interest</u> To receive declarations of personal and prejudicial interest (if any) from Members/Officers in accordance with the provisions of the Members Code of Conduct adopted by Council from 1 September 2008 (including Whipping declarations)
- 3. <u>Approval of Minutes</u> 3 10 To receive for approval the minutes of a meeting of the Community Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee of 8 October 2015
- 4.Forward Work Programme Update11 145.Draft Budget Consultation 2016-17
Invitees:15 56

Mark Shephard - Corporate Director – Communities Satwant Price, Head of Regeneration and Development Zak Shell, Head of Neighbourhood Services Councillor Hywel Williams - Cabinet Member for Communities Joanne Norman - Finance Manager - Education Communities and Transformation

6. Urgent Items

To consider any item(s) of business in respect of which notice has been given in accordance with Part 4 (paragraph 4) of the Council Procedure Rules and which the person presiding at the meeting is of the opinion should by reason of special circumstances be

Tel/Ffôn: 01656 643643	Fax/Facs: 01656 668126	Email/Ebost: <u>talktous@bridgend.gov.uk</u>
SMS Messaging/Negeseuon SMS: 07581 157014	Twitter@bridgendCBC	Website/Gwefan: <u>www.bridgend.gov.uk</u>
Text relay: Put 18001 before Cyfnewid testun: Rhowch 18001 o flaen ur	any of our phone numbers for t whyw un o'n rhifau ffon ar gyfei	

transacted at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

Yours faithfully **P A Jolley** Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Regulatory Services

Distribution:

Councillors: DK Edwards CA Green RM James RD Jenkins Councillors CL Jones DRW Lewis JR McCarthy G Phillips <u>Councillors</u> JC Spanswick JH Tildesley MBE KJ Watts R Williams

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES ANGEL STREET BRIDGEND CF31 4WB ON THURSDAY, 8 OCTOBER 2015 AT 2.00 PM

Present

Councillor JC Spanswick – Chairperson

CA Green	RD Jenkins	CL Jones	JR McCarthy
G Phillips	CE Smith	JH Tildesley MBE	R Williams

Officers:

Darren Mepham	Chief Executive
Kym Barker	Scrutiny Officer
Andrew Rees	Senior Democratic Services Officer - Committees

Invitees:

Cllr C E Smith Cllr H Williams Mark Shephard Satwant Pryce Zak Shell Andrew Hobbs Mark Halliwell Andrew Jones Ieuan Sherwood Sue Whittaker Jeff Peters Gareth Davies Phillip Morris	Cabinet Member Regeneration and Economic Development Cabinet Member Communities Corporate Director - Communities Head of Regeneration and Planning Head of Neighbourhood Services Group Manager - Street Works Manager Regeneration Funding Manager Regeneration Projects and Built Environment Manager Countryside and Tourism Manager Local Enterprise Initiatives and Rural Development Team Leader Projects and Business Approaches Director of Development Leisure Partner, E J Hales
Karl Schmidtke	Regional Director, Trecco Bay Holiday Park

18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the following Members for the reasons so stated:

Councillor D K Edwards – Holiday Councillor D R W Lewis – Other Council Business.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

20. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u>

<u>RESOLVED:</u> That the minutes of the Community, Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee of 28 July 2015 be approved as a true and accurate record.

21. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Scrutiny Officer presented a report which detailed the items to be considered at the next meeting of the Committee and sought confirmation of the information and invitees required.

The Scrutiny Officer also reported that Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards looked after children and young people and that all Members have a level of responsibility for the children and young people looked after by the authority. She requested that Members consider how the services within the remit of the Committee affect children in care and care leavers and how it can assist in these areas. The Scrutiny Officer stated that Scrutiny Champions can greatly support the Committee in this by advising of the ongoing work of the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee any decisions or changes which they should be aware of as Corporate Parents.

The Scrutiny Officer also reported that the Corporate Resources and Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed to set up a Joint Research and Evaluation Panel for Sickness Absence and sought a nomination from this Committee to sit on the Panel.

Conclusions:

- (1) Noted the topics to be considered at its meeting on 18 January 2016 and the invitees to attend to attend the meeting;
- (2) Determined the invitees to be invited to attend the meeting on 27 January 2016;
- (3) Nominated Councillor C L Jones to sit on Sickness Absence Joint Research and Evaluation Panel.

22. <u>REGENERATION IN THE COUNTY BOROUGH - DELIVERING ON THE CORPORATE</u> <u>PRIORITIES</u>

The Committee was introduced to the managers in the Regeneration Service and to Mr Phillip Morris, Leisure Partner of E J Hales, Mr Karl Schmidtke, Regional Director, Trecco Bay Holiday Car Park and Mr Gareth Davies, Director of Development of Coastal Housing Group who had been invited to the Committee as external invitees.

The Head of Regeneration and Development presented a report on the alignment between the Regeneration Service's work programme and the proposed corporate priorities. She summarised the main programmes and projects delivered by the Regeneration Service and their connections to delivering the corporate priorities. She stated that the Regeneration Service had changed a great deal and from 2016-17 would cost £1.3m mostly spent on staff. The vast majority of funding for regeneration was levered from elsewhere. She informed the Committee that she was very proud of her staff all of whom perform exceptionally well with most of the work being done with partners.

The Committee referred to the Garw Mountain Bike Trails and questioned what would happen to the project once the current funding had ended. The Head of Regeneration and Development informed the Committee that as resources have shrunk it had been difficult to continue funding many schemes, although there was an opportunity to continue delivering the project through the Rural Development Programme. She stated that as resources have shrunk many future projects would not be project managed by Regeneration and she had invited a representative of the Coastal Housing Group to the

Committee who had been appointed as project managers for the delivery of the Rhiw redevelopment.

The Committee commented that it had been very impressed with the success of the Regeneration Service in drawing down Welsh Government and European funding which had been used to carry out regeneration schemes in the County Borough's Town Centres. The Committee expressed its concern whether the corporate priorities were correct in reducing resources in the Regeneration Service given the emphasis by the Welsh Government on the development of the City Deal which the County Borough is a partner. The Regeneration Service needed to be in a position in order to exploit the City Deal and to maximise its benefits to the County Borough. The Chief Executive informed the Committee that the City Deal which he was personally involved in is in its infancy and could see £1bn invested in the region over 10 years. This would see investment in infrastructure projects such as the development of a metro link across the region. He stated that there was a need to secure the involvement of universities to create the right job and skills among the workforce in the region. The City Deal had advantages that would apply across all Council services. The Cabinet Member Regeneration and Economic Development commented that key to the success of City Deal would be the investment in infrastructure and broadband in order for it to achieve a lasting legacy. He stated that City Deal is seen as a top priority and would proceed according to existing local government boundaries with this Council's interests lying to the East where it was engaged in a number of collaborations. The Cabinet Member Communities informed the Committee that Cabinet is fully supportive of the City Deal concept and the Regeneration Service will play an important role in its development.

The Regional Director of Trecco Bay Caravan Park commended the Council on its proactive approach to regeneration which stood head and shoulders above other local authorities in Wales. He stated that the Council through its Tourism Service had been successful in drawing down European funding which would enable Park Holidays to invest £12m in its facilities over the next 4 years. This had seen record visitor numbers to the caravan park. He expressed concern that bureaucracy was seen as a barrier to making and executing quicker investment decisions.

The Director of Development of the Coastal Housing Group commented on Coastal's experience in Town Centre regeneration and that it would bring a leap of faith with the redevelopment of the Rhiw Multi Storey Car Park which could act as a catalyst for further regeneration projects in Bridgend Town Centre. He echoed the concern of Regional Director of Trecco Bay Caravan Park that bureaucracy was making it difficult to get projects up and running quickly in line with their investment strategy but recognised that both the developer and the Council needed to put in place safeguards prior to development commencing.

The Leisure Partner, E J Hales informed the Committee that investment in smaller scale schemes was less attractive to private sector investors as the timescales involved are off putting due to the fluctuating economy and the need for investors to get in and out of projects swiftly due to increasing construction costs and rental values decreasing. He stated that it was critical to get private sector investment at the right time to enable development to take place.

The Director of Development of the Coastal Housing Group informed the Committee that it would work with the Council to ensure that there were employment opportunities for both skilled local labour and apprenticeships during the construction phase of the Rhiw Multi Storey redevelopment. The Local Enterprise Initiatives and Rural Development Manager informed the Committee that it was hoped to place skilled local and experienced labour on site and that work had been done in relation to the bridges into

Work programme. The Welsh Government had an ambition as part of the funding for the project to create 14 jobs.

The Committee referred to the proposed redevelopment of the Jennings Building, Porthcawl and questioned the reasons why a local estate agent had announced that 11 units had been sold when a planning application had not been submitted. The Head of Regeneration and Development informed the Committee that a planning application had now been submitted and that a great deal of pre-application had been undertaken. She stated that it was not unusual for developers to pre-sell units. The Manager Regeneration Projects and Built Environment informed the Committee that the Jennings Building had come to fruition as a result of a soft marketing exercise.

The Head of Regeneration and Development informed the Committee that the masterplan for the Salt Lake / Sandy Bay site was being revisited which needed to reviewed in the context of the engineering proposals and there would also be Supplementary planning Guidance for this site. The Leisure Partner, E J Hales informed the Committee that the requirements of the food store operator changed very quickly which prevented the previous development happening, however there may be scope for smaller scale retailers to be part of the development. The Regional Director of Trecco Bay Caravan Park stated that the lack of development had had a negative impact on the operation of the caravan park but was hopeful that development on the site would improve the tourism product. The Cabinet Member Regeneration and Economic Development commented that the development at Salt Lake needed to be right for Porthcawl. The Manager Regeneration Projects and Built Environment informed the Committee that public expectation would be high when the masterplan is revisited.

A member of the Committee expressed concern that services were being externalised to social enterprises and charity trusts and in doing so there would be a lack of public accountability and control and that consideration should be given to looking at in-house solutions and the services remaining in the public domain. The Cabinet Member Regeneration and Economic Development informed the Committee that there is accountability with the cultural trust and this step had been taken in order to avoid losing services such as libraries. The Corporate Director Communities stated that the key plank of this approach is preserving services as due to budget cuts the Council would not be in a position to run these services. He informed the Committee that the Council had invested in a Community Asset Transfer Officer to facilitate Community Asset Transfer of sports pavilions, community centres, bus stops and public toilets. He understood the concerns regarding this approach but stated that it was a means of protecting assets which the Council would not have the funding to run those services. A member of the Committee asked whether APSE could be involved in assisting the Council to transform services and expressed concern that the Council was going down the path of commissioning services. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that a range of models of service delivery was being considered.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Head of Regeneration and Planning stated that the Regeneration Service budget in 2010-11 represented 1% of the Council's budget and in 2016-17 would diminish to 0.71% of the Council's budget.

Conclusions

The Committee noted the report, which provided Members with information on the alignment between the Regeneration Service's work programme and the proposed corporate priorities and focus areas.

• Members were supportive of the work of the Regeneration team and commended their success in obtaining and utilising funding. Members raised concerns that if the

team and the services they provide are diminished there will be a risk that the Authority will not be in a position to maximise the potential of opportunities in future, such as those which City Deal could provide.

- Members raised concerns that local community regeneration projects such as Garw Mountain Bike Trails may be discontinued. The Officer replied that where it was more difficult for the Authority to deliver smaller scale projects alternative ways would have to be found to ensure they continue.
- Members raised concerns regarding services identified in the report for Community Asset Transfer and queried whether consideration had been given to managing these services in-house. The Officer responded that a mixed approach may be used in future.
- Members supported the appointment of a dedicated Community Asset Transfer Officer and stressed the importance of providing a single point of contact to ensure that the transfer process is dealt with as efficiently and effectively as possible.
- Members asked invitees from the business community whether anything that could be better with regard to working with BCBC. The invitees were unanimous in responding that they sometimes experience frustration due to the levels of bureaucracy involved. This makes investment in smaller scale schemes less attractive to private sector investors as the timescales involved are off putting due to the fluctuating economy and the need for investors to get in and out of projects swiftly enough to take advantage of the situation when the economic climate is right.

23. SERVICE LEVELS FOR FRONTLINE STREET SCENE SERVICE DELIVERY

The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee of the Communities Directorate's current understanding of the potential impact to service standards due to recent and future reductions to frontline Streetscene services. He stated that services would need to be different, remodeled and resourced differently in view in known cuts to budgets.

The Committee requested a breakdown of costs to enable Town and Community Councils to make an informed decision on whether they could fund litter picking and grass cutting in their communities prior to them setting their precepts. The Group Manager Streetworks informed the Committee that indicative costs could be provided to Town and Community Councils if requested, however there was the issue of double taxation, licences and contract arrangements with third parties to consider. A member of the Committee stated her Community Council would seek to enter into an arrangement with the Council where it would be invoiced for the work the Council undertook on its behalf. The Group Manager Streetworks stated that this raised broader policy issues at how services were delivered in communities. He stated there would need to be a coherent and consistent approach as to the services Town and Community Councils were prepared to fund. A member of the Committee commented that there needed to be a simplified approach in order to encourage Town and Community Councils to come forward with proposals. A member of the Committee requested that they be provided with information of land ownership to enable Town and Community Councils to make an informed decision on its future maintenance.

The Committee questioned whether the 18% budget reduction in the Parks service area included staff. The Committee also questioned whether bowling clubs who enter into an arrangement with the Council to self-manage facilities would receive assistance. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that there would be opportunities for clubs and Town and Community Councils who self-manage facilities to bid for capital funding or transition funding. He stated that the Council is aiming at adopting a flexible approach to the transfer of assets and the Community Asset Transfer process had a 4 stage process.

The Committee expressed its concern at the decimation of the Communities Directorate which are frontline services, contribute to the corporate themes and priorities and are also the subject of the majority of Members' referrals. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the Council could potentially move forward quickly where Town and Community Councils are prepared to fund or carry out additional work particularly the maintenance of cemeteries, subject to the issue of double taxation being resolved. He stated that there is scope within the Medium Term Financial Strategy to devolve works to sports clubs.

The Regional Director, Trecco Bay Holiday Car Park informed the Committee of the importance of creating the right impression for tourists and ensuring that all Council facilities are open to the public, however businesses needed to be responsible and community minded as well. He stated that staff at the caravan park had also undertaken litter picking.

The Committee questioned whether some sports clubs may not be willing or able to take responsibility for and to maintain facilities such as outdoor sports facilities and playing fields appropriately and asked whether there would be any intervention should this occur. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that some clubs may struggle to manage facilities and that some facilities would go eventually but that some would thrive and that work would be carried out via the Community Asset Transfer Officer to support clubs in the transition process.

The Committee questioned what the 'reactive' service would look like and what the health and safety implications would be if this approach is used. The Group Manager Streetworks informed the Committee that the reactive service is in place now with litter being collected across the County Borough 5 days a week. Town centres were cleaned more frequently and some areas of the County Borough receiving enhanced cleaning. He stated that part of the service would have to absorb other duties such as the clearing up of fly tipping. The Group Manager Streetworks also informed the Committee that safety inspections will be carried out as present and if repairs rather than basic maintenance were required and if the costs for repairing a park to the required level of health and safety standards became too high it may needed to be closed. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the service would focus on emptying litter bins but a general cleanse of areas would be undertaken on a reactive basis. The Committee commented that the majority of Members' referrals related to the Street Scene service and expressed concern that with a diminishing budget the environment would similarly diminish. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the budget for the Directorate is £17.5m and that some of its services such as highways, planning and housing are statutory, however the parks service is non-statutory and there would have to be cuts in the non-statutory services run by the Directorate. He stated that sports clubs and Town and Community Councils would have to recognise that they would need to take on additional responsible in view of diminishing budgets.

The Committee expressed concern at the potential risks in reducing the gritting service and how would the Council cope in the event of heavy snowfalls. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the Council would look to be as effective as possible in managing the gritting service mindful of resilience and risk management. He stated that there were now three gritting routes instead of the four routes operated previously. He stated that the level and area of coverage was similar to that operated previously which had been made possible by implementing night runs, extra shifts and by securing better leasing arrangements for the vehicles.

The Committee questioned plans to disinvest in services. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the Council had not reached the point where it had to disinvest in services. He stated that greater use of facilities should be considered such as investing in a network of 4G pitches. The Cabinet Member Communities informed the Committee of the difficulties in finding solutions to the budget when the Council had to reduce its budget by £50m. He stated this budget reductions would be achieved by a mixture of cost recovery, cost transfer, the tapering of grant and the transfer of some services to Town and Community Councils. He encouraged Members to provide him with their ideas for shaping the future of services and options for service provision.

Conclusions

The Committee noted the report on the Communities Directorate's current understanding of the potential impact to service standards due to recent and future reductions to frontline Streetscene services. The report invited Members to consider the minimum service levels that would be acceptable for the residents of Bridgend in the context of anticipated service reductions over future years of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

- Members raised concerns that the contribution which frontline community services provide towards Corporate and National priorities is not adequately acknowledged and that the impact of reducing them or ceasing to support them will result in a gradual deterioration of the health and wellbeing of communities within the Authority.
- Members queried whether some clubs may not be willing or able to take responsibility for and to maintain facilities such as outdoor sports facilities and playing fields appropriately and asked whether there would be any intervention should this occur. The Officer responded that there may be some facilities which would go eventually but that some would thrive and that work would be carried out via the CAT Officer to support clubs where appropriate.
- Members asked what a 'reactive' service would look like and what the health and safety implications may be if this approach is used. The Officer responded that the reactive part of the service would cover areas such as repairs rather than basic maintenance and that if costs for repairing a park to the required level of health and safety standards became too high it may need to be closed.
- Members are concerned that information on who owns what land and who is currently carrying out services such as grass cutting does not appear to be available, and asked that a single point of contact is established as this has worked successfully in other services.
- Members were concerned about the potential risks in reducing the gritting service. The Officer responded that, although there were now three rather than four routes, the level and area of coverage was similar and that this has been made possible by implementing night runs, extra shifts and by negotiating better leasing arrangements for vehicles.
- Members asked what the long term cost of ceasing to provide services will be compared to the cost of continuing to run them more innovatively. The Officer responded that this was not easy to answer as it depends on what options may be used to provide and support provision in future.
- Members asked whether information could be made available to Town and Community Councils, possibly in the form of a template, to enable them to make informed decisions on if or how they would like to work with the Authority in future. Members also asked whether consultation had taken place with communities to engage them in seeking options for their own areas. The Officer responded that there may need to be a set of core services set out throughout the County Borough and then to establish what other additional work Councils would like.

 Members asked which options have been explored to help to provide support for Town and Community Councils during the Community Asset Transfer Process. The Officer responded that the CAT guidance suggests that there may be an option to bid for interim funding and support. The Cabinet Member – Communities encouraged Members to provide him with their ideas for shaping the future of services and options for service provision.

Recommendations

- The Committee recommends that clear information on cost and options for Town and Community Councils should be made available and a simplified process set in place to enable them to work with the Authority to improve communication and an understanding of the need of individual Councils and communities and the services and support available from the Authority.
- The Committee recommends that the information presented in the report to this Committee be shared with Town and Community Councils.

24. <u>HEALTHY LIVING PARTNERSHIP PROJECT</u>

The Committee received the end of year performance report of Halo leisure limited with regard to the eight leisure centres and swimming pools they manage on behalf of the Council within the Healthy Living Partnership.

Conclusion

That the Committee noted the report, which provided information on Halo Leisure Ltd year end performance for 2014/15 and advised Members of performance targets set for 2015/16 and that the report be placed on the Forward Work Programme to be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

25. <u>URGENT ITEMS</u>

There were no urgent items.

26. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business as it contained exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 14 and 16 of Part 4 and Paragraph 21 of Part 5 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) (Wales) Order 2007.

> Following the application of the public interest test it was resolved that pursuant to the Act referred to above, to consider the undermentioned item in private with the public being excluded from the meeting as it would involve the disclosure of exempt information as stated above.

27. <u>APPROVAL OF EXEMPT MINUTES</u>

The meeting closed at 5.00 pm

REPORT TO COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

18 January 2016

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE – LEGAL AND REGULATORY SERVICES

FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present the items due to be considered at the Committee's meeting to be held on 27 January 2016 and seeks confirmation of the information required for the subsequent scheduled meeting to be held on 23 March 2016.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

2.1 The key improvement objectives identified in the Corporate Plan 2013-2017 have been embodied in the Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes. The amended Corporate Improvement Objectives adopted by Council on 25 February 2015 formally set out the improvement objectives that the Council will seek to implement between 2013 and 2017. The Overview and Scrutiny Committees engage in review and development of plans, policy or strategies that support the Corporate Themes.

3. Background

3.1 At its meeting on 10 June 2015 the Community Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee determined its Annual Forward Work Programme for 2015/16.

4. Current Situation / Proposal

Meetings of the Community Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee

4.1 In relation to the Committee's next scheduled meeting to be held on 27 January 2016, the table below lists the items to be considered and the invitees due to attend.

Торіс	Invitees	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
Cultural Partnership Project	Mark Shephard - Corporate Director – Communities, Richard Hughes - Group Manager: Cultural Services, Councillor Philip White - Councillor Hywel Williams - Cabinet Member for Communities (other invitees?)	This item to be revisited once the NPDO has been established for an update and for further monitoring to be put in place.	To be confirmed.

Vibrant and Viable Places Programme	Mark Shephard - Corporate Director – Communities Councillor Hywel Williams - Cabinet Member for Communities (other invitees?)	The Committee wish to retain this on the Forward Work Programme as the scheme progresses in light of the risks identified on financial claw back or withdrawal of funding by the Welsh Government in relation to outcomes. To include 'Business Improvement District – Bridgend Town Centre', which goes to Cabinet on 25 May 2015.	To be confirmed.
---	---	---	---------------------

4.2 The table below lists the items to be considered and the invitees due to attend in respect of the subsequent meeting of the Committee to be held on 23 March 2016.

Торіс	Invitees	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
Report on Housing	Mark Shephard - Corporate Director – Communities Councillor Hywel Williams - Cabinet Member for Communities	Content and focus for this item to include the Social Housing Allocation Policy (Common Housing Register) and the Housing function within BCBC.	To be confirmed
2 nd item TBC			

4.3 The table below lists potential items which are put to the Committees for reprioritisation as appropriate.

Торіс	Proposed Date	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
MREC	27 January 2016	Recommendation from Budget Research and Evaluation Panel that scrutiny of the situation regarding MREC should be carried out by the Community Environment and Leisure Committee.	To be confirmed.
HALO	твс		To be confirmed.

Corporate Parenting

4.4 Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards looked after children and young people. This is a legal responsibility given to local authorities by the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act 2004. The role of the Corporate Parent is to seek for children in public care the outcomes every good parent would want for their own children. The Council as a

whole is the 'corporate parent' therefore all Members have a level of responsibility for the children and young people looked after by Bridgend.¹

- 4.5 In this role, it is suggested that Members consider how the services within the remit of their Committee affects children in care and care leavers, and in what way can the Committee can therefore assist in these areas.
- 4.6 Scrutiny Champions can greatly support the Committee in this by advising them of the ongoing work of the Cabinet-Committee and particularly any decisions or changes which they should be aware of as Corporate Parents.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework and Procedure Rules

5.1 The work of the Community Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee relates to the review and development of plans, policy or strategy that form part of the Policy Framework and consideration of plans, policy or strategy relating to the power to promote or improve economic, social or environmental well being in the County Borough of Bridgend.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

6.1 None

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 None.
 - 7. Recommendations

The Committee is asked to:

- Note the topics due to be considered at the meeting of the Committee for 27 January 2016 and confirm if it requires any additional specific information to be provided by the invitees listed or the Overview & Scrutiny Unit;
- Determine the invitees to be invited to attend, any specific information it would like the invitees to provide and any research that it would like the Overview & Scrutiny Unit to undertake in relation to its meeting for 23 March 2016;
- (iii) Revisit and consider the list of future potential items for the Committees Forward Work Programme and reprioritise as the Committees feels appropriate.

Andrew Jolley, Assistant Chief Executive – Legal & Regulatory Services

Contact Officer: Kym Barker, Scrutiny Officer

¹ Welsh Assembly Government and Welsh Local Government Association *'If this were my child... A councillor's guide to being a good corporate parent to children in care and care leavers'*, June 2009

Telephone: 01656 643161

Email: <u>scrutiny@bridgend.gov.uk</u>

Postal Address: Democratic Services - Scrutiny Bridgend County Borough Council, Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend, CF31 4WB

Background Documents: None

Agenda Item 5

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

18 JANUARY 2016

REPORT OF THE SECTION 151 OFFICER

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2016-17 to 2019-20

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present the Scrutiny Committee with the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-17 to 2019-20, which includes a financial forecast for 2016-20 and a detailed draft revenue budget for 2016-17.

2. Connections to the Corporate Plan

2.1 The Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) identify the Council's service and resource priorities for the next four financial years, with particular focus on 2016-17.

3. Background

Corporate Plan - Policy Context

- 3.1 The Council reviews its Corporate Plan each year to ensure it continues to reflect the Council's corporate improvement priorities, commitments and performance indicators. The Council's six corporate improvement priorities and specific commitments for 2016-17 are currently under review, with revised set of three priorities being included in the public consultation "Shaping Bridgend's Future". The final plan will be presented to Council for approval alongside the MTFS 2016-20 in March 2016. The final Corporate Plan and MTFS will be fully aligned and will include explicit links between resources and corporate priorities.
- 3.2 The Council's MTFS is set within the context of UK economic and public expenditure plans, Welsh Government priorities and legislative programme. The MTFS articulates how the Council plans to use its resources to support the achievement of its corporate priorities and statutory duties, including the management of financial pressures and risks over the next four years. It helps the Council work more effectively with partners in other sectors and provides a strategy for the use of balances to meet changes in resources or demands from year to year without impacting unduly on services or council tax payers.
- 3.3 The MTFS includes:
 - The principles that will govern the strategy and a four year financial forecast, comprising detailed proposals for 2016-17 and outline proposals for 2017-18 to 2019-20.

- The capital programme for 2016-17 to 2025-26, linked to priority areas for capital investment and Capital Financing Strategy.
- The Treasury Management Strategy and Corporate Risk Register, which will both be updated and included in the final MTFS in March 2016.

The Financial Context

- 3.4 The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the results of his Comprehensive Spending Review on 25 November 2015. Although the Westminster government remains committed to tackling the budget deficit and achieving a surplus by 2019-20, George Osborne announced an improvement of £27 billion in public sector finances over the next five years, according to figures from the Office of Budget Responsibility. As a result, he was able to halt the introduction of controversial changes to tax credits as well as announce increased investment of £3.8 billion in the English NHS and protection for policing budgets.
- 3.5 As a consequence of the Barnett formula and the increase in spending to relevant areas, particularly health, the UK Government Settlement to the Welsh Government for 2016-17 is a cash increase of 0.85%. The Welsh Government has not been given a firm settlement at this point for future years, but indicative figures in the HM Treasury Spending Review report suggest similar settlements in 2017-18 and beyond. That said, these figures are subject to change and there is much speculation from economic commentators regarding their reliability. On 8 December 2015 the Welsh Government published its draft budget which included £293 million of extra funding to the Welsh NHS in 2016-17.

Welsh Government Provisional Local Government Settlement 2015-16

- 3.6 On 9 December councils received the provisional Local Government Settlement which provided an average -1.4% reduction in Aggregate External Finance (AEF) for 2016-17 across Wales (after allowing for transfers into and out of the Settlement). Bridgend's reduction in funding versus AEF received in 2015-16 is 1.2%. This takes into account the £1.4 million Outcome Agreement Grant which is now included in the Revenue Support Grant (RSG). Councils were advised that the settlement also includes sufficient funding to protect school budgets' equivalent to 1% above the change in the Welsh Government's Revenue Budget (£1.578 million or 1.85%) as well as additional funding to help councils support pressures in social services.
- 3.7 The provisional settlement compares favourably to the -4.5% "most likely" assumption that is contained within the Council's MTFS for 2016-17 and is better even that the "best" case scenario assumption of -3%.

Settlement Implications for 2017 to 2020

3.8 In line with previous years, there is no indication of local government settlements for 2017-18 onwards. While the 2016-17 draft settlement is better than forecast, the prospect of interest rate rises and the continuing uncertainty around the economy and the subsequent pace of the Westminster government's ongoing austerity programme make future years' settlements highly unpredictable. Against this background and in the absence of any further clarity from Welsh Government, the MTFS "most likely" scenario assumptions have been revised to an annual reduction in AEF of -3.2% for 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20. Based on these assumptions

the total recurrent budget reduction requirements are forecast to be £36.549 million from 2016-17 to 2019-20.

Grant Transfers into the 2016-17 Revenue Settlement

- 3.9 The full picture on specific grants is not yet clear, but the draft settlement includes information on a number of changes to the level of grants at an all Wales level which impact on the Council's resources. Specifically:
 - The Outcome Agreement grant funding of £1.4 million has been transferred into the RSG
 - A 6.4% reduction in the Single Environment Grant across Wales (BCBC received £2.904 million in 2015-16)
 - A reduction in the Families First grant of 16.7% across Wales. The actual reduction to Bridgend is 11.7%, or £223,000.

Regional Collaboration Fund (RCF) / Intermediate Care Fund (ICF)

3.10 In line with previous announcements, Welsh Government has ceased the RCF in 2016-17. Bridgend has historically benefitted from the RCF to help establish collaborations, such as Western Bay, and the Regulatory Services collaboration. By contrast, the ICF has increased from £20 million in 2015-16 to a proposed £50 million across Wales for 2016-17 in the draft budget, which will again be allocated to the NHS to manage, albeit working in partnership with local authorities.

Council Tax

3.11 In line with recent years, the Minister's statement included an expectation on Local Authorities "to take account of all the available funding streams in considering service provision and setting their budgets and Council Tax". The previous version of the MTFS assumed a 4.5% increase in Council Tax for 2016-17. However the 2016-17 draft Revenue Budget, shown in Table 7, assumes a Council tax increase of 3.9%. This change reflects the provisional settlement and recognises the views expressed in response to the Council's recent "Shaping Bridgend's future" consultation. This increase seeks to strike an appropriate balance between the needs of the Council and its citizens.

Welsh Government Capital Settlement

3.12 In February 2015 Council approved a capital programme for 2015-16 to 2024-25, based on the assumption that annual Welsh Government capital funding would be flat lined from 2015-16 onwards. Council subsequently approved a revised capital programme in July and again in October 2015, to incorporate budgets carried forward from 2014-15 and any new schemes and grant approvals. The draft local government capital settlement for 2016-17 provides this Council with £6.293 million capital funding for 2016-17, which is £5,000 more than 2015-16. No indications have been given for 2017-18 or beyond.

Current Year (2015-16) Financial Performance

3.13 The in-year financial position as at the 30 September 2015 is shown below.

Directorate/Divisions	Revised Budget 2015-16 £'000	Projected Outturn 2015-16 £'000	Projected Over / (Under) Spend Qtr 2 2015-16 £'000	Projected Over / (Under) Spend Qtr 1 2015- 16 £'000
Directorate				
Education and Transformation Social Services and Wellbeing Communities Resources Legal & Regulatory Services	105,860 61,944 24,988 14,510 6,065	105,639 61,937 25,092 14,177 5,951	(221) (7) 104 (333) (114)	7 60 145 (79) (140)
Total Directorate Budgets	213,367	212,796	(571)	(7)
Total Council Wide Budgets	38,834	38,059	(775)	(100)
Total	252,201	250,855	(1,346)	(107)

Table 1- Comparison of budget against projected outturn at 30 September2015

- 3.14 At the half year stage, an overall under spend of £571,000 is projected on Directorate budgets. The main contributors are projected under spends on the Education and Transformation, Resources and Legal and Regulatory Services directorates, a projected over spend on the Communities directorate, and a projected under spend on the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) and other corporate budgets.
- 3.15 In accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure Rules any planned over spends or under spends by directorates will be carried forward into next year to meet known funding pressures. Fortuitous under spends in budgets will be applied to offset over spends on other budgets.

4. Current Situation

Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2016-17 to 2019-20

- 4.1 This section of the report sets out the proposed MTFS for the Council for the next four financial years, based on the latest information available from the Welsh Government. It does not include fixed funding, expenditure or activity projections, but sets best, worst and most likely scenarios for the resources that will be available. The MTFS is reviewed regularly and amended as additional information becomes available, with the detail for future years being developed over the period of the strategy.
- 4.2 The development of the MTFS 2016-17 to 2019-20 has been led by Cabinet and Corporate Management Board (CMB) and has taken into account auditors' views,

the recommendations of the Budget Research and Evaluation Panel and issues arising in 2015-16, underpinned by the ongoing aim to embed a culture of medium term financial planning closely aligned with corporate planning.

4.3 Implementation of the MTFS will continue to be led by Cabinet and CMB, supported by financial and performance data. As usual Cabinet and CMB will seek to ensure that it is widely understood by internal stakeholders (Members, employees and Unions) and external stakeholders (citizens, businesses and partners). As well as linking explicitly to the Council's corporate priorities the MTFS also links to other internal resource strategies (eg ICT strategy and the Council's Workforce Plan).

MTFS Principles

- 4.4 As well as consideration of future income and expenditure scenarios, the MTFS provides a set of clear principles which drive the budget and spending decisions over 2016-2020 and which Members and others can examine and judge the Council's financial performance against. The fourteen key principles are to ensure that:
 - 1. The Council continues to meet its statutory obligations and demonstrates how it directs resources to meet the Council's corporate priorities.
 - 2. Adequate provision is made to meet outstanding and reasonably foreseen liabilities.
 - 3. The financial control system is sufficiently robust to support the delivery of financial plans and mitigate corporate risks.
 - 4. Budgets will be reviewed annually to ensure existing and forecast spend is still required and to identify further efficiency savings as required to meet inescapable budget pressures.
 - 5. Financial plans provide an optimum balance between income and expenditure for both capital and revenue.
 - 6. All services seek to provide value for money and contribute to public value.
 - 7. Balances are not used to fund recurrent budget pressures or to keep down council tax rises unless an equivalent budget reduction or increase in council tax is made in the following year in recognition that balances are a one-off resource.
 - 8. The Council Fund balance will be maintained at a minimum of £7 million over the MTFS period.
 - 9. Capital investment decisions support the Council's corporate priorities and mitigate any statutory risks taking account of return on investment and sound option appraisals.
 - 10. Prudential borrowing is only used to support the capital programme where it is affordable and sustainable within the Council's overall borrowing limits and the revenue budget over the long term.

- 11. Decisions on the treatment of surplus assets are based on an assessment of the potential contribution to the revenue budget and the capital programme.
- 12. Resources are allocated to deliver the Bridgend Change Programme based on clear strategic plans that are kept under review by Corporate Directors to maintain alignment with the MTFS and a MTFS Budget Reduction Contingency Reserve will be maintained.
- 13. Other resource strategies (including the Workforce Development Plan, Treasury Management Strategy, ICT Strategy and Asset Management Plan) are kept under review to maintain alignment with the MTFS and the Corporate Plan.
- 14. Budgets will be managed by Corporate Directors in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure Rules.

Principle 12 has been expanded to include provision for a MTFS Budget Reduction Contingency Reserve to enable the Council to manage delays or unforeseen obstacles to the delivery of significant MTFS budget reduction proposals. The current financial landscape of declining external funding demands that significant budget reductions need to be made to deliver a sustainable budget. It is therefore prudent to set aside a specific reserve to provide a buffer or a safeguard against budget reductions with a RED risk status not being delivered to plan. An earmarked reserve will be established at year end from any corporate under spends at a level to be determined annually following an assessment of budget reductions categorised as 'red' and deemed material within the MTFS. This will provide additional capacity for discretionary use by the Chief Financial Officer, on consultation with CMB and Cabinet to manage inescapable problems with delivery until a solution can be found.

MTFS Resource Envelope

4.5 The MTFS planning assumptions for 2017-20 are based on an annual reduction in AEF of -3.2% and an assumed increase in council tax of 3.9% for 2017-18, 4.2% for 2018-19 and 4.5% for 2019-20, recognising the ongoing uncertainty around our funding in future years. The 2016-17 AEF figure is -1.2% based on the published Provisional Settlement. However, these assumptions, together with forecast pressures and risks are all subject to change, not least due to continuing economic uncertainty as well as national legislative and policy developments. The MTFS will be regularly reviewed against service performance and external economic and fiscal information to ensure that early action can be taken as necessary to keep it and the Corporate Plan on track. In view of the uncertainties, the MTFS has been developed taking into account possible resource envelope scenarios, based on percentage changes in AEF shown in Table 2.

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
	% Change	% Change	% Change	% Change
Best Scenario		-1.5%	-1.5%	-1.5%
Most Likely Scenario	-1.2%	-3.2%	-3.2%	-3.2%
Worst Scenario		-4.5%	-4.5%	-4.5%

4.6 Table 3 shows the Council's potential net budget reduction requirement based on the forecast resource envelope (paragraph 4.5), inescapable spending assumptions (paragraph 4.7) and assumed council tax increases.

	2016-17 Actual	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Best Scenario	7,495	7,002	6,509	5,979	26,985
Most Likely Scenario	7,495	10,190	9,697	9,167	36,549
Worst Scenario	7,495	12,628	12,135	11,605	43,863

Table 3: MTFS Potential Net Budget Reductions Requirement

Managing within the MTFS Resource Envelope

- 4.7 The financial forecast is predicated on £36.549 million budget reductions being met from Directorate and Corporate budgets and these are referred to later in the report. It is also predicated on a number of spending assumptions, including:
 - Projections for demographic changes, including an ageing population and an increasing number of young people with complex disabilities living into adulthood and adding progressively to the demand for care.
 - o Inflationary uplifts to support specific contractual commitments.
 - Inflation for energy costs based on notification of known increases and projected forward pricing.
 - The potential impact of national policies and new legislation not accompanied by commensurate funding e.g. Welfare Reform Bill, Social Services and Wellbeing Act, Housing Act and auto enrolment related to the provision of employee pension schemes.
 - A projected increase of 0.3% in 2016-17, 0.2% in 2017-18 and a further 0.2% in 2018-19 in employers' pension contributions resulting from the triennial Actuarial Valuation. Teachers' pensions increased from 14.1% to 16.48% in September 2015 so there is also the additional increase in employers' contributions of 2.38% from April to August 2016.
 - The removal of the National Insurance Contribution rebate as a result of the introduction of the single tier state pension in April 2016.
 - Fees and Charges will increase by the statutory minimum or CPI (at prevailing rate, currently +0.1%) plus 1%.

- Services will absorb within budgets non contractual inflationary pressures up to the prevailing CPI rate.
- Significant increases in the cost of external contracts as a result of the implementation of the living wage from April 2016.

Net budget reduction requirement

- 4.8 Table 4 shows the current position in respect of the addressing the forecast budget reduction requirement of £36.549 million. It shows that £17.4 million of budget reduction proposals have already been identified over the period of the MTFS, including the full £7.495 million required for 2016-17. The table shows that the Council still needs to develop proposals to the value of £19.2 million and a range of options are under consideration including:
 - Digital transformation of council services
 - Income generation opportunities
 - Further reductions in employee numbers
 - Reconfiguration of post 16 education provision;
 - Working with partners to protect community facilities;
 - Review of nursery education provision;

Table 4 - Risk Status of Budget Reduction Proposals 2016-17 to 2019-20

Year	GREEN: Proposal developed and deliverable	AMBER: Proposal in development but includes delivery risk	Budget reductions Identified So far	RED: proposals not yet developed	Total Required
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
2016-17	3,469	4,026	7,495	0	7,495
2017-18	617	4,908	5,525	4,665	10,190
2018-19	0	2,769	2,769	6,928	9,697
2019-20	0	1,583	1,583	7,584	9,167
Total	4,086	13,286	17,372	19,177	36,549
Percentage of total required	11.2%	36.3%	47.5%	52.5%	100%

Risk Status Key:

REDProposals not yet developed or under considerationAMBERProposal in development, but includes delivery riskGREENProposal developed and deliverable

- 4.9 The budget reduction proposals identified can be categorised as:
 - I. Making Best Use of Resources
 - II. Managed Service Reductions
 - III. Collaboration and Service Transformation; and
 - IV. Policy Changes
- 4.10 The value of budget reduction proposals identified to date is shown in Table 5 by category. The categories are also shown by individual proposal in Appendix B.

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Total	%
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	
Making Best Use of Resources	4,389	4,305	1,604	1,216	11,514	66%
Managed Service Reductions	735	504	335	0	1,574	9%
Collaboration & Service Transformation	1,221	319	163	200	1,903	11%
Policy Changes	1,150	397	667	167	2,381	14%
Total Identified as at 22.12.2015	7,495	5,525	2,769	1,583	17,372	

Table 5 – Budget Reduction Proposals Identified 2016-17 to 2019-20

- 4.11 The table shows that two thirds of the proposed budget reductions identified so far will come from Making Best Use of Resources, for example through:
 - Retendering learner transport contracts
 - A safe reduction in the number of Looked after children
 - Income generation from other public sector bodies
 - Development of online services
 - Staffing restructures
- 4.12 Budget reduction proposals relating to Collaboration and Service Transformation amount to 11% of the total budget reductions. These include budget reductions within the Youth Offending Service, remodelling of adult social care and delivering further budget reductions from the regulatory services collaboration which has been created. Policy changes amount to 14% and include reducing services to the statutory minimum as well as cutting some discretionary services. These include eligibility criteria for adult social care, changes to childrens respite care and increasing planning application fees in line with Welsh Government guidelines. The policy change proposals are subject to consultation.
- 4.13 All of the proposals have implications for the Council workforce given that around two thirds of the Council's net revenue budget relates to pay costs. It follows that annual real terms' reductions in Council budgets over the next four years will lead to a reduced workforce over the MTFS period. The intention is to manage such a reduction through the continuation of a recruitment freeze, redeployment, early retirements and voluntary redundancies, but some compulsory redundancies will continue to be necessary.

Scrutiny and Challenge

4.14 A full consultation, "Shaping Bridgend's Future" has been undertaken over an eight week period during October and November, covering both the Council's proposed new priorities as well as a range of budget proposals under consideration. The consultation included an online survey, community engagement workshops, social

media debates, community engagement stands and a meeting with third sector organisations. Members had the opportunity to take part in a budget workshop similar to the public engagement events. The results have been presented in a separate Cabinet report, (attached at Appendix D), but in broad terms a total 1,819 responses were received, with nearly 1,000 people completing the full survey. There was positive support for the majority of proposals put forward. The level of responses was significantly higher than in previous years.

4.15 The budget consultation showed that at least 80% of participants agreed with the three proposed priorities. However, 71% believed something was missing, citing most commonly the themes of streamlining the council, public transport and infrastructure and local business support. The majority of respondents agreed with the idea of protecting some services over others, but equally around two thirds felt that schools, an area which has received Welsh Government protection in recent years, should be expected to make efficiency savings too. 11 of the 12 budget reduction proposals put forward received majority support, with the weakest support for reductions in highway maintenance, which received 48%. A full list is given below in table 6:

Rank	Proposal	Introduce or increase proposed budget reduction (%)	Introduce Smaller budget reduction (%)	Cut elsewhere (%)
1	Online services	87	9	5
2	Lifeguard services	83	14	3
3	Regeneration	82	13	5
4	Looked after children	73	18	9
5	Complex homecare	72	19	9
6	Holiday support for people with a learning disability	69	24	7
7	Nursery service	66	24	10
8	Subsidised bus routes	61	30	9
9	Parks and playing fields	59	29	12
10	Street cleaning	57	27	16
11	Respite care	54	33	13
12	Highway maintenance	48	37	15

Table 6 – Budget Reduction Proposals consultation response

2016-17 Draft Revenue Budget

4.16 The following table shows the draft revenue budget for 2016-17.

Table 7 – Draft Revenue Budget 2016-17

	Revised Budget 2015-16	Specific Grant Transfers from WG	Inter- Directorate Transfers	School Protection	NI & Pension Changes	Pay / Prices / Demogra phics	Inescapabl e Budget Pressures	Budget Reducti on Proposa Is	Revenu e Budget 2016-17
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Service Budgets									
Education & Transformation									
Education & Transformation	20,548				270	29	223	-910	20,160
Schools	85,287			1,578	0	0			86,865
	105,835	0		1,578	270	29	223	-910	107,02 5
Social Services & Wellbeing									-
Adult Social Care	40,173		-157		429	467	298	-1,544	39,666
Safeguarding	18,068				143	32		-850	17,393
Sport, Play and Active Wellbeing	2,746				16	0		-296	2,466
	60,987	0	-157	0	588	499	298	-2,690	59,525
a									
Communities	25,075		255		290	67	70	-1,336	24,421
Resources Legal & Regulatory	14,438		-105		291	36	363	-1,205	13,818
Services	6,090				93	0		-398	5,785
Corporate Budgets									
Capital Financing	10,372		56					-300	10,128
Levies	6,912							-23	6,889
Repairs and Maintenance	1,100							-200	900
CTR Scheme	14,254					650		-300	14,604
Sleep Ins	800								800
Pension Related Costs	1,190				68				1,258
Insurance Premiums Other Corporate	1,634		-3			28		-100	1,559
Other Corporate Budgets	3,514	1,400	-46	-1,578		3,252	1,663	-33	8,172
Net Budget Requirement	252,201	1,400	0	0	1,600	4,561	2,617	-7,495	254,88 4

Council Tax Implications

4.17 Based on the proposed budget of £254.884 million, the council tax increase for 2016-17 will be 3.9%.

Pay, Prices and Demographics

4.18 At this point in time, a national pay settlement has not been agreed, but the Employers are offering 1% each year for two years. The draft budget assumes this

is accepted and the appropriate amount has therefore been allocated centrally to meet this cost, which will be allocated to directorate budgets once known.

- 4.19 Price inflation has been allocated to service budgets and includes provision for contractual increases in business rates, food costs and other commitments. In addition, provision has been made for an estimated increase in employer pension contributions from 1 April 2016.
- 4.20 The remaining inflation provision will be retained centrally within corporate budgets and reviewed pending the outcome of any unforeseen demand led contract price inflation in relation to, for example, Out of County Education placement agreements or adjustments which may be required to meet contractual increases where the index is set after the Council's budget is approved.

Unavoidable Pressures

4.21 During 2015-16 a number of unavoidable 2016-17 service budget pressures have arisen totalling £2.617 million, detailed in Appendix A. These have been categorised into one-off pressures, with varying degrees of probability, and more certain and recurring pressures. In total for 2016-17, the recurring pressures total £2.290 million. The one-off pressures total £327,000. The pressures figures are provisional at this stage and will be refined as further information becomes available, for example specific information on Welsh Government grants. As such they may change between draft and final budget.

Schools Protection and Social Services Funding

4.22 The draft settlement from Welsh Government included within it additional amounts in respect both of schools protection (1% above the Welsh Government's own settlement, in line with recent years) as well as in recognition of the pressures facing social care and the positive contribution it makes towards health outcomes and spending. Schools protection equates to 1.85% and the cost of this protection is £1.578 million. The funding provided for social care will help the Council to manage pressures on this service, including the impact of demographics, the living wage and support for carers.

Budget Reduction Proposals

4.23 Budget reduction proposals of £7.495 million have been identified from service and corporate budgets to achieve a balanced budget, detailed in Appendix B.

Corporate Budgets

- 4.24 Corporate budgets include funding for the Council tax reduction scheme, costs of financing capital expenditure, precepts and levies, centrally held pay and prices provisions, insurance budgets, discretionary rate relief, provision for redundancy related costs and the Carbon Reduction Commitment.
- 4.25 The Outcome Agreement Grant (OAG), which in 2015-16 underpins base budgets by £1.4 million, has been transferred into the main Revenue Support Grant from Welsh Government. It will therefore no longer be dependent on the achievement of specific outcomes.

Fees and Charges

4.26 Generally, income from fees and charges will be increased by CPI (at the prevailing rate, currently +0.1%) plus 1%, subject to rounding, or in line with statutory or service requirements. Schedules of fees and charges will be reported separately, as usual, under Delegated Powers.

Council Reserves

4.27 In line with the MTFS principle 8, the Council will maintain its general fund at no less than £7 million in 2016-17. Details of the Council's earmarked reserves forecast as at 30 September 2015 are shown in Table 8. These are kept under review and the forecast will be updated in the Final MTFS report to Council in March 2016.

Opening Balance 1 April 2015	Reserve	Forecast Movement 2015-16	Forecast Closing Balance 31 March 2016	Forecast Movement 2016-17	Forecast Closing Balance 31 March 2017
£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
7,450	Council Fund	-	7,450	-	7,450
	Earmarked Balances:-				
10,531	Major Claims Reserve	(51)	10,480	(250)	10,230
3,177	Insurance Reserve	(500)	2,677	(200)	2,477
210	Waste Management Contract	-	210	(210)	-
1044	Treasury Management Reserve	(1,044)	-		-
300	Welfare Reform Bill	-	300		300
702	Asset Management Plan	(202)	500	-	500
300	Building Maintenance Reserve	-	300	-	300
627	Capital feasibility fund	(41)	586	(190)	396
115	DDA Emergency Works	-	115	(35)	80
6,434	Capital Programme Contribution	811	7,245	(2,987)	4,258
4,749	Service Reconfiguration	1,277	6,026	1,200	7,226
2,398	Change Management	(362)	2,036	(300)	1,736
861	ICT & Finance Systems	(283)	578	(250)	328
261	Invest to save / Joint projects	(133)	128	(128)	-
555	Car Parking Strategy	(120)	435	(435)	-
600	Wellbeing Projects	(67)	533	(250)	283
31	Connecting Families	-	31	(31)	-
1,490	Directorate Issues	(1,490)	-	-	-
824	Looked After Children	-	824	(400)	424
125	Porthcawl Regeneration	(15)	110	-	110

Table 8 – General Fund and Usable Earmarked Reserves

(4, 466)

Capital Programme and Capital Financing Strategy

- 4.28 This section of the report deals with the proposed Capital Programme for 2016-17 to 2025-26, which forms part of, but extends beyond the MTFS. It also covers the Council's capital financing strategy (including prudential borrowing and capital receipts forecast). Both have been developed in line with the MTFS principles and reflect the Welsh Government capital settlement for 2016-17, which provides general capital funding (GCF) for the Council for 2016-17 of £6.293 million of which £3.912 million is un-hypothecated supported borrowing and the remainder £2.381 million as general capital grant. No indicative allocations have been provided for 2017-18, so for now it is assumed that this level of funding will remain constant for the years after 2016-17, but this will be indicative only.
- 4.29 The Programme was last revised in October 2015. Since then a review has been underway to identify the Council's capital investment requirements for 2016-2025, compared to available capital receipts, against the following criteria:
 - Link to proposed new corporate priorities
 - High level of Risk of not progressing, in terms of impact on service delivery, ability to meet MTFS budget reductions, and prevention of building failure and closure
 - Service is able to meet any additional revenue costs arising from the scheme
 - Payback period (where appropriate)
- 4.30 The capital programme also contains a number of fixed annual allocations that are met from the total general capital funding for the Council. These allocations are shown in Table 9 below, and currently amount to 73.73% of the 2016-17 general capital funding:

	2015-16 £'000	% of 2016-17 GCF
Highways Capitalised Repairs	200	3.18%
Transportation Capitalised Repairs	250	3.97%
Disabled Facilities Grant	2,350	37.34%
Housing Renewal Schemes	100	1.59%
Special Regeneration Funding	540	8.58%
Minor Works	1,100	17.48%
Community Projects	100	1.59%

Table 9 – Current Annual Allocations of Capital Funding

Total	4,640	73.73%
-------	-------	--------

- 4.31 These annual allocations are also in the process of being reviewed, and any changes will be reported in the Final MTFS report in March 2016.
- 4.32 In addition, Council approved a contribution of £1 million per year (£5 million total across the life of the 21st Century Schools Programme), as part of the local authority matched funding contribution for the Programme. This leaves a balance of general capital funding of £653,000.

Capital Programme

- 4.33 The current programme contains a number of significant strategic investment projects that support a number of the proposed new corporate priorities. Appendix C sets out the current capital programme for the period 2016-17 to 2025-26 as approved by Council in October 2015, which will be updated for any new schemes in the MTFS 2016-17 to 2019-20 final report.
- 4.34 In October 2015, Council gave approval to the following additional capital projects:
 - o necessary works to the administrative estate
 - o ICT investment to enable agile working
 - Updates to the 21st century schools programme
 - Community Asset Transfer support funding
 - Additions to the councils vehicle fleet
 - Sports facilities match funding

Raising Aspirations and Improving Educational Attainment

- 4.35 The Schools' Modernisation and Investment Programme forms a cornerstone of the corporate priority making smarter use of resources. School modernisation and school improvement complement each other, and well established collaborative arrangements are taking forward strategies to enhance teaching and learning and school leadership, supported by state of the art buildings and the innovative use of new technology. The Welsh Government has committed to fund £22.475 million of the total costs (currently estimated at £45.510 million) for Band A priority projects, through a combination of capital grant and the Local Government Borrowing Initiative, with the balance met from Council resources. Council has agreed that this would be met from core funding allocations of £5 million, anticipated S106 funding of £5.228 million and projected receipts from the sale of schools and other sites, and central funding, of £12.747 million.
- 4.36 The programme is based on the current estimated expenditure profile over the funding period. This is an ambitious programme and it is essential that the planned capital receipts already committed and ring fenced from the sale of school sites to finance the programme are retained for this purpose. Any change to this commitment would require Council approval.
- 4.37 In the meantime, the following projects have been included in the Council's approved programme, but funding for each project will not be confirmed until Welsh Government approves the final business case and sufficient capital receipts have been generated:

Project	Current Status
Coety / Parc Derwen Primary School	Construction complete – school opened 2 nd
	November 2015 as per the statutory notice.
Special Education Needs Provision	Construction completed – school opened 15 th
	June 2015 as per the statutory notice. The
	Bridge Alternative Provision and education
	support services have transferred into the
	campus.
Garw Valley South Primary Provision	Revised OBC submitted to Welsh
	Government - awaiting approval to move to
	FBC. The design is being progressed.
Pencoed Primary School	Design commenced. School opening date
	revised to April 2018.
Gateway Primary Provision	Cabinet approved the enlargement to
	Brynmenyn Primary School. OBC approval
	has been received from WG. Appointed a
	cost consultant and project manager for the
	scheme. Cabinet approval received to tender
	the scheme, which will be undertaken in due
	course via the SEWSCAP framework
Mynydd Cynffig Primary School	Primary school opened on a split site on 1 st
	September 2015 as per the statutory notice.
	Feasibility study completed. Additional
	funding sought for preferred option.
Heronsbridge Special School	Exploring opportunities for additional capacity
	to meet needs of children with ASD.

Capital Financing Strategy

- 4.38 The Capital Financing Strategy is underpinned by the Council's Treasury Management Strategy. The two key principles used in the Capital Financing Strategy are:
 - 1. Decisions on the treatment of surplus assets are based on an assessment of the potential contribution to the revenue budget and the capital programme.
 - 2. Prudential borrowing is only used to support the capital programme where it is affordable and sustainable within the Council's overall borrowing limits and the revenue budget over the long term.

Capital Receipts

4.39 The Council estimates that around £21 million could be generated as part of the enhanced disposals programme, with circa £9.3 million already delivered (anticipated to reach £10 million by the end of 2015-16) and circa £11 million of capital receipts to be generated over the next three years 2016-17 to 2018-19, of which £4 million is expected to be realised in 2016-17. Of the £21 million, £8.8 million relates to school buildings and land vacated through the 21st Century Schools Programme, to be used as match funding for the programme. It also includes receipts anticipated from the sale of the Waterton site along with the sale

of other surplus sites within the County Borough. Receipts are subject to the exchange of contracts, so it is prudent not to commit them until we have a contractual agreement.

Prudential Borrowing

- 4.40 Prudential Borrowing totalling £41.5 million was approved by Council on 25 February 2015, which included £5.6 million of Local Government Borrowing Initiative (LGBI) funding towards the costs of the 21st Century Schools Programme.
- 4.41 Total prudential borrowing taken out by the end of 2016-17 is estimated to be £41.745 million, of which approximately £32 million is still outstanding.
- 4.42 At the time of reporting, the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-17 to 2019-20 was due to be considered by Cabinet on 12 January 2016 for them to agree to submit it for consultation.

5. Effect on Policy Framework and Procedure Rules

5.1 The budget setting process is outlined within the Council's Constitution and Financial Procedure Rules.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 The proposals contained within this report cover a wide range of services and it is inevitable that the necessary budget reductions will impact on the local population in different ways. In developing these proposals, consideration has been given to their potential impact on protected groups within the community and on how to avoid a disproportionate impact on people within these groups.
- 6.2 Equality Impact Assessments will be undertaken on all budget reduction proposals before the final recommendations are made concerning next year's revenue budget.

7. Financial Implications

7.1 The financial implications are reflected in the report.

8. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8.1 Committee Members are asked to:
 - (i) Consider the information contained in the report and attached appendices;
 - (ii) Determine whether it wishes to make any comments or recommendations which fall within their remit to submit to the Corporate Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consolidation and inclusion in their report to Cabinet on the draft budget proposals as part of the budget consultation process.

Ness Young CPFA Section 151 Officer and Corporate Director - Resources December 2015

Contact Officer : Randal Hemingway Deputy Section 151 Officer and Head of Finance & ICT Ext.3302. E_mail: randal.hemingway @bridgend.gov.uk

Background Papers: Cabinet Report – MTFS 2016-17 to 2019-20 – 14 July 2015 Council Report – Capital Programme 2015-16 to 2024-25 – 7 October 2015

Directorate	Service Area	Desciption of pressure	Recurrent Pressure	One Off Pressure
Wellbeing	Adult Social Care	The Social Services and Wellbeing Act will place a responsibility on Local Authorities to arrange for advocacy services to be made available to people with needs for care and support, whether or not those needs are being met by a local authority. There is currently a very low level of advocacy services in Bridgend which is located in the voluntary sector. There is a clear need for a specifically commissioned advocacy service with a focussed remit to meet the requirements of the Act.	50	
Wellbeing	Adult Social Care	To provide recurrent funding for a carers development officer role for which grant funding has ended. The Social Services and Wellbeing Act places local authorities duty of care for Carers on an equal footing with the cared-for.	31	
Wellbeing	Adult Social Care	To comply with new requirements of the Social Services and Wellbeing act to provide a secure service to the inmates of Parc Prison located with the county borough. Should this new requirement be fully funded by a specific grant from Welsh Government, this pressure will be removed from the final budget	217	19
Wellbeing	Childrens	Additional requirement for supervised contact for Looked After Children population due to increased volume ordered by courts		50

This page is intentionally left blank

Budget Reduction Proposals 2016-17 to 2019-20

Pa ßef. 35	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	Achieved	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
	MSR- Manag	Best Use of Resources ed Service Reductions oration and Transformation changes			AMBER	Proposals r Proposal in	not yet devel developme eveloped and	nt but incluc	les delivery	

EDUCATION & TRANSFORMATION

CENTRAL EDUCATION & TRANSFORMATION

CH1	MSR	Out of County budgets - reduction of Education costs by returning children with additional needs to in-house provision with additional support if required	Potentially, the needs of children will not be totally met and this could lead to legal challenge. Currently children's complex needs are met out of county and therefore bringing these in-house will bring them closer to home but they may need additional support which in turn may have a financial impact on a case by case basis.	1,513	13%		200			
CH2	CST	Youth Offending Service Collaboration	Posts which have become vacant have not been replaced and there are a number of posts which BCBC now do not hold (eg information officer post which is shared with NPT). The YOT is combined with Swansea and NPT and the reduction needs to be agreed with them.	419	23%		95			
СН3	BUR	Retender Learner Transport contracts	Lower cost contracts may result in reduced quality of service as well as an increase in the number and complexity of complaints regarding the service.	4,310	2%	400	100			
CH4	MSR	Rationalise Special Education Needs transport	Children with special educational needs may see changes to their current modes of transport and they will have to share transport when they have had dedicated transport in the past. This will inevitably lead to complaints from parents and could result in successful challenge.	4,310	3%	100	150			
CH5	PC	Review of Learner Transport Policy regarding statutory distances for free travel	The number of children receiving free transport will reduce, this could affect the choice of schools parents make which may skew our current pupil projection numbers leading to an imbalance in numbers. It could also lead to a reduction in the number of parents and children choosing Welsh medium or faith provision. This could negatively affect the WESP and also the PIs in relation to Welsh medium education.	4,310	5%			67	67	67
CH9	BUR	School transport route efficiencies	Minimal impact. More efficient routes to be identified.	4,310	9%	200	200	200		

Budget Reduction Proposals 2016-17 to 2019-20

Pa ge 36	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
CH15	BUR	Staff Restructure - Inclusion and Additional Learning Needs	Potential redundancies and reduction in the staffing resources available. There will be inevitable delays in children receiving an assessment of their needs and then a further delay in services being available to meet those needs. This may negatively affect some children's ability	3,202	3%		100			
CH36	BUR		Minimal impact. Amalgamation of services has led to savings on premises budgets.	66	45%		30			
CH38	BUR	Efficiency review of Catering Service	Efficiencies have been identified year on year within this service and the service will be unable to continue to make such efficiencies year on year without compromising on quality.	663	15%			100		
CH40	BUR	Reduction in cost of Central South Consortium arising from efficiencies generated from transfer of additional services.	Additional services will be provided to all member authorities by the Central South Consortium, generating efficiency savings through collaboration. The danger of this approach is the LA will lose the remnants of the locally retained services.	676	5%		35			
		Total Education and Transformation central		20,777	6.8%	700	910	367	67	67
SCHOOLS	3									
SCH1	BUR	Agreement in principle: Cabinet have agreed that schools should be	The details of these efficiencies and the potential impact on each individual school has been detailed in a separate document. It is however clear that even a 1% budget reduction has the potential to make some schools unviable, will result in many schools going even further into a deficit position and will result in some teacher redundancies.	85,086	3%			842	834	826
		Total Schools		85,086	2.9%	0	0	842	834	826
				00,000	2.370	0		072	004	020
N/A	N/A	Proposals under consideration or not yet developed within Education & Transformation Directorate						59	1,623	2,021
		Total Education & Transformation	Directorate	105,863	7.2%	700	910	1,268	2,524	2,914

SOCIAL SERVICES &

Theme 1 - Remodel Service Delivery									
ASC1	CST	specialist and complex care	Focus in-house homecare provision on specialist and complex care and retain 2,268 hours to achieve this. Commission the remaining 2,132 hours from the independent sector to deliver more generic packages of care	1,895	13%	307	250		

Page 37	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
ASC2			The reviews of care packages will include a consideration of the authorities statutory obligation to provide support and that which the service user could fund themselves. Advice has been sought from the legal team and these reviews will be done on an individual basis and based on a needs assessment.	3,280	1%	220	40			
ASC3	PC	Link the work on the new assessment framework to the new national eligibility criteria as part of the Social Services and Wellbeing Act ensuring timely	This saving proposal is based on the adoption of a whole system transformation to the assessment framework with a view to improve the well-being outcomes for people who need care and support and reduce the numbers of people requiring long term support. This has and will transform the way we respond to people contacting social care services; it will be a balance between offering people high quality advice and information to assist them to resolve their problems by maximising the use of community resources, developing solutions that don't require complex assessment or the formal provision of care and therefore reducing the level of individuals that require long term managed care. The savings represent a 6% reduction in commissioned care packages	21,459	4%	1,399	662	150		
ASC7	CST	Reprovision and remodelling of Shared	The saving will reduce dependence on residential placements to a Shared Lives setting for all adults. There will always be a need for residential placements which places pressure on this saving however work is currently progressing with the new provider to identify individuals that would benefit from this type of service model	968	10%	135	50	50		
ASC9	CST	Review CHC-eligible cases to secure appropriate contribution to packages of care	This is managed as one of the work streams under the Changing the Culture Project Board overseen by the Remodeling Adult Services Board. Where CHC applications are being made the progress is tracked and the financial impact recorded. All applications are monitored and where necessary engagements with the Health Board are overseen by Senior Management. These savings have been based on between 7 to 12 individual being eligible for CHC funding.	21,459	1%	70	118			
ASC17		Managed Service Reductions	A review of the level of residential respite care provided to individuals may impact on the level of service received. Figures are based on a 13% reduction in current levels of demand and spending.	5,777	13%			414	335	

Pa fe f. 38	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
ASC18	PC	Development of Extra Care Housing	Development of Extra Care as an alternative to Residential Care, to meet the future needs of Bridgend Residents	2,017	33%			160	500	
ASC19	CST	Develop a Delivery Model for the Bridgend Resource Centre	Development of an income stream for the service via 'selling' 4 weekly placements to other public sector organisations and reviewing the management arrangements of the centre. A working group has been established and project management arrangements are being developed.	1,306	8%		108			
ASC21	MSR	Transfer Family Care Service to the Community Hubs	A transfer plan will be produced during 2015/16	237	89%		210			
CH25	BUR	Reduction in Safeguarding LAC numbers and related reduction in costs	It is envisaged that costs can be reduced if children at risk can be identified early and alternative support be provided instead of them becoming 'Looked after'	9,862	9%		357	520		
ASC27	PC	Redesign respite and emergency services, including a review of transition services	Redesign respite and emergency services across Adults and Children Services						100	100
Theme 1 -	Remodel Servic	e Delivery - sub-total		68,260		2,131	1,795	1,294	935	100
Theme 2 -	Service Efficien	cies								
ASC6	BUR	Management, Admin and Training Implement measures to achieve 7% and 5% across the 2 years	There will be a low impact on the public.	2,550	3%	215	76			
ASC12	BUR	Continued efficiencies within LD Day Services	A staff restructure is being implemented and an options appraisal for the future management arrangements of the service is being produced	1,062	15%	35	36	120		
ASC15	BUR	Achieve transport efficiencies	There will be no impact on staff or service users by this arrangement which involves some of the in-house routes being provided by a community transport organisation.	724	2%	37	18			
ASC23	BUR	Changes in Workforce	Work will commence in October 2015 to plan a new structure for the Social Services and Wellbeing Directorate. This will involve bringing services together across Adults, Children and Sport, Play and Active	Cross service budget			100			
CH22	PC	Remodelling of Childrens Respite Care	Remodelling children respite services in Bridgend, a review of current provision is underway in line with partners.	430	47%		200			

Pa fe f. 39	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
HL 2	BUR	Review Healthy Living Partnership Contract	Decisions would be needed following presentation of options and consideration of financial penalties and capital claw-back.	2,140	24%		181	188	140	
HL3	CST	Continued savings associated with the Halo leisure partnership	None if the business plan can continue to be delivered with reduced financial support from the Council	2,140	4%	247	80			
HL5	MSR	Transfer management of Porthcawl dual use hall to school management	Potential withdrawal of facility for community use or increase in pricing by School. Usage is low, in comparison to other sites, and could be managed by School.	12	100%		12			
HL4	MSR	Review of Lifeguard services to consider length of season and beach coverage.	Removing the lifeguard service would reduce support for rescues, assists, advice, first aid and lost children. Partnership with lifeguarding clubs would increase voluntary patrolling arrangements alongside paid cover for school holiday periods.	151	15%		23			
Theme 2 -	Service Efficiend	cies - sub-total		9,209		534	726	308	140	0
Thomo 3	Income Generat	ion								
ASC10	BUR	Dovelop income stream for specialist	There is currently a service review underway for this care provision, one of the areas being explored could be the potential generation of income for the directorate from other public sector organisations.	113	78%	15	15	73		
ASC20	PC	Introduce charges for supplementary holiday support in Learning Disabilities	Implementation of this process will bring a consistent model across all learning disability support living services	Cross service budget			100			
ASC22	BUR	Income Generation at Bryn y Cae	To work in partnership with Health and other public sector organisations to reconfigure the use of beds at this provision. This could include further development of reablement beds or creation of transition beds	555	10%		54			
Theme 3 -	Income Generat	ion		668		15	169	73	0	0
N/A	N/A	Proposals under consideration or not yet developed within Social Services & Wellbeing Directorate			0%			1,806	2,826	1,849
COMMUN		Total Social Services & Wellbeing	Directorate	62,002	19.4%	0	2,690	3,481	3,901	1,949

COMMUNITIES

Page 40	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
COM4	BUR	Review staffing structures within the Communities Directorate to identify possible savings	The proposal in 2016/17 on top of previous reductions, may impact on the Council's ability to develop projects and programmes to support a successful economy and draw in external funding. The impact will be mitigated by focusing the remaining resources on strategic projects, and by integrating support for business and tourism. Any community based regeneration will be funded through externally funded programmes such as the RDP	17,263 (staffing budget for Communities Directorate as a whole)		544	260			
COM7	MeD	Review of Grounds Maintenance & Bereavement Services	The introduction of wild meadow flowers to some grassed areas accompanied by a reduction in grass cutting will give a more natural look to verges and grassed areas, with less neatly cut and mown verges. Sports pitches and bowling greens will receive less maintenance. Changes to the provision of park pavilions will also be required. Budget reductions attached to Bereavement Services may lead to a reduction in general grounds maintenance activities	1,234	6%	437	69			
СОМЭ	I BUR	Review of Highways maintenance/DLO Services	This will result in staffing reductions and service reconfiguration which will deliver efficiency savings but will also require a reduction in highways service provision such as winter gritting operations, flooding, highway damage and maintenance (including pot hole repair), hazarding and street lighting. Any necessary reduction in service will be mitigated as far as possible through greater prioritisation of resources to meet areas of greatest need and demand.	6,373	11%	308	417	290		
COM16	MSR	Review of supported bus services	Depending on the public consultation outcome this would reduce the subsidy currently provided to some of the least used routes in some parts of the County Borough.	322	5%	120	15			
COM18			Planning fees have not increased in Wales since 2009. It is not considered that there will be any major impact on attracting development to Bridgend as the increase is national and comparative fees in England have already been increased. Developers are aware of the increase and will be prepared although there may be a consequent 'rush' to submit applications before the increase takes effect. There is the risk of planning fee income being dependent on the number of applications submitted. If there is another downturn in the economy then we may not achieve the predicted levels.	-499	-15%		75			
COM20	MSR	Reduction to Winter Maintenance Budget	This cut is in addition to the reductions to the highways maintenance /DLO services already approved. It will mean that the service standard reduces further resulting, for example, in less winter road gritting.	319	19%			60		

Page 41	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
COM21	PC	Review of overtime across Highways/Streetscene	This reduction is part of a corporate project to seek to review and reduce overtime payments across the Council. It will result in less out of hours work and may therefore lead to delays in response across the service	£3,669K total staffing budget for Highways Services			90			
COM22	MSR	Reduction of current weed spraying to one spray per annum	A reduction of 50 % from two sprays per annum to one will result in greater weed growth on the highway network including pavements.	30	50%			15		
COM23	MSR	Technical Surveys - Reduction in budget to cover only costs of SCRIM/SCANNER and a number of other required inspections	The digital scanning of the highway network can be reduced to cover the minimum required for Welsh Government purposes.	20	25%			5		
COM24	MSR	Reduction in road marking maintenance	This proposal will result in less frequent maintenance and re- marking of line painting on roads	100	10%			10		
COM26	PC	Removal of Security budget Waterton	A technological solution is being sought to remove the need for the current security arrangements	20	100%			20		
COM27	CST	Fleet budgets	This is an efficiency savings based on is expected to be delivered through joint procurement, increased commerciality, economies of scale and administrative efficiency	-96	N/a - Fleet has a net income budget				93	
COM28	MSR	Review of Housing budgets for efficiency savings in 2016/17. Saving in 19/20 from Homelessness Budget (fully committed until this year)	This is an efficiency savings which, dependent on demand (eg arising from the introduction of Universal Credit), should be deliverable without an impact on service performance.	941	6%		56			
COM32	BUR	Implementation of Digital working and	Nil Public Impact	24	50%		12			
COM33	BUR	Review of all budget heads in Business Support creating less resilience for unexpected expenditure	Nil Public Impact	81	31%		25			
HL5	CST	Library Service Options appraisal and implementation of agreed service model	Implementation will be delivered by Awen Trust and is in the partnership agreement	Total culture budget for 15 16 is £3,250. Total of savings = £719K	22%		150			
COM17	CST	New models of service delivery will be in place for Cultural Services by 16/17. Savings required for 17/18 will comprise an extension of these.	Implementation will be delivered by Awen Trust and is in the partnership agreement	Saving would be pursuant to Partnership Agreement (Cultural Trust)	n			101		

Page 42	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
HL6	CST		Implementation will be delivered by Awen Trust and is in the partnership agreement	Saving would be pursuant to Partnership Agreement (Cultural Trust)	n		100			
ASC5		Ischemes	Efficiencies delivered from Bleaf and WoodB joining the Cultural trust.	278	24%	67	67			
N/A	N/A	Proposals under consideration or not yet developed within Communities Directorate						1,591	518	1,469
		Total Communities Directorate		24,884	22.1%	1,476	1,336	2,092	611	1,469

RESOURCES

FINANCE

RES1	BUR	To reduce the number of Finance and accountancy staff	Detailed plans to be developed and consulted upon at the appropriate time, but expectation is that some savings, particularly in future years, would come from collaboration. Capacity will be reduced to undertake statutory financial functions and support schools and directorates.	2027	11%	119	51	169		
RES3	BUR	To reduce costs of ICT systems	Plan to bring finance system back in-house and to reduce number of software applications and licenses as Council reduces	1423	26%	0	192	182		
RES4	CST	To reduce the number of Internal Audit hours commissioned from joint service	Reduced internal audit capacity within the Council focused increasingly on statutory work only, increasing risk of failure of internal controls	403	18%	20	19	34	20	
RES7	BUR	To reduce the number of ICT service staff	Detailed plans to be developed and consulted upon at the appropriate time. Capacity will be reduced to undertake key support functions and paticipation in corporate transformation projects	2,056	4%	52	18	70		

Page 43	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
RES27	BUR	To put Council Tax and some aspects of benefits online and to collaborate with others	Digitisation should result in better customer access and service, but savings are likely to be delivered through staff reductions from putting council tax and some benefits on line. A detailed plan is being developed and will be consulted upon.	2198	23%	0	60	150	290	
RES28	BUR	To secure reductions in External Audit Fees	Agreed reduction in external auditor's fees	420	21%	0	87			
RES33	BUR	To recover grant audit fees from grant	Plan to negotiate with Welsh Government to ensure audit of grants covered by grant. Expected reduction in grants in future years should also reduce pressure on net budget.	47	64%	0			15	15
RES34	BUR	To repay prudential borrowing on ICT capital	Net revenue budget has been released by repaying loan early from 2014-15 fortuitous under spend.	220	77%		170			
		Total Finance and ICT		7,531	20%	191	597	605	325	15
HUMAN R	ESOURCES									
RES12(b)	CST	Reduce CCTV Services Operations	Quality of service (i.e. response time) likely to be compromised, subject to the pace and scale of roll out of digital services across the Council.	297	10%	30	30			
RES13	BUR	To reduce number of staff in HR, OD and Communications and business support	Staff reductions will be managed by reprioritising and reconifguring work programmes.	2,689	4%	164	95			
RES15		To publish County Bulletin and Bridgenders electronically only	Digitisation of content is better use of resources and hard copies would be made available at council offices	19	84%	3	16			
RES36	BUR	To reduce DBS checks budget	A reduction in net budget is possible due to a sustained reduction in demand	100	10%		10			
		Total Human Resources		3,926	4%	197	151	0	0	0

Image: Non-State in the state in the stat		
RES13 BUR To reduce number of staff in HR, OD and Communications and business support reconifguring work programmes. 2,689 4% RES15 BUR To publish County Bulletin and Digitisation of content is better use of resources and hard 19 84%	RES36	
RES13 BUR To reduce number of staff in HR, OD and 2 689 4%	RES15	3
	RES13	164
RES12(b) CST Reduce CCTV Services Operations Quality of service (i.e. response time) likely to be compromised, subject to the pace and scale of roll out of digital services across the Council. 297 10%	RES12(b)	30

Pa fe 44	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
PROPER	TY (ESTATES AN	D BUILT ENVIRONMENT)								
RES19	BUR	To increase non-operational estate income	Increased income provided an additional investment property can be purchased. Increasing rental and fees to commercial tenants will generate additional income but this puts occupancy levels at risk.	-752	-11%	25	5	50	25	
RES21	BUR	To rationalise the core office estate - disposal of Sunnyside	Staff have moved into Civic Offices making better use of space and saving on running costs	1,148	23%	120	191	25	25	25
RES29	BUR	To rationalise the core office estate - leasing of Raven's Court	Plan to move staff into Civic Offices, generate rental income and save on running costs, will require investment in ICT to enable staff to work in an agile manner and to achieve staff to desk ratio of 3:2.	411	47%		195			
RES30	BUR	To review the Resources Directorate Service Level Agreement with Schools	SLA to be reviewed to ensure principle of full cost recovery is in place for services provided by Resources Directorate. Assumption is there is an imbalance between the SLA and the cost of its delivery.	312	38.1%		44	75		
RES32	BUR	Account staff in the Built Environment	Service is exploring potential commercial opportunities to sell its design and construction services to other public sector partners. Increase in income dependent on securing new business	725	21%			150		
RES40	BUR	Change Out of Hours Service provided by Built Environment	Will require Built Environment and Highways staff to provide cover for each other, with stand by cover partly provided by Emergency Planning officers to achieve saving	725	3%		22			
RES38	BUR	To maximise the productivity of the Built Environment DLO	Review of DLO productivity levels and charging structure to identify productivity gain opportunities	2,935	5%			145		
		Total Property		2,431	40%	145	457	445	50	25
N/A	N/A	Proposals under consideration or not yet developed within Resources Directorate						531	960	1302
		Total Resources Directorate		14,548	37.6%	533	1,205	1,581	1,335	1,342

Page 45	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
LEGAL &	REGULATORY S	ERVICES								
LRS1	CST	Public Protection Collaboration	The project is intended to reduce costs and maintain resilience. The project is expected to provide savings over and above those originally stated and it is important that the project provides proportionate savings to its costs to avoid other parts of the department taking an unacceptably high burden of cuts n one area. Savings targets for years 2018 on are speculative.	1,953	29%	286	181	134	50	200
LRS2		Restructure of Legal & Democratic, Performance & Partnership Services.	Concern in relation to the ability of the department to provide services to the authority impacting not only on performance but on the ability to meet wider MTFS savings. Disproportionate effect on Legal Services. Reductions place significant burden on service requiring	3416	2%	268	70			
LRS3	BUR	Increase income targets Registrars	Unlikely but must retain ongoing monitoring of income	0	0%		66			
LRS4	BUR	Staff reductions already made	Reduction in capacity	3416	3%		81			
LRS5	BUR	IL OTOOTATE SAVIDOS TATOET PROCUTEMENT	Requires new structure and business model with Corporate support	0	0%				25	50
N/A	NI/ 4	Proposals under consideration or not yet developed within LARS Directorate						587	69	328
		Total LARS		6,043	30.5%	554	398	721	144	578

CORPORATE / COUNCIL WIDE

CS1	BUR	Rationalise and reduce voluntary sector funding by 10%	Minimal Impact	Cross directorate		78	33			
CS3	BUR	building maintenance	Sale of Sunnyside building and additional investment in Civic Offices has reduced the call on the corporate R & M budget	1,100	18%	50	200			
CS5	BUR		Reduce the amount of interest paid on investments and increase the amount of interest generated from external investments.	10,315	9%	200	300	216	150	300

Page 46	Categories	Budget Reduction Proposal	Impact	Budget 2015-16 £'000	Total Budget Reduction 2016- 2020 as % of 2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Savings Achieved £000	Indicative 2016-17 £000	Indicative 2017-18 £000	Indicative 2018-19 £000	Indicative 2019-20 £000
CS7	PC	Reduction in the Coroner's precept	This will require discussions with precepting authorities e.g. Fire and Rescue Authority to secure reductions in precepts, in line with overall reductions in public sector funding.	6,928	0%	102	23			
CS8	BUR	Reduction in other Corporate budgets including pay and price provision.	Impact to be determined depending on economic climate, inflationary rates etc.	6,027	6%	72		340		
CS9	BUR	Reductions in Insurance Premiums	Reduction in the annual amount put aside to increase the estimated cost to the Council of the outstanding liability for Employer's Liability, Public Liability and Property.	1,736	17%	100	100	100	100	
CS13	I BUR	Reduction in provision for Council Tax Reduction Scheme	Budget underspent by £800k in 2014-15. Impact will need to be monitored as this budget is demand led.	14,254	4%		300	300		
N/A	N/A	Proposals under consideration or not yet developed within Corporate Budgets						91	932	615
		Total Corporate / Council Wide		38,861	10.6%	602	956	1,047	1,182	915

GRAND TOTAL REDUCTIONS	252,2	201 14.5%	3,865	7,495	10,190	9,697	9,167

balants TotalData TotalApproval recoVinco recoStatus recoData reco </th <th>CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016-2026</th> <th></th> <th>APPENDIX</th> <th>C</th> <th></th>	CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016-2026															APPENDIX	C	
balants TotalData TotalApproval recoVinco recoStatus recoData reco </th <th></th> <th>Indic</th> <th>ative</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>												Indic	ative					
Distance Image		to 31-3-15	2015	Approvals			2015/16											Total to 2025/26
Part Yeal Branny School 6.769 747 1		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Mynod Cyfrighnar Shoul Elevann 2 15 . 10 . 78 1.88 1.09 6 .																		
Myrods Cyfelger Parnary hallynag Works Myrods Cyfelger Parnary Bolton Barnes Corrent		6,765					474											474
Characterization 39.278 201 M 200 M <td></td> <td>2</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-10</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>3,188</td> <td>1,029</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4,898</td>		2	10			-10	-		3,188	1,029	6							4,898
CampBare Devane Devan								700										700
Grade Decomposition S20 Z20 Z20 <thz0< th=""> Z20 <thz00< th=""></thz00<></thz0<>																		210
Veel Plan Privation 0 250 - 350 - - - - - - - 1 0 1 0						-96		200										5,509
Additional Learning Needs 3.107 684																		29
Same Valley South Phrang Provision 315 690																		250
Percode financy Stood 0 1.081 -0.961 0.00 7.220 171 -0 -0 0.884 Statewy to the Valge financy Provider 630 7.20 7.71 -0 -0 6.84 Statewy to the Valge financy Provider 630 7.80 7.81 5.85 166 -0 -0 8.84 State State State 0.0 7.80 7.81 7.80 8.80 8.80																		893
Sakewy be hysing priminany provision 1 1,040 699 341 1,085 5.57 108 541 541 right of prival 302 3 681 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>9,686</td></th<>																		9,686
Physe Start Provison 665 281																		8,800
Ming M Prech Or Sgar 1912 8 M 8 M						-699		1,685	5,957	166								8,149
Ying De Ogan Ying De Ogan<			-															281
intromoting Special School 0 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1,90 500 - - - - - 7,90 500 - - - 7,90 - - 7,90																		8
Schools Moderingation Reletions 0 - 70 - 0 - 70 Litchard Dimany School 2,968 170 - 170 - - - - 171 Litchard Dimany School 2,968 170 - 173 - - - 132 Cital Canadity School 57,000 12,33 0 2,267 6 0 0 0 0 0 4,33 Cital Canadity School 1,203 - 1,324 - - - - - 1,33 Cital Canadity School 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 - - - - 1,24 Adult School Canadity School 0 0 1 8 - - - - - 1,24 Adult School Canadity School 0 1 88 - - - - - - 1,24 -							24											24
Studio 3, Pyle 0 74 74 74 74 75		-					-	-	1,000	500								1,500
Lither Direnary School 2.999 170 Image of the state of the st								707										707
Children's Oracle Millor Works 0 1.322 0 0 2.267 9.864 9.355 2.4002 2.407 6 0 0 0 0 0 4.385 Veliboing 1 2.207 9.864 9.355 2.4002 2.407 6 0 0 0 0 4.385 Adult Social Care Monw works 0 800 1.209 1 1.200 1																		74
Total Childmaria 57,020 12,231 0 0 -2,267 9,864 9,315 22,002 2,407 6 0		2,995																170
Weilbeing Mail Social Care		v																1,332
Adult Social Care Image: Contr Purchase and Relutioned		57,020	12,231	0	0	-2,267	9,964	9,315	22,002	2,407	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	43,694
Caltic Court Purchase and Refurbishment 1.202	Wellbeing																	
Adult Social Care Minor works 0 80 <																		
Care Standards Act 218 89 89 - 140 168 0 0 0 168 - - - - - - - 140 168 168 168 - - - - - 168		, -						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,209
Sports Facilities month of the sports																		80
Silen y Afon Resource Centre 0 143 143 - 1 <		218						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89
Total Wellbeing 1,420 1,600 0 1,600 - - - - - - - - - 1.6 - 1.6 - 1.6 - 1.6 - - - -																		87
Communities Image: Control of the second secon		•						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	143
Street Scane Image Maintenance (Capitalised Repairs) Image Maintenance (Capitalised Repairs) <t< td=""><td></td><td>1,420</td><td>1,608</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1,608</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>1,608</td></t<>		1,420	1,608	0	0	0	1,608	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,608
Highways Maintenance/Capitalised Repairs) 0 200																		
Transportation Minor Works(Capitalised Repairs) 0 250 <																		
Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways 5,552 646 646 - <th< td=""><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2,200</td></th<>		-																2,200
Infrastructure 5,552 646 646 - <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>250</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>250</td> <td>2,750</td>		0	250				250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	2,750
Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Street Lighting) 1,285 402 402 - 128 28 -																		
Road Safely 0 241 241 - - - - - - - - 22 Inadopted Highways 0 50 50 50 0 0 0 28 Dint Vehicle Maintenance Lift Ramp 0 283 223 - - - - - - 28 Joint Vehicle Maintenance Lift Ramp 0 46 46 - - - - - - 28 28 283 - - - - - - 27 20 28 28 27 - - - - - - - 28								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	646
Jnadopted Highways 0 50								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	402
Fleet Vehicles 0 283 283 - 1.28 28 1.26		-						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	241
Joint Vehicle Maintenance Lift Ramp 0 46 46 7 7																		50
Parks Pavilions 72 10 10 977 - 112 112 113 114 115 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 100 100 100 <								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	283
Playground at Ffordd yr Eglwys 0 75 75 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 12 Highways Street Infrastructure 0 1,250 - - - - - - - - 14 - - - - - - 12 12 - - - - - - - 14 - - - - - - - 14 - - - - - - - - 14 - 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 </td <td></td> <td>46</td>																		46
Highways Street Infrastructure 0 1,250 1,250 - - - - - - 1,250 - - - - - - - - 1,250 - <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>987</td></t<>									-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	987
Residents Parking Bridgend Town Centre 16 136 136 - 135 115 115 115 115 115 115 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 116 <th16< th=""> 116 <th16< th=""> 11</th16<></th16<>		-							-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75
Street Scene Minor Works 0 14 14 - 101 111 105 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td></td></t<>								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bridgend Recreation Car Park 0 115 115 115 115 116 117 Shop mobility 0 105								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	136
Shop mobility 0 105 105 0 105 0 105 21								-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
Transport Grant Schemes 0 1,038 1,038 - - - - - - - - 1,03 Coychurch New Cremators 220 840 840 840 6 6 6 6 6 840 840 6 840 6 840 840 6 840 840 840 6 840																		
Coychurch New Cremators 220 840 840 Image: Constraint of the state of																		105
Asáa Land Compensation 26 19 19 Image: Compensation of the second								-	-		-	-	-			-	-	1,038
Regeneration & Development Image: Constraint of the system o													L	L				840
Bridgend Digital 105 21 21 21 - 105 21 103 31 108 108 - - - - 103 108 108 108 - - - - 106 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 540 540 540 540 - - - - 24 <th24< th=""></th24<>		26	19				19											19
Bridgend Town Centre Infrastructure Programme 0 182 Image: Control of the structure Programme 0 182 182 Image: Control of the structure Programme 0 182 182 Image: Control of the structure Programme 0 182 183 183 182 <										ļ								-
Special Regeneration Funding 0 - - 271 540 540 540 - - - - 2,43 Bridgend Townscape Heritage Initiative 1,916 381 381 40 - - - - - - 42								-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
Bridgend Townscape Heritage Initiative 1,916 381 381 381 40 42		-					182											182
		-					-		540	540	540	540	-	-	-	-	-	2,431
								40	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	421
	Maesteg Townscape Heritage Initiative	2,149	12				12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
Porthcawl Townscape Heritage Initiative 61 598 6 598 225 35 35 889	Porthcawl Townscape Heritage Initiative	61	598				598	225	35	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	893

							Indicative										
	Total Costs	October	New			Revised											Total to
	to 31-3-15	2015	Approvals	Vire	Slippage	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2025/26
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Bridgend Town Centre	8,695	95				95	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
Maesteg Town Centre Regeneration Phase 4	2,751	51				51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51
South East Wales Local Inv Fund	2,032	138				138	120	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	258
Llynfi Valley Development Programme	0	-				-	2,400										2,400
Porthcawl infrastructure	266	-				-	5,507	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,507
Porthcawl Coastal Defence	0	174				174	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	174
Porthcawl Rest Bay Waterside Cycle		33				33	248										281
Vibrant and Viable Places	630	4,267				4,267	4,709										8,976
Commercial Improvement Areas	0	110				110	70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	180
Rural Development Plan	0	-				-	150	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150
Community Economic Development	483	22				22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22
Housing Renewal Area	0	474			-200	274	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	474
Housing Renewal Schemes	0	300				300	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1,300
Housing Renewal/Disabled Facilities Grants	0	3,337			-980	2,357	3,330	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	2,350	26,837
Sport, Play and Active Wellbeing								,		,		,				,	-
Bryngarw House	0	28				28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28
Healthy Living Minor Works	0	25				25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25
Berwyn Centre	0					200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200
Pyle Life Centre	28	-					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Communities	26,287	16,168	0	0	-1,180	14,988	18,797	3.475	3.475	3.440	3.440	2,900	2.900	2.900	2.900	2.900	62,115
Resources		,			.,			-,	-,	-,	-,	_,	_,	_,	_,	_,	,
Minor Works	0	602				602	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	11,602
Upgrading Industrial Estates	0					40	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	.,	40
Fire Precautions	0					122											122
DDA Works	0	150				150											150
Maximising Space and Technology / BCP	875	597				597	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		-	597
Civic Offices External Envelope	0.0					001	2,550										2,550
Agile Working (Rationalisation of Admin. Estate)	0	637				637	2,000				580						1,217
Community Care Information System	3,840	2,744				2,744					000						2,744
Relocation of Depot Facilities	60	4,376				4,376				-	_	_	_		_	_	4,376
Bridgend Market	0	20				20					_					_	20
Non-operational assets	520	480				480	_	_	_	_	_	-					480
Investment in ICT	020	300				300				-							300
Community Projects	310	148				148	100	100	100	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	798
Total Resources	5,605	10,216	0	0	0	10,216	3,750	1,200	1,200	1,150	1.730	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,150	24,996
Unallocated	5,605	10,216	0		•	10,216	3,750	1,200	648	1,150	,	2,238	2,238				14,648
	90,332	40,223	0	0		-	-	-			1,118						14.040
Total Expenditure Expected Capital Resources	90,332					26 776	24 000	26.677			6 200			2,238	2,238	2,238	
		,	•	•	-3,447	36,776	31,862	26,677	7,730	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	2,238 6,288	2,238 6,288	6,288	147,061
General Capital Funding		.0,220			-3,447	36,776	31,862	26,677			6,288						
Conservation Constraints of Demonstrated				Ŭ	-3,447				7,730	6,288		6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	147,061
General Capital Funding - Supported Borrowing		3,909			-3,447	3,909	3,909	3,909	7,730 3,909	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant		3,909 2,379				3,909 2,379	3,909 2,379	3,909 2,379	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288		6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	147,061 42,999 26,169
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts		3,909 2,379 9,062			-3,447	3,909 2,379 5,851	3,909 2,379 7,973	3,909	7,730 3,909	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing		3,909 2,379			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485	3,909 2,379 7,973 977	3,909 2,379 8,453	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG		3,909 2,379 9,062				3,909 2,379 5,851	3,909 2,379 7,973	3,909 2,379	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200	3,909 2,379 7,973 977	3,909 2,379 8,453	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG		3,909 2,379 9,062			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485	3,909 2,379 7,973 977	3,909 2,379 8,453	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure)		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 - 527			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400	3,909 2,379 8,453 - -	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools)		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883	3,909 2,379 7,973 977	3,909 2,379 8,453	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - - 1,181	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 	0		-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400	3,909 2,379 8,453 - -	7,730 3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909	3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	6,288 3,909	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 527 2,883 2,665 23,910			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665 20,499	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713 20,351	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - 1,181 15,922	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - - - 6,372	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665 107,160
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF)		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - - 1,181	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) CADW		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 527 2,883 2,665 23,910 462			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665 20,499 462	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713 20,351	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - 1,181 15,922	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - - - 6,372	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665 107,160 880
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) CADW WG - Flying Start		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 527 2,883 2,665 23,910 462 - 281			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665 20,499 462 - - 281	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713 - 20,351 - 348	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - 1,181 15,922	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - - - 6,372	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665 107,160 880 - 281
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) CADW WG - Flying Start WG - Other		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 - 527 2,883 2,665 23,910 462 - - 281 4,596			-3,211 -200 -3,411	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665 20,499 462 281 4,596	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713 - 20,351 - 348 - 348 - 433	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - 1,181 15,922 35	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - - - 6,372 35 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665 107,160 - - 281 5,029
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) CADW WG - Flying Start WG - Other WG - 21st Century Schools		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 527 2,883 2,665 23,910 462 			-3,211	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665 20,499 462 - - 281 4,596 1,150	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713 - 20,351 - 348 - 348 - 433 5,800	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - 1,181 15,922	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - - - 6,372	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665 107,160 880
General Capital Funding - General Capital Grant Capital Receipts Unsupported Borrowing Loan - WG Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (Highways Infrastructure) Local Govt Borrowing Initiative (21st Century Schools) Revenue Contribution Sub-Total General Capital Funding External Funding Approvals Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) CADW WG - Flying Start WG - Other		3,909 2,379 9,062 2,485 - 527 2,883 2,665 23,910 462 - - 281 4,596			-3,211 -200 -3,411	3,909 2,379 5,851 2,485 - 200 527 2,883 2,665 20,499 462 281 4,596	3,909 2,379 7,973 977 2,400 - 2,713 - 20,351 - 348 - 348 - 433	3,909 2,379 8,453 - - 1,181 15,922 35	7,730 3,909 2,379 84 - - - 6,372 35 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	3,909 2,379	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	6,288 3,909 2,379 - - -	147,061 42,999 26,169 22,361 3,462 2,200 527 6,777 2,665 107,160 - - 281 5,029

											Indic	ative					
	Total Costs	October	New			Revised											Total to
	to 31-3-15	2015	Approvals	Vire	Slippage	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2025/26
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Transport Grant		1,211				1,211	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,211
EU		104				104	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	104
S106		3,628			131	3,759	504		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,263
Other Contributions		1,019				1,019	450	450	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,919
Sub-Total External Funding Approvals		16,313	0	0	-36	16,277	11,511	10,755	1,358	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39,901
Total Funding Available		40,223	0	0	-3,447	36,776	31,862	26,677	7,730	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	6,288	147,061
Funding Shortfall/Surplus		-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-

Glossary of terms SBIG - School Building Improvement Grant WG - Welsh Government SEN - Special Educational Needs

TG - Transport Grant

SUSTRANS - Org. focused on making smarter travel choices

EU - European Union

WVSRA - Western Valleys Special Regeneration Area HLPP - Healthy Living Partnership Programme S106 - Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning

This page is intentionally left blank

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO CABINET

15 DECEMBER 2015

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR RESOURCES

OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION 'SHAPING BRIDGEND'S FUTURE'

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the outcome of the 'Shaping Bridgend's Future' consultation which asked citizens to share their views on the council's corporate priorities and on a number of key budget proposals being considered over the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) period.
- 1.2 This report provides an overview of the budget consultation activities, analysis and key findings.

2.0 Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The 'Shaping Bridgend's Future' consultation sought to obtain views on a revised set of corporate priorities as well as specific budget reduction proposals across council directorates. In addition the allocation of financial resources determines the council's ability to meet its corporate objectives. As such the report links to all corporate priorities.
- 2.2 Decisions on the MTFS will influence the extent to which the council can deliver against its corporate priorities.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 Over the next four years Bridgend County Borough Council is expecting to have to make budget reductions of up to £50 million. Despite the financial challenges ahead, the council is determined to deliver its vision of working together to improve lives across the county borough.
- 3.2 In addition to questions on the proposed corporate priorities, respondents were also asked, using budget sliders, to share their views on 12 key budget proposals being considered between 2016-17 and 2019-20, including: nursery services; residential and respite care; complex homecare support; lifeguard services; holiday support for people with a learning difficulty; highways maintenance and direct labour; reduction of supported bus services; looked after children; regeneration; cleaning service; parks and open spaces and online services.
- 3.3 Budget consultation exercises were undertaken in 2013/14 and 2014/15. This 'Shaping Bridgend's Future' consultation exercise has built on the knowledge gained from the previous two consultations and further developed the consultation to include new ways for people to participate and engage with the council.

- 3.4 The budget consultation overview, document and survey was made available between 28 September 2015 and 22 November 2015. The survey was available to complete online through a link on the council's website or by visiting: www.bridgend.gov.uk/future
- 3.5 The consultation aimed to reach the following key stakeholders: citizens, schools, BCBC cabinet members/councillors, local businesses, the third sector, BCBC staff, trade unions, town and community councils, partner organisations, equality groups, youth services/council and local media.
- 3.6 Communication and promotional activities included a radio campaign with Bridge FM, various press release/editorials in the Gazette and other local media, a social media/web campaign, development of three short films, poster/sign campaign, direct marketing to key target audiences e.g. businesses, youth council, internal communications campaign for staff and elected members.
- 3.7 Methods of engagement included a survey (available online and hard copy at all local libraries), engagement events and town centre engagement stands, social media debates, a dedicated Citizen's Panel survey, meetings with representative groups e.g. Bridgend Association of Secondary Heads.

As part of the engagement and town centre events, citizens could also fill in comment cards and take part in a coin game to prioritise budget proposals.

Responses were also welcome via letter, email or telephone.

3.8 A target was set for this consultation exercise of 1400 responses to represent c.1% of the population of Bridgend County Borough.

4.0 Current Situation / proposal

- 4.1 The attached consultation report (appendix 1) sets out in detail the views expressed by those who participated.
- 4.2 Overall, the council has received 1819 responses via the various consultation mechanisms identified in 3.7. A breakdown of these is documented in the consultation report.
- 4.3 The response rate can be summarised as:
 - 989 responses to the surveys were received in total including responses gathered through the Citizens' Panel outlet of the responses received there were 753 online submissions and 204 paper versions returned. The remaining 32 responses were received from the community engagement events.
 - Of the 989 responses, 424 surveys were received directly from the Citizens' Panel 220 were received online and 204 paper versions.
 - In total, there were 495 interactions at the public community engagement events across the county borough. This figure is a combination of 167 comment cards and 247 counter game interactions received at the engagement stands and 81 from attendees at engagement workshops.
 - During two social media question and answer sessions there were a total of 167 interactions from Twitter and 85 interactions from Facebook, being seen a total of

79,861 times on Twitter and 49,811 times on Facebook respectively. During the consultation period there were a total of 334 interactions using social media.

- No comments were received by letter, email or telephone call.
- 4.4 Headline figures and themes include:
 - All three proposed corporate priorities received strong support, with at least 80 per cent of respondents agreeing. 71 per cent however, believed the priorities are also missing important factors. Streamline the council; workforce and processes (39 responses), public transport, highways and infrastructure improvements (27 responses), and support local businesses and offer free parking (23 responses) were the three most suggested themes put forward by respondents.
 - There was minority support for increasing council tax in order to keep services running (only 31% agreed). Providing some council services through other organisations (76%), focusing services on the vulnerable (65%) and introducing charges to maintain some services (52%) all received support from the majority of respondents.
 - The majority (68%) believe schools should be expected to make efficiency savings. However, 73 per cent believe some services should be protected over others. In particular, care of older people, services for disabled people and primary schools were the three most popular areas to protect.
 - 11 of the 12 budget proposals were supported by the majority of respondents. Online services were the most popular – a combination of 87 per cent either agreed with the proposal or chose to increase the proposed reduction. Highway maintenance was the least supported proposal with 48 per cent either agreeing with the proposal or increasing the proposed reduction.
 - There was a high level of consistency when respondents chose to reduce/(increase) specific proposals. The most common alternative was to cut elsewhere/(spend elsewhere), followed by increasing/(lowering) council tax.
- 4.5 Report conclusions
- 4.5.1 The overall response rate is very positive, exceeding the target of 1,400 set. In comparison we have received 1338 more interactions than the previous year's combined responses (survey, simulator, event attendance and social media replies) Direct comparisons:
 - Survey completions (general and Citizens' Panel) of 989 this year compared with 382 last year across both the separate survey and budget simulator;
 - Social media replies/comments of 334 this year compared to 28 last year (It is
 important to note this year's results cover the whole consultation period not just
 the actual debate as we did last year);
 - Event attendance of 81 this year compared to 71 last year (across six events)

Survey completions are able to measure demographic information which allows us to understand which stakeholders have engaged with us. Key statistics are:

Age	Number	
Under 18	35	
18 – 24	25	
25 – 34	82	
35 – 44	154	
45 – 54	185	
55 – 64	181	
65+	202	
Prefer not to say	64	
Total	884	

- 4.5.2 The majority of respondents responding very positively to budget consultation, with the proposed three new priorities receiving strong support. There was strong support for protecting some budgets over others, and of the 12 budget proposals, 11 received majority support, and the least supported received 48%
- 4.5.3 The least support was to raise council tax to protect services, which received a positive response from 31%. In addition, the consultation has identified some additional priorities for consideration which are set out in paragraph 4.4 above.
- 4.5.4 Electronic methods such as online survey, films and social media have received larger levels of engagement and interaction compared to more traditional methods such as events and paper-based surveys. The evening engagement events on the whole continued to receive poor attendance, however the introduction, this year, of the engagement stands in town centres has proved successful. Other local authorities have better attendance at evening engagement events so there is a need to review the differences and pro-actively respond to that for next year as well as build on the success of the social media debates.

5.0 Effect upon Policy Framework and Procedure Rules

5.1 There are no proposed changes to the policy framework and procedure rules.

6.0 Equality Impact Assessment

6.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and no equality issues have been identified. Budget reduction proposals pursued will be subject to the appropriate equality impact assessment prior to implementation.

7.0 Financial Implications

7.1 The consultation report seeks to inform and aid cabinet members' decisions on the future direction of the council and how to meet the challenging budget constraints in the years ahead.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 Cabinet is recommended to note the outcome of the consultation with interested parties as detailed in the attached consultation report.

Ness Young CPFA Section 151 Officer and Corporate Director - Resources 15 December 2015

Contact Officer: Randal Hemingway Deputy Section 151 Officer and Head of Finance & ICT Ext.3302. E_mail: randal.hemingway@bridgend.gov.uk

Appendix 1: Shaping Bridgend's Future Consultation Report

Background Documents

None

This page is intentionally left blank