

*Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg.
Rhowch wybod i ni os mai Cymraeg yw eich
dewis iaith.*

*We welcome correspondence in Welsh. Please
let us know if your language choice is Welsh.*



**Gwasanaethau Gweithredol a Phartneriaethol /
Operational and Partnership Services**

Deialu uniongyrchol / Direct line /: 01656 643147
Gofynnwch am / Ask for: Andrew Rees

Ein cyf / Our ref:
Eich cyf / Your ref:

Dyddiad/Date: 22 July 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 Committee Rooms 2/3, Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend, CF31 4WB on **Thursday, 28 July 2016 at 2.00 pm.**

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
To receive apologies for absence from Members.
2. Declarations of Interest
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. Approval of Minutes 3 - 18
To receive for approval the minutes of a meeting of the Community Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee of 23 March 2016.
4. Waste Services Provision 19 - 26
Invitees:

Cllr C Reeves - Cabinet Member, Communities
Cllr HM Williams – Cabinet Member Resources
Mark Shepherd, Corporate Director Communities
Andrew Hobbs, Group Manager Street Works

- | | | |
|----|--|---------|
| 5. | <u>Community Asset Transfer and Management of Sports Pavilions</u>
Invitees:

Cllr C Reeves, Cabinet Member – Communities
Mark Shephard, Corporate Director – Communities
Andrew Hobbs, Group Manager Street Works
Carly McCreesh, Community Asset Transfer Officer | 27 - 38 |
| 6. | <u>Forward Work Programme 2016-17</u> | 39 - 48 |
| 7. | <u>Forward Work Programme Update</u> | 49 - 52 |
| 8. | <u>Corporate Parenting Champion Nomination Report</u> | 53 - 56 |
| 9. | <u>Urgent Items</u>
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 transacted at the meeting as a matter of urgency. | |

Yours faithfully

P A Jolley

Corporate Director Operational and Partnership Services

Distribution:

Councillors:

DK Edwards
L Ellis
CA Green
CJ James

Councillors

CL Jones
JR McCarthy
HE Morgan
G Phillips

Councillors

JC Spanswick
JH Tildesley MBE
KJ Watts
R Williams

Agenda Item 3

COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 23 MARCH 2016

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOMS 1/2/3, CIVIC OFFICES ANGEL STREET BRIDGEND CF31 4WB ON WEDNESDAY, 23 MARCH 2016 AT 2.00 PM

Present

Councillor JC Spanswick – Chairperson

CA Green
DRW Lewis
R Williams

RM James
JR McCarthy

RD Jenkins
G Phillips

CL Jones
JH Tildesley MBE

Officers:

Kym Barker
Mark Galvin

Scrutiny Officer
Senior Democratic Services Officer - Committees

Invitees:

Stephen Cook	Chief Executive, Valleys 2 Coast
Joanne Ginn	Housing Solutions Team Leader
Richard Hughes	Chief Executive, Awen Trust
Julie McKim	New Homes Team Leader, Valleys 2 Coast
Alun Morgan	Chairman of Board of Trustees of Awen Trust
Scott Pickrell	Day Services Manager
Mark Wilkinson	Group Manager - Learning Disability
Jenny Williams	Housing Manager, Wales and West
Elizabeth Willington	Housing Manager, Valleys to Coast

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor KJ Watts

42. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

43. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the following meetings of the Community, Environment & Leisure O&SC be approved as a true and accurate record:-

18 January 2016
27 January 2016

44. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Regulatory Services submitted a report, the purpose of which, was to present the items due to be considered at the Committee's next meeting to be held following the Annual meeting of Council.

The Scrutiny Officer referred to paragraph 4.1 of the report that detailed in tabular format, the potential items to be considered at the next scheduled meeting and the Invitees due to attend.

Paragraph 4.2 of the report also contained a table listing potential items as yet to be decided for the 2016-17 Forward Work Programme. The prioritisation and timings of these would be agreed at the Committee meeting following the Annual meeting of Council.

RESOLVED: That the Committee noted the list of potential items for the 2016-17 Forward Work Programme, the prioritisation and timings of which would be agreed at the Committee meeting following the Annual meeting of Council.

45. **AWEN CULTURAL TRUST**

The Chairperson on behalf of the Committee, welcomed the Invitees to the meeting.

The Corporate Director Communities submitted a report, the purpose of which was to update the O&S Committee on the progress made by Awen Cultural Trust (the Trust) since it was established to manage a range of cultural services and facilities on behalf of the Council, with effect from 1 October 2015, including an update on the Wood B and B Leaf programmes.

He advised Members that the Trust was obviously still in its infancy stages, however, a considerable amount of work had been committed to the continuation of the provision of cultural services. As an independent organisation the Trust is governed by a voluntary board of trustees who have a duty to ensure it is viable and fit for purpose. He confirmed that attached to the report at Appendix 1 was a Service Plan for 2015/17, which included the partnership outcomes framework. The Service Plan would focus in particular, on organisational culture, developing values and behaviours that will underpin the Trust's commitment to its customers.

He added that he also has regular meetings with the Chief Executive of the Trust, in order that the Trust and BCBC succeed in supporting each other as the programme moves forward.

He concluded his introduction by advising that Wood B and B Leaf were also developing further under the auspices of the venture.

In terms of Wood B and B Leaf, a Member asked if their viability would be sustained under the Trust.

The Chief Executive of the Trust, confirmed that both Wood B and B Leaf had integrated well since being transferred to the Trust, with both time and investment having been committed to these initiatives since they had been transferred from BCBC.

He confirmed that the cost in terms of budget for the operation of both of these initiatives was the same as had been with the local authority, ie £250k per annum in total for the operation of both entities. Both Wood B and B Leaf were progressing well and starting to generate increased income as a result of operating in a social enterprise environment - things were looking positive for the future. Progression it was anticipated would be incremental rather than accelerated with the needs of the services users always at the heart of what they do.

Both Wood-B and B-leaf support the wider functions of the trust – an ethos that works across the organisation. They particularly support Bryngarw Country Park, as well as produce their own products for retail. The Trust were presently looking to increase hours of business for both these projects, in order to promote business further.

The Corporate Director Communities reiterated that there had been a very smooth transition of services being transferred from BCBC to the Trust, and relationships with the Trust were very good. Plans were now being looked at to move services forward to the next level in order to increase profit margins etc. He reiterated that budget levels in terms of the support of these two work related projects were similar to that before the transfer had taken place. There was some commercial potential relating to the viability of Wood B and B Leaf, and the Trust are looking to engage specialist advice to do an analysis of this, and felt that there was a good strong base and platform within which products produced by both project groups could be promoted further. Therefore there was some optimism of the future of these going forward he added.

A Member confirmed that he had visited B Leaf and had looked at the products they were making, though he was also aware, that there had previously been limited engagement and advertising of these products with/to the public. He was pleased to see now that steps were being taken to promote these work related projects further under the Trust. He was concerned however over the budget reductions planned for Wood B and B Leaf under the latest round of the MTFs.

The Chief Executive of Awen Trust confirmed that whilst there were savings earmarked under the MTFs as the Members had correctly stated, these savings would likely be offset from other areas and efficiency across the Trust. This will include developing external funding strategy, gift aid opportunities, as well as generating income elsewhere. Though there may be a small budget reduction in these areas, this would be less than if services such as these had been maintained by the Council.

A Member asked if any staff from BCBC had been transferred to Bryngarw House as part of the Trust proposals and were there library staff based at the House.

The Chief Executive of the Trust confirmed over 130 individuals transferred to the Trust and its registered office was at Bryngarw House. However, the House is predominantly used, and is increasingly successful, as a weddings venue.

The Chairperson referred to page 20 of the report and paragraph 4.7 of the report, where it stated that the Trust was a separate independent organisation with a charitable status. He noted that due to the significant amount of public funds invested in the new venture, Internal Audit had audited the assessment of controls, in order to provide the Council and the Trust with reasonable assurance that they are adequate. Paragraph 4.9, also referred to issues regarding strengthening client arrangements between both organisations. He asked how the above intended to be monitored.

The Corporate Director Communities advised that the undertaking of an audit was agreed between the Finance Department and himself, due to the organisation being in its infancy. It was particularly necessary to complete an audit, so as to ensure that there were sound financial processes and procedures in place, and the result of the audit confirmed that there were. In terms of monitoring the business going forward, the Corporate Director Communities confirmed that the Authority were acting as a Strategic Commissioner for Awen, and therefore, the Council's Corporate Priorities were being aligned against the Trust's Draft Service Plan. He confirmed that the relationship between the Trust and the Council, operated in a similar manner to that of Halo and the Authority.

A Member referred to page 30 of the report, and the paragraph headed Performance Indicators and Targets, and that as an approach to measuring the Trust's success against the Outcomes Framework, Awen were proposing adopting elements of their Performance Scorecard. This had been developed to consider their charitable/outcome objectives, whilst also delivering a user friendly overview of the organisation's overall health and performance. The scorecard was shown at Appendix C to the report. He asked if this Scorecard adequately catered for and reflected all the different services that the Trust supported, for example library services, the Grand Pavilion and other theatre venues, and Bryngarw House/Park, all of which offered something different. He also made reference to the fact that the outcome measures were developed using the logic basis where longitudinal and academic evidence supports that participation has benefit, eg that children who use libraries perform better at school and have better literacy skills. The Chief Executive of the Trust, confirmed that the above outcome measure had been introduced on the assumption of there being evidence to suggest that if a child regularly visits a library, then their literacy should improve. Similarly, if young people attend dancing classes then they eventually obtain specific dance as well as transferable skills and confidence.

The suggested indicators included in the draft Service Plan, reflect that if the Trust examine ways to encourage people to visit libraries, hence In turn, increasing the number of visitors there, this would fit in with the Authority's School Improvement Agenda for pupil attainment for literacy. If an advertising campaign was undertaken with regard to get more visitors to visit Bryngarw House and Park, then this would have a positive effect on the economy and bring inward investment to the Trust etc. He added that any surplus that the business accrued would be used to secure the viability of the Trust and then invested back into the Trust and the services it delivered. The Trust was a Charity and was governed by charity law, and therefore investment made was committed to the delivery of its charitable purposes.

He further added that the Trust were obliged to deliver on the Contract for the Council, including the aims and objectives contained within this. However, he also explained that it had to operate as a business and to make an improvement in people's lives through the provision of cultural changes and improvements. The more sustainable the organisation was, then the better services it would provide.

The Chairperson of the Trust confirmed that obviously the organisation had to make a surplus in order to maintain its existence, the main thrust of the Trust was meet cultural demands. So it was a combination of making both a financial return and cultural return to benefit the inhabitants of the County Borough. The Board that supported the Trust was made up of individuals with a wide range of skills and were interested in seeing service provision grow within the business. A balance would be struck he reiterated, between securing profit within the business and offering in due course as the Trust developed a range of different cultural services.

A Member was aware that the likes of Wood B and B Leaf were supported by individuals who were being trained purposely to develop their skills, as opposed to being paid employees. She asked if these initiatives became more successful in terms of making and being able to sell-on more products that they developed, then could the service users supporting these ventures possibly be paid/receive an allowance.

The Chief Executive of the Trust confirmed that it was an ambition of the Trust to realise this, as the people supporting Wood B and B Leaf were seen more as colleagues than service users. The cost of this could not be supported formerly through the Council, due to financial restraints associated with the MTFs, but would be looked at as the Trust

developed. These colleagues were however developing training opportunities which in turn, would develop their skills, which would in turn, enhance their prospects of seeking paid employment elsewhere. He added that Wood B and B Leaf were being campaigned more via the web site and through the avenues of social media in order to encourage the sale of the products they produced, particularly with regard to B Leaf.

A Member noted that on average Bryngarw Park received about 200,000 visitors per year. He was pleased to note that last Christmas, B Leaf produced some clever and extremely well made Christmas reindeers that sold well and brought in income. He felt that it was a shame that more of these weren't made due to there only being a few trainees working there as they generated income for the Trust, that could be re-invested in Projects.

The Chief Executive of the Trust advised that the service users were very proud due to producing these, and the income generated from the sale of the product exceeded £1k, which was a fine example of a social enterprise working effectively. This project would be repeated next Christmas. The wood used to make these also came from Bryngarw Park he added.

The Day Services Manager concurred with the above, adding that this project had been positive for the Trust. He added that Wood B and B Leaf had now been in existence for two decades, with both these originating from Day Care Centres. He confirmed that the new Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014 would help support both these initiatives further, and more work was planned in consultation with people with learning disabilities, to develop their skills further through expanding them by providing extra training for services users (for example in carpentry and joinery), in order that they could make not just more products, but different ones also.

The Cabinet Member Regeneration and Economic Development added that the marketing and sale of products were more achievable through a Social Enterprise like Awen Cultural Trust than they would be through the local authority. They were in a better and more viable position than BCBC he confirmed, to both market and allow for the sale of any products that they made.

A Member referred to page 36 of the report, and the current charges for the hiring of Awen Community Centres, and he was pleased to note, that not for profit organisations get a reduced rate for the hire of these buildings. He noted that there was no mention in this section of the report to the Grand Pavilion, Porthcawl or the Maesteg Town Hall, and asked for information regarding the charges for the hiring of these buildings.

The Chief Executive of the Trust advised that Community Centres were protected, in that there was no increase to the hire of these beyond a cost of inflation. The Trust had been gifted with the capacity to use discretion in the hire charging of other buildings. There were both commercial and not for profit rates applicable, and these had to be competitive, in order to attract customers. He confirmed that he would provide further information on this matter over and above that included in the report to the Member outside of the meeting, including information regarding rates of hire charges for both the Grand Pavilion and Maesteg Town Hall.

Conclusions:

The Committee noted the report, which provided Members with an update on the work of the Trust since it was established, including specific information on the Wood B and B Leaf projects.

- Members asked how well Wood B and B Leaf had been integrated into the Trust and asked how much it cost to run the projects. The Officer responded that it had been a positive experience, that the overall budget is currently the same as when the services were run by the Council and that there was potential for reducing costs using the Social Enterprise Model.
- Members raised concerns regarding the lack of public awareness of the projects. The Officer responded that the new arrangements include identifying opportunities to promote the projects.
- Members asked how the performance of the Trust was being monitored. The Officer responded that the expectation is that the Trust would be responsible for the monitoring framework and that there is a potential to put other monitoring in place, as necessary.
- Members asked for clarification regarding the methodology used to develop outcome measures; in particular they referred to the term 'longitudinal and academic evidence'. The Officer responded that this methodology would enable the service to ensure that commercial success can be balanced with the achievement of priorities for local communities.
- Members asked for clarification where figures in the draft balanced scorecard were expressed as actuals rather than percentages. The Officer responded that the figures in the final version of the scorecard would show percentage values.
- Members queried whether there could be an allowance, either monetary or otherwise, for trainees contributing to the work and output of Wood B and B Leaf. The Officer responded that this was a possibility in future.
- Members requested that this item remain on the Forward Work Programme to enable them to monitor the work of the Trust.

Further Information requested

- The Committee requested benchmarking information to enable them to compare performance in context with performance information from Local Authorities.
- The Committee requested a breakdown of figures relating to the Pavilion and Maesteg Town Hall to show charges before and after they were moved to the Trust.

46. **SOCIAL HOUSING ALLOCATION POLICY AND COMMON HOUSING REGISTER UPDATE REPORT - HOUSING SOLUTION INTERVIEW, HOUSING REGISTRATION AND NOMINATION PROCESSES**

The Chairperson explained that in relation to this item, each of the Invitees from the different organisations would be invited to the meeting in turn to respond to questions from Members, in relation to the above topic.

The first representative to be invited to the meeting was the Housing Solutions Team Leader from BCBC.

The Chairperson advised that there was some concern regarding the way the different organisations followed the processes and procedures of the Common Housing Register, developed by BCBC in partnership with the 4 local Registered Landlords, ie Valleys to Coast (V2C), Linc Cymru, Hafod and Wales and West Housing Association.

The report confirmed that V2C were able to allocate up to 25% of their vacancies through their own allocation policy, as set out in the Deed of Stock Transfer. For all other RSL's, they offer 100% nomination rights to the Council.

He added that he also had some concerns over how RSL's were monitored and scrutinised in relation to the criteria that should be followed in respect of the allocation of RSL housing accommodation up to the percentages agreed upon. If this was not being achieved, he added that people hoping to secure housing association accommodation, were then left with the option of taking up accommodation from a Private Landlord.

A Member confirmed that he was concerned that the Council were not having their full agreed nomination rights with regard to Social Housing Allocation under an agreement with V2C, ie that the local authority would have 75% of these rights with V2C having 25%. With all other RSL's the Council had 100% nomination rights. He was particularly concerned that this was not taking place in his Ward, where there seemed to be a considerable number of empty properties. He estimated that V2C controlled approximately 7,000 dwellings, and therefore, he asked how many of these were empty and an explanation as to the reasons why they were unoccupied.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader confirmed that there seemed to be a common theme in relation to 'voids' under the Common Housing Register, though she could not give a specific answer to the Members question in respect of how many properties were empty and the reasons for this, adding that V2C would probably be able to comment on this when their representatives join the meeting. Mostly it was due to the fact that the properties required some work, i.e. re-decorating or something of a more structural nature, which often took longer so inevitably due to this, there would always be a case of some properties being empty at any given time

Monthly housing meetings were convened with V2C, and the 4 other RSL's attended these meetings also.

The Chairperson referred to paragraph 4.13 on page 51 of the report, and asked the Invitee what was the definition of a void property.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader advised that in terms of Social Housing controlled by the Council through RSL's, the Council viewed a void property as a property that was empty and ready to let through the Common Housing Register. However, V2C classed a void property as a property that required some work to be carried out on it, prior to it being allocated under the Social Housing Allocation Policy, with such accommodation being allocated in accordance with the procedures set out Common Housing Register.

A Member asked about the process regarding nominations from the Council to V2C for persons on the Common Housing Register applying for accommodation. He asked for further clarification as to the process that was followed in instances such as this.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader advised that if there were three failed nominations due to the fact that the would-be tenants did not satisfy the criteria of V2C so as to be allocated housing accommodation by them, then V2C take the property back, with a view to then letting the property to someone else who does satisfy their criteria to obtain housing through them as the RSL, under their My Choice scheme.

A Member referred to page 47 of the report, and the terms under which individuals had been assessed as having an urgent housing need, and the last bullet point where a person looking for accommodation was under occupying social housing, and in view of this, wanting to transfer to a smaller property in order to avoid financial hardship. In light of the rental of larger properties increasing through the introduction of the criteria relating to bedroom tax, he asked if individuals who wished to be transferred to alternative accommodation were reducing.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader responded by confirming that there was no recognisable reduction in cases of transfer requests under the above criteria, though it was true that tenants were looking for smaller (and more affordable) accommodation as a result of the coming into being of bedroom tax. Though there were other reasons for such a request taking place, such as couples separating and tenants being made redundant, and therefore requiring a smaller property that would be less costly to run in terms of the paying of utility bills, etc.

A Member asked if individuals that were under 25 years of age and were formerly in but then came out of care, were classed as a priority for accommodation under Band A or Band B of the Social Housing Allocation Policy/Common Housing Register.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader advised that 18 – 21 year olds who were previously a looked after child, were a priority need category under homelessness and if owed the final housing duty would come under band A

If the young person was in supported housing and was needing to move on they would be in band A

She added that, if however, the young person was over 21 leaving care and homeless and had no vulnerability, they would likely end in Band B.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader then stated that in homelessness, there were a number of duties owed to applicants as follows:-

Prevention duty – where someone is at risk of homelessness there is a duty to help the applicant from becoming homeless by retaining their current accommodation or help in securing alternative accommodation

Relief duty – where someone is actually homeless there is a duty to help the applicant secure accommodation

Final duty - If we fail to prevent and then fail to relieve the homelessness, the last duty to consider is the final duty. This duty is only granted to those who are in a priority need category and are unintentionally homeless. There was other criteria such as eligibility and local connection she added. The duty here was to secure accommodation for the applicant.

A Member referred to page 48 of the report, and the criteria for would-be tenants being classed in Band B category on the accommodation waiting list. He asked if an applicant lived in the area, but then for argument sake moved to somewhere in England, then moved back into the County Borough, would they be deemed to have no local connection with the area or not.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader advised that the definition of the term 'local connection' applied to having family members also, ie immediate family members such as mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters.

A Member referred to page 48 of the report, and the issue of damp being experienced in a rented property provided by a Registered Social Landlord. He asked that if the landlord of the property refused to make good this problem, then could the Council take enforcement action against them to do so.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader confirmed that the above could be pursued through the Council's Public Protection Department, and it was incumbent upon the Registered

Social Landlord to undertake any works that may be necessary, particularly if not to do so, would be to the detriment of the health of the tenant. If a condition affecting the property such as damp was considered that bad after the completion of a survey of the property, then the Council could shut the property down and under the relevant tenancy agreement, the RSL would have a certain amount time to make the property once more fit for habitation.

A Member asked if the local authority had ever taken a RSL to court over failing to carry out any works that were urgently needed to one of their properties, particularly of the nature that not do so, would compromise the health of the tenant(s).

The Housing Solutions Team Leader confirmed that she was not fully aware of the answer to this, but she would find out and in turn contact the Member outside of the meeting. She added however, that a Prohibition Order could be served if the condition of the property was severe, rather than the property being 'shut down'.

A Member raised a query in respect of V2C and their option to veto nominations, which equated to this RSL seemingly having over and above the agreed 25% of allocation of tenants to housing vacancies under their own allocation policy rather than the Council's (i.e. agreed 75% to 25% in favour of the local authority).

The Housing Solutions Team Leader advised that she was not aware of this shrinkage, over and above any reference and explanation to this being made in the report.

The Member responded by making the point, that assurance was needed by the local authority from V2C, that they were ensuring that Social Housing was being made available to those that most needed it, i.e. people who were homeless or unemployed and receiving benefits, and not just to families who were in regular employment.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader recognised there was a balance that needed to be struck in terms of allocating individuals to properties under the terms of the Social Housing Allocation Policy. From her experience in the majority of cases, most individuals or families who occupied social housing were not working and receiving Unemployment or Housing Benefit. She added that there was a balance required to be struck in terms of Social Housing, in that if all tenants on the same housing estate were unemployed and/or receiving benefits, the location could then be classed as a socially deprived area. One of the caveats of Social Housing was that it was provided for those that most needed it, similarly to Affordable Housing and there was a considerable need for more of the latter.

The Housing Solutions Team Leader then left the meeting, and the Chairperson on behalf of Members invited to the meeting the Housing Manager from Wales and the West Housing Association.

She advised that a considerable amount of the work she was responsible for, related to the management of the Common Housing Register and associated work regarding the allocation of housing accommodation to tenants.

She confirmed that Wales and the West Housing Association were involved in the management of no less than 7 Common Housing Registers of local authorities across Wales, all of which differed in some way or another. The Manager, Wales and West confirmed that BCBC did have one of the better Common Housing Register's, in that it had been devised in such a way, that applicant's looking for rented housing accommodation could easily understand it.

She explained that as at the end of Quarter 4 last year, 17 properties had been let under the Common Housing Register, and 21 offers had been made under these letting arrangements (82%).

The success rate of housing tenants at the first time of asking, had not been as good in the current year as it was last year she added, however, pre-tenancy works organised by the Housing Options team, including their advice and assistance to tenants had shown a considerable improvement in the above period.

The Housing Manager, Wales and West Housing Association advised that some problems were being experienced in securing tenants for properties in certain difficult to let areas, and therefore, as well as using the Council's website for this purpose, Gumtree was also being used as there seemed to be more success in this through using their website.

A Member asked the Invitee what the main reasons were for individuals declining a property offered to them.

The Housing Manager, Wales and West Housing Association advised that the reasons for this were that the area within which they had been offered accommodation wasn't suitable, or if it was situated within a preferred area it may not be the right size property or not suitable for them internally speaking.

The Chairperson asked if any people refused taking up a tenancy due to a lack of support needs of one kind or another.

The Housing Manager, Wales and West Housing Association confirmed that this was something that was examined at pre-tenancy stage i.e. if a tenant was able to sustain their tenancy without any assistance, including financial support. If this was not the case, then there were elements of support that were made available, including for people who maybe had drug/alcohol dependency, those that required mental health support. Some of these problems often required long term rather than short term support.

People on the waiting list for accommodation should not refuse the offer of housing she considered, if they had any problems such as those mentioned above, as there were adequate support mechanisms in place to help support these types of problems.

The Chairperson referred to page 52 of the report, Table 2, and noted that in terms of failed nominations due to an applicant's circumstances, the percentage rate for Wales and West was good. He asked if this was because they were more flexible than other RSL's in terms of who they allowed to take up tenancy agreements.

The Housing Manager, Wales and West Housing Association advised that there were no real restrictions in relation to their properties. They did not however, tolerate the use of drugs at properties by tenants. With regard to older persons accommodation there was also a limited restriction here also.

Though the Common Housing Register was an effective system, Wales and West only had a limited view of this, and she felt that Wales and West should have increased access to this. They did not though, due to there being in place a database system restriction.

The Housing Manager, Wales and West Housing Association in conclusion, explained that relationships between BCBC and the partner RSL's was generally good, in that they

all had the same common aims and objectives, and were working more effectively as the partnership was developing.

The Chairperson thanked the Invitee for attending, and then invited to the meeting the representatives from V2C Housing Association.

The New Homes Team Leader V2C, confirmed that relationships between BCBC, V2C and the other RSL's was effective and had improved with time, with the relationship being professional, whereby all organisations were working towards a common goal and looking to make a commitment that would prove beneficial to customers.

All partners she felt were looking to provide sustainable communities that would be partly based upon housing the right people in areas that were suitable for their needs, and that the Housing Allocations and Inclusions Panel of BCBC/V2C, to which representatives of the other RSL's were invited to, ensured that all cases of nominations were properly looked at, so that processes and procedures that were followed in relation to the Social Housing Allocation Policy and the allocation of suitable housing to individuals and families included on the Common Housing Register were applied both correctly and impartially.

She added that there were areas for improvement, for example, V2C would like to have full rather than limited access to the Common Housing Register, in order to obtain as much information as possible regarding a customer, in order to help ensure that they were offered suitable accommodation that would help sustain their tenancy. V2C also felt that there was room for improvement by which nomination processes could be better discharged. A discussion had taken place with the local authority regarding this, though to help achieve this, it would mean that V2C staff would need to come to BCBC to use the system, as opposed to it being adapted and made directly accessible by V2C in their own offices.

The Chairperson enquired whether V2C were not able to fully utilise the system due to issues regarding data protection.

The New Homes Team Leader V2C confirmed that she was unsure of the reasons for this, though V2C had offered to purchase additional licences to overcome any security element and have full access to the Common Housing Register directly from their office.

A Member felt that relationships between BCBC and RSL's were in the main very good. He did however, have a recent experience with a constituent who came to see him explaining that she had 3 children, and was working in Porthcawl but looking for Social Housing accommodation in the area. She was subsequently offered accommodation though in the area of Garth, which would have proved to be very difficult for the above reasons should she have accepted this. She therefore appealed against this offer due to it not being suitable, and is now awaiting the outcome of the appeal.

The Chief Executive of V2C advised that he was not personally aware of this particular case, but with regard to normal process, he confirmed that in the main, nominations for housing for individuals and families usually came to V2C from the Housing Department of the local authority, including preferred areas within which to house applicants. If people were homeless, BCBC directed V2C to allocate accommodation to these individuals as a matter of urgency. If applicants were not homeless, they would indicate their area of preference. If they advised that they would be happy to be housed anywhere in the County Borough, then they would obviously have an opportunity of securing accommodation quicker than if they only wished to be housed for example in Porthcawl or Maesteg. He added that a certain amount of pressure was applied to V2C

by BCBC to allocate properties to tenants sometimes in an area which was not their preferred choice. However, V2C then sometimes responded to the local authority advising that if the nomination was delayed for a week or so, then a suitable property may become available in the preferred area as indicated on the application form.

The Chief Executive V2C felt that it was better to adopt this course of action, as if a tenant was placed in a suitable property for them in one of their preferred areas of choice, there was an increased likelihood that they would settle and be happy in the property resulting in a sustained tenancy which everybody would obviously prefer.

A Member noted that the local authority had 75% nomination rights in respect of the Social Housing Allocation Policy, whilst V2C had 25%. He was under the impression that this percentage had in recent months swayed significantly in favour of V2C, and he asked the Invitees if this was the case.

The Chief Executive of V2C confirmed that this was not the case, and that annually, this was reflected in the Social Housing Allocation Policy.

The Chief Executive V2C added that in 2015 there had been a total of 400 properties vacant, 372 of which the Council had nomination rights to (as oppose to V2C).

He reiterated that if the Council did fail to house a person or family after three attempts of doing so, then V2C would have an opportunity to do so, which may slant the 75% / 25% ratio, but this was the only criteria under which these percentages would alter.

The Member asked a supplementary question, namely if V2C ever refused applications for tenancy under the Social Housing Allocations Policy.

The New Homes Team Leader V2C advised that they did have their own allocations policy that differed from that of the Council. Applicants were interviewed and V2C then undertook a financial assessment of the individual to ensure that they could afford the accommodation they were intending to be the tenant of. She added this was important to V2C, as if they were in a position where they would struggle to keep up the tenancy payments going forward, then this would result in them accruing debt. In cases such as this, V2C were in all likelihood going to refuse their application for tenancy. The same situation would apply to applications from persons who had a previous record of housing related debt.

A Member asked if the RSL made the necessary checks in order to ensure that the applicant was being truthful in their application about their personal circumstances and health etc.

The Chief Executive V2C advised that checks were made regarding the contents of the form and the validity of the information contained therein, with the local authority and other key agencies. The applicant also had to sign the form declaring that the information they have put in this is correct.

He stressed however, that applications for Social Housing were only refused from the outset in very accentuating circumstances.

A Member pointed out that the local authority has a statutory obligation to make every attempt possible to find accommodation for the homeless or someone who has come out of prison.

The Chief Executive V2C confirmed that he was aware of this, and that V2C were happy to work with the local authority and other RSL's to ensure that this was achieved. The most important issue was ensuring that tenants were in the right property to suit their personal needs, and this applied in terms of their financial status, their preferred location and the right size property, whether this be smaller accommodation for single persons, or larger accommodation to cater for families. As mentioned previously, this often resulted in the tenants remaining in the property and providing a sustainable tenancy.

He added that page 52, Table 2, reflected that there had been between the period 01/01/15 – 31/12/15 a total of 25% failed nominations due to lettings criteria, and 27% failed nominations due to applicant's circumstances. He was happy to report to Members however, that since this period both these percentages had improved/reduced.

The Chairperson referred to page 53 of the report and paragraph 4.21 that made reference to void properties, and stated that with the exception of V2C, the remaining RSL partners will accept several nominations for a void property until a suitable match of tenant can be found. He asked if it was custom and practice for V2C to just accept one nomination, whilst other RSL's were willing to receive more.

The Chief Executive confirmed that V2C took 3 nominations, and if the first failed under their policy/criteria, they would similarly consider a 2nd and 3rd nomination. However, he added if the Council requested V2C to consider a 4th nomination, then they would do so.

The Chairperson of the Committee followed - up, by asking the Chief Executive, V2C what their definition was of a void property.

He confirmed that it meant that the house was empty, and waiting to be let for whatever reason. An assessment was then undertaken, in order to establish when it would be in an appropriate and acceptable condition to be re-let, after whatever work was required to be carried out to it. The Council were informed and updated when situations such as this took place.

V2C were obviously keen on repairing or re-furbishing properties so that they lost their void status, as empty properties equated to losing business as well as a loss of money.

He added that V2C presently had currently a total of 120 empty properties, around 10 of which required some major work in order for them to be made habitable once more. Of the remainder around 30 – 35 properties were almost ready for occupation, whilst others were having a small amount of work done to them. The aim he advised, was to reduce the amount of void properties from around 110 to 75 as soon as was possible.

He further added that since the new Social Housing Allocation Policy had been introduced under the revised Common Housing Register, the waiting list for housing accommodation had reduced significantly from around 4,000 to 1,000. This register was also now under the governance of the local authority only, whereas the previous register had been a combined register including all other relevant RSL's. Under the new Social Housing Allocation Policy, only persons considered as having a 'housing need' were placed on the waiting list, and therefore this had resulted in a smaller pool of applicants to allocate properties to. The Chief Executive V2C, felt that this often did not help with data matching, in terms of placing people who applied for social housing in appropriate accommodation that was entirely suitable for their needs. He confirmed that this situation was compounded by not enough smaller sized affordable accommodation that would suit single people, a couple, or perhaps a single parent with one child. All of the above factors contributed to tenants being placed in unsuitable accommodation that was

often as a result of this, for a short term rather than a longer term tenancy. He further added that 67% of the CHR were single people.

The Chief Executive, V2C proceeded by advising that he felt that adopting a housing waiting list was too prescriptive, whereas a choice system for tenants was far more flexible. He felt that wherever possible, the customer's needs regarding preferred choice of area and type/size of property should be considered.

A Member pointed out, that in Bryntirion there were instances whereby tenants were paying a service charge for maintenance work on green areas fronting their properties. However, as there were also private dwellings within the vicinity of these areas, they were enjoying the benefits of this also without having to pay for them.

The Chief Executive, V2C noted this point, adding that there had previously been a High Court ruling on this, where the case had been lost. He added however, that if there was a situation such as the above, and for example there were 10 properties fronting an area of open space that required maintaining, 5 of which were privately owned and 5 of which were owned by V2C, with the maintenance costs for grass cutting per annum being £100, then the tenants in the V2C dwellings would only pay £10 each (per property) with the remaining £50 being funded by the RSL, as the occupiers of the private dwellings could not be charged for the maintenance work.

As this concluded debate on this item, the Chairperson thanked the Invitees following which, they left the meeting.

Conclusions:

The Committee noted the report, which provided Members with an update on the Housing Solutions Service.

- Members requested that the BCBC Officer and RSL invitees join the meeting separately to enable them to discuss any issues or concerns.
- Members queried the criteria under Band A which refers to where there is an issue of under occupation and whether the 'bedroom tax' had meant an increase in numbers under this criteria. The Officer responded that there had not been a peak in numbers when the reform happened.
- Members asked about working relationships between BCBC Housing Officers and RSL staff, the BCBC officer responded that there was some frustration regarding, for example, information sharing where requests by BCBC Officers for information on voids had not been addressed. There were also concerns raised regarding the option for V2C to veto nominations, resulting in them having the over and above the agreed 25% control.
- Members asked whether BCBC can require that landlords action repairs where these may have been outstanding for some time, the Officer said that Landlords would be contacted in the first instance but that they could be required to carry out repairs if necessary.
- Both RSL representatives commented that working relationships were, in the main, working well.
- Both RSL representatives commented that there was some frustration regarding the limited access they have to the system and said that there were changes which could easily be made to the system enable improved access.
- Members were concerned that 'support needs' was cited as an example of criteria for turning down a nomination. The RSL representative responded that there had been some improvement in this regard lately in that the approach when considering people who may fit these criteria had been relaxed.

- Members requested clarification regarding instances where no one had been nominated for vacant properties. The RSL representative gave examples of situations where this may occur, for instance where rentals would not be sustainable due to the circumstances of the prospective tenant.
- Members requested information and examples where the option to veto nominations has been used. The RSL representative V2C gave an example where a nomination sent to V2C from BCBC had been rejected due to a £5.00 shortfall in the finances of the nominee. Members were concerned that this meant that the person nominated was not then given V2C social housing/accommodation because of this veto.
- Members queried whether the current situation could be improved to ensure that opportunities to nominate people for V2C properties are not missed in future. The RSL representative V2C responded that it would be helpful to add another band to address this issue.
- Members requested clarification regarding service charges to tenants. The RSL representative explained contingencies to address issues wherein tenants would be paying service charges which would benefit other residents living nearby.

Recommendations

- The Committee recommend that there should be consensus regarding the meaning of the term 'void'.
- The Committee recommend that the wording for the criteria in Band B which states 'You are homeless and housing will relieve your homelessness' is reworded to clarify what this means.
- The Committee supports the development of a common financial assessment tool.
- Members support the development of another band to ensure that opportunities to nominate people for properties are not missed in future.

Further Information requested

- The Committee requests further information regarding the number and nature of instances where BCBC had required landlords to carry out repairs.
- The Committee requests further information on whether/how allocation figures have changed over time.
- The Committee requests clarification regarding Looked After Children and whether and how they are prioritised for accommodation on leaving care.
- The Committee requests more detail on the BCBC and V2C partnership, specifically regarding how processes and working relationships concerning SHAP can be improved.

47. URGENT ITEMS

None

48. NOMINATION TO STANDING BUDGET RESEARCH AND EVALUATION PANEL

The Assistant Chief Executive Legal and Regulatory Services submitted a report, requesting Committee to nominate the Chairperson and one other Member of the Committee onto the standing Budget Research & Evaluation Panel and to nominate a further Member as a reserve.

RESOLVED: That Councillor JC Spanswick and Councillor CA Green be appointed on to the Budget Research and Evaluation Panel, with Councillor RM James (Reserve) being appointed as the Reserve Member.

49. 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 Paragraph 14 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.

50. APPROVAL OF EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the exempt Minutes of the meeting of the Community, Environment & Leisure O&SC of 17 January 2016 be approved as a true and accurate record.

The meeting closed at 5.15 pm

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

SCRUTINY REPORT

COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

28 JULY 2016

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

WASTE SERVICES PROVISION

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To set out for consideration by Overview and Scrutiny Committee the progress made on the procurement for the provision of residual & recycling collection services and provision of services at the Council's Community Recycling Centres (formally Household Waste Amenity Sites).
- 1.2 The report will also bring to the attention of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee changes to the level of service provided as part of the Council's current procurement exercise for waste management arrangements, in order to meet the performance targets for recycling set by the Welsh Government.
- 1.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to note that changes to the level of service are necessary in order to meet the Welsh Government target for recycling set out in its Blueprint for waste "Towards Zero Waste" and its Municipal Sector Plan, and that a significant financial penalty (£200/tonne) can be imposed by the Welsh Government where the target is not achieved by Councils.

2 Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The provision of Waste Services forms part of the portfolio of responsibilities allocated to the Corporate Director Communities. The proposals to re-procure the provision of waste collection and civic amenity site management services embrace and recognise the objectives detailed in the Corporate Plan under Priority 3 – (Smarter use of resources), ensuring that all our resources (financial, physical, human and technological) are used as effectively and as efficiently as possible, and supporting the development of resources throughout the community that can help deliver our aims.

3 Background

- 3.1 The Domestic Waste Collections Service and Household Waste Amenity Sites (HWAS) have been delivered via contracted provisions since 2003 and 2004 respectively. On the 31 March 2010 both contracts were brought together following a competitive dialogue procurement exercise into a single integrated contract for the provision of waste and recycling services which was awarded at the time to May Gurney but is now operated by Kier, The current contract term is seven years with a contract provision to allow the extension of this contract, subject to agreement between the parties, for a further period of up to seven years.

- 3.2 A decision was taken by Cabinet to market test the service by competitively tendering the work.

4 Current Situation

Procurement Progress

- 4.1 Tenders for the provision of waste services were made available for bidding contractors to view on the 31 May 2016. A programme outlining the anticipated time scales attached to the procurement exercise is presented for information in **Appendix A**.
- 4.2 To date a number of contractors have registered an interest in tendering for the work. However, it is too early in the process to confirm to Overview and Scrutiny Committee how many of these expressions of interest, will translate into compliant bids for the work.
- 4.3 Overview and Scrutiny Committee are asked to note that a number of risks are attached to the procurement process, which is currently ongoing. Procurement rules set by UK and European legislation provide highly prescriptive guidance on how procurement exercises are to be run and managed, that in themselves represent risks to the successful delivery of the project and to the time scales indicated in **Appendix A**. It is also common practice in the waste management sector for bidding contractors to include as part of their tender submissions amendments to the contract terms which through the procurement process will be negotiated to arrive at an acceptable position for both parties. Again at this time it is not possible to advise Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the level of such amendments or to give an indication of the likely impact on the procurement programme.

Waste Levels of Service

- 4.4 To support the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2016-17 to 2019-20 it is of paramount importance that the new service provision from 2017 represents best value. This is also provided that the quality of service is assured and the service model chosen places the Council in a position to meet the Welsh Government (WG) recycling targets as it moves forward.
- 4.5 The current level of recycling of Council municipal solid waste is projected to just meet the 58% target required by the Welsh Government (WG) for 2015/16. However, it is understood from recent modelling work undertaken in partnership with the Waste Recourses Action Programme (WRAP is funded by Welsh Government to give local authorities “hands on” practical expertise, advice and financial help), and from experience of the current collections system, that achieving the target set for 2019/20 of 64% will not be possible without changes to the way in which the service is delivered. The Bridgend recycling performance was amongst the best in Wales when the current contract was rolled out in 2010, however, each year since more other authorities pass Bridgend’s performance as they change their service and restrict residual waste collections.

- The WG recycling rate targets moving forward are:

2015/16 until 2018/19 – 58 %

2019/20 until 2023/24 – 64 %

2024/25 onwards – 70 %

- 4.6 On the basis of the above, with no change to the current collections methodology, the Council would inevitably fall increasingly behind the recycling targets required, with the potential consequence of fine levels at £200 per tonne for material not recycled. For clarity if the Council were to miss the recycling target by 1%, this may result in fines of around £150,000. There is also the potential that special measures may be imposed by WG. Therefore retaining the status quo collection methodology has considerable financial implications.
- 4.7 In seeking to set levels of service which achieve these targets, and in particular the target for 2019/20 of 64%, Overview and Scrutiny Committee will recall the recent public consultation exercise undertaken over an eight week period from 14 December 2015 to 8 February 2016, and the decision of Cabinet taken on the 15 March 2016 to approve the collection of residual waste on a fortnightly basis and to restrict the amount of residual waste that can be presented by the household to two bags per collection.
- 4.8 Included in this Cabinet report were also proposals for the collection of absorbent hygiene products (nappies etc.). As part of the proposed changes to the collection arrangements it is proposed that the absorbent hygiene products collection service will coincide with the collection of black bags to support families and residents who use such products. Measures have been included within the current procurement to recycle these materials but the final option on whether to recycle or to treat the materials by other means will need to take into account the relative costs of each option. This will not be known until the procurement exercise has been concluded.
- 4.9 Also included in the report to Cabinet were proposals to change the way in which the Council's Civic Amenity Sites operate. The sites will now be rebranded as Household Recycling Centres and householders who wish to dispose of bagged mixed materials will be asked to sort the recycling into separate streams for the appropriate containers prior to arrival at the sites before disposing of any small amounts of residual waste remaining.
- 4.10 The changes detailed above will come into place on 1 April 2017. There will be a three month bed in period with engagement and education for residents prior to enforcement of compliance.
- 4.11 More detailed explanation on the exact details of the recycling collection system which will be rolled out from the 1 April 2017 when the new contract is due to go live are as yet unavailable. In order to secure best value under the current procurement, the contractor has been given the option to continue with the existing range of bags and boxes to deliver the service or to present alternative proposals for consideration. In considering his method of service delivery the Contractor will need to take into consideration the requirement of European and WG legislation in the waste area. This places controls on the way that recyclates are presented and collected at the kerbside and require the four main waste streams, paper, glass,

plastics, and metals to be collected separately. There are exceptions to this where it can be demonstrated that it is not technically, environmentally, and economically practicable to do so or where the comingling of recyclable materials result in an equivalent quality of product for processing.

Service Requests

- 4.12 Under the current contractual arrangements the responsibility for responding to requests for service and complaints from the public is split in various proportions between the Council and the Contractor. In the case of complaints, these are currently received by the customer contact centre who will try and respond to the customer's complaint at the point of contact. Where they are unable to do this, the complaints are referred to the contractor or passed to the Cleaner Streets Teams in Civic Offices to investigate and respond. In many instances the contact centre, Cleaner Streets Team and the Contractor are all involved with responding to a complaint. Under the new contract, it is proposed that all requests for service and complaints are referred directly to the Contractor as first responder. However, matters which the Contractor has not been able to fully resolve will be dealt with by the Council's contact centre or Cleaner Streets Team. To ensure that appropriate checks and balances are in place and that matters of financial probity and transparency are properly considered the Contract will be managed going forward through exception reports presented at appropriate frequencies by the Contractor at operational meetings. These reports would contain the relevant detail required by the Council on performance and delivery of the service.

Dispensation Proposals

- 4.13 During the public consultation exercise, the public raised a number of questions regarding the operation of restrictions on the collection of residual waste to two bags per household. While matters relating to absorbent hygiene products, as detailed above, were considered as part of the process and subsequently reported to Cabinet for consideration, other matters relating primarily to capacity were not fully considered. The following questions were raised by householders during the consultation: -

How will,

- Households with a high number of occupants manage?
- Households that dispose of ash from coal or other solid fuel central heating systems manage?
- Households that dispose of waste arising from pets manage?

- 4.14 To address these questions it is proposed to, subject to Cabinet approval, proceed in August 2016 to undertake a further public consultation exercise to seek the wider views of the public. A further report will be brought forward for consideration by Cabinet on the findings of this public consultation, which will seek their views on the detail of any policies to be adopted in these areas.

- 4.15 It is important to note that the views of the public gained through the consultation process will need to be considered in conjunction, both with the cost of any

dispensation to be granted, as well as the likely effect a dispensation would have on the overall recycling rate. For example giving an extra bag to households with pets would result in 60% of the households in Bridgend not having to comply with the two bag limit. This would have significant waste disposal cost implications and negatively impact on the recycling rate projection.

- 4.16 During the public consultation exercise a number of consultees raised comments on the potential for the proposed restriction on the number of black bags placed at the kerbside for collection, to be flouted or abused by householders not wishing to comply with the scheme.
- 4.17 The comments listed amongst the concerns included the potential for householders to place additional bags against neighbouring properties, or for those who present their waste in communal areas to put out for collection as many bags as they want due to the difficulties that the Council would have in identifying the households or individuals concerns. As a means of addressing these concerns and overcoming some of the anticipated behaviour of some of the Borough's householders, it will be necessary to review the Council's approach to enforcement and the levels of resources allocated to this function. The result of this review will be brought forward for consideration by Cabinet prior to the end of the 2016 calendar year. This could include employing an external company to assist with enforcement activity in the waste and street cleaning areas as a number of our neighbouring authorities have recently trialed.

5 Effect upon Policy Framework & Procedure Rules.

- 5.1 There are no effects on the Policy Framework and Procedures Rules.

6 Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 Equality Impact Assessments have been undertaken at the appropriate stages in the process.

7 Financial Implications

- 7.1 Where available the financial implication of any proposal to introduce dispensation to the Council's proposed restriction on the presentation of residual waste, will be presented to Cabinet for consideration, alongside any proposed policy or procedure resulting from the public consultation exercise.
- 7.2 A further report on the outcome of the financial implications from the tendering process for the new waste services collection contract will be placed before Cabinet for Cabinet's further consideration.

8 Recommendations Scrutiny Committee is recommended:

- 8.1 To provide comment on the content of the report.

Mark Shephard
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES

Contact Officer: Andrew Hobbs
Group Manager Street works
Telephone: (01656) 643416
E-mail: Andrew.Hobbs@Bridgend.gov.uk

Background documents: Cabinet Report 15th March 2016
Current tender documents for provision of waste service
provision.

Appendix A

Procurement Programme

Event	Without Negotiation	With Negotiation
Tender Submission / Return – consisting of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Qualification Questionnaire (Compliance Questions).</u> 2. <u>Qualification Questionnaire (Bespoke (Scored) Questions).</u> 3. <u>Initial Tender Submission: (And all required documentation).</u> 	09/08/16 – 12:00 Hrs	
Evaluation - (Qualification Questionnaire (Compliance / Bespoke (Scored) Questions)	16/08/16	
Opening of Initial Tenders (ISIT Document)	17/08/16	
Evaluation of Initial Tenders - completion	05/09/16	
Start of Negotiation Period (provisional)		06/09/16
End of Negotiation Period (provisional)		20/09/2016
Submission of Final Tender (provisional)		04/10/2016
Notification of Intent to Award a Contract Start of 10-day Standstill Period.	Start: 06/09/16 End: 19/09/16.	Start: 18/10/16 End: 31/10/16
Contract Award Date	20/09/16	01/11/16

This page is intentionally left blank

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

28 JULY 2016

COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER AND MANAGEMENT OF SPORTS PAVILIONS

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to update the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the progress made through the Community Asset Transfer (CAT) programme in Bridgend County Borough Council since it was accelerated in November 2015.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives/Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 Community Asset Transfer contributes to the corporate priority area of Helping People to be More Self Reliant and aims to help meet the budgetary targets outlined in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-17 to 2019-20 (MTFS).

3. Background

- 3.1 The external environment - The period up to 2019 and onwards is likely to offer a number of significant challenges to Bridgend County Borough Council (BCBC), in terms of continuing public sector financial restrictions.
- 3.2 The Council has recognised that with significant budgetary constraints services can no longer operate as previously and that there is a need to explore alternative models of service delivery where local people and community organisations play a larger role in public life. Community owned and managed models of delivery can reinvigorate community assets and ensure that local groups can directly control what happens within the community in which they operate. To this end, Cabinet resolved in July 2015 to undertake a phased approach to Community Asset Transfer (CAT) with the first tranche focussing on the transfer of sports pavilions, community centres, bus shelters and public conveniences.
- 3.3 As a result the Council refreshed its Asset Management Plan at the end of 2015 to ensure that the policy reflects operational processes on the ground. It was recognised that although some good practice examples of CAT had been implemented, progress still remained slow and capacity to take this forward was limited. This resulted in Cabinet resolving on the 14th July 2015 to:

- (a) Set aside £200,000 from the Change Management Earmarked Reserve to fund a dedicated CAT officer, for a 3 year period, along with

specific legal and property support to enable the programme to move forward; and

(b) Present a report to Council to request approval of an additional £50,000 per annum from 2016/17 to 2018/19 to support Town and Community Councils to undertake capital projects. This is in addition to re-focusing the £50,000 already in the Capital Programme in each of these years for community purposes to support CAT. Subsequently this was approved on 7th October 2015.

3.4 The Community Asset Transfer Officer came into post in November 2015 and since that time the following progress has been made:

- 56 organisations have approached the CAT officer regarding 48 different premises.
- 11 applications are now in business planning stage
- 2 applications have been deferred and 2 applications have been withdrawn. 2 applications are being dealt with by Property Services.
- 3 town and community councils are progressing applications for various amenities including public toilets, pavilions, bus shelters and community centres.
- 10 enquiries from community and voluntary organisations – predominantly exploring community centres and pavilions

3.5 Predominantly to date the majority of queries and interest are coming from sports clubs and associations in relation to self-management of pavilions and playing fields.

3.6 The CAT process has been designed to test an organisation's capacity and the robustness of its business and financial case.

A. **Stage 1** of the process is the submission of an Expression of Interest which gives the CAT officer the opportunity to meet with the group face to face to discuss their proposals. At this stage checks are undertaken on the building and the group are given all relevant data for the asset. This will normally inform their decision to progress with CAT. Decisions are traditionally formed dependant on the condition and affordability of the asset.

B. **Stage 2** of the process is where due diligence of the group and its business case commences where the CAT officer will work with the group and assess the following issues:

- a) **Capacity of the organisation** – will review their governance, legal structure, powers within their authority as an organisation identifying if the proposed works are in line with the directors or members

responsibility and capability. The group will also be asked to provide key policies and procedures such as Equality policy, Safeguarding policy, Environmental policy, financial management procedures, insurance etc. Where areas for development are identified groups will be signposted to organisations such as Wales Coop, Coalfields Regeneration Trust and BAVO for additional support and training, which can include support with business plans, funding, and governance. A level of common sense is being adopted when appraising applications to ensure that the process does not become a barrier or restriction to enable groups to progress forward and support will be provided where possible.

- b) **Skills and capacity of the group** – groups will be asked for pen profiles of its directors or members and a brief outline of what skills and experience they will bring to the organisation. Groups will be encouraged to develop role descriptions and a structure to understand how the facility will be managed, procedures surrounding this and outline how conflict will be managed. Additionally some groups (especially where there is one champion within an organisation or an ageing committee) will be asked to develop a succession plan. Groups will be asked to undertake a skills audit of its committee and implement training or mentoring in areas where there are skills deficits/gaps.

- c) **Business and financial case** – At Stage 2 the group is expected to submit a 5 year business and financial plan for review. This will identify how viable the scheme is and gives the case officer the opportunity to challenge and question some of the assumptions made to inform cash flow projections. The CAT officer will present the case to Strong Communities Connecting Service (SCCS) board. The purpose of SCCS Programme Board is to ensure that the Council and key partners maximise services within communities through the use of its buildings and strategic planning of community assets and services. Community Asset Transfer policy and delivery is a key part of the SCCS agenda. An application assessment matrix and report will be presented by the CAT officer for discussion and decision, which scores an organisation on the following criteria:
 - i. Applicant organisations capacity – skills of committee, how it's governed and what processes and procedures are in place to ensure good practice is adopted
 - ii. The business case and proposal for the asset
 - iii. Community and partnership impact – looking at needs analysis
 - iv. Suitability of the asset
 - v. Financial case and assumptions
 - vi. Capacity to manage the asset (operational)

4. Current Situation Proposal

- 4.1 The Rural Development Programme recently commissioned a report on the impact to date of the Community Asset Transfer Programme, on clubs and societies operating in the rural wards of Bridgend. (Wales Cooperative Centre report – Review of Sustainable Venues and Assets in Bridgend County Borough). This provided a timely opportunity to stop and reflect on the first 6 months of the delivery of the CAT programme as it gave an opportunity to engage with the voluntary sector and internal departments to understand what was working well and what was challenging progress and process in relation to CAT.
- 4.2 The report identified 10 recommendations for Bridgend County Borough Council as outlined below:
1. The Council develops a clear narrative for all aspects of its CAT policy to include:
 - What happens to community assets should no-one come forward to take control?
 - Make clear to groups the date when assets will be closed or the Council's support withdrawn.
 - Clarify if CAT applications can continue to be submitted beyond any closure date.
 - Clearly state if the Council has any long term objective to sell un-adopted community assets.
 2. The Council explore the opportunity of making available a small amount of seed corn (development) funding for groups to facilitate the first steps of the CAT process e.g. for surveys, feasibility studies, etc.
 3. The Council ensures that the CAT policy is given sufficient importance by senior management to ensure it achieves its objectives and that Council departments liaise with the CAT officer to develop a clear internal pathway for processing CAT applications.
 4. The Council reviews its current open ended application process and considers adopting 2 application windows a year.
 5. The Council adopts a risk based approach to dealing with minor assets such as bus stops and public toilets.
 6. Priority is given to CAT applications that clearly demonstrate a community or partnership approach to managing an asset.
 7. Terms and conditions of lease agreements offered to groups are in line with the organisation's plans and ambitions for the assets, as set out in their business plan.
 8. The Council ensures that all organisation's seeking medium to long term leases or freehold control of an asset have a robust asset lock written into their governing documents, therefore ensuring that the asset remains publicly owned.
 9. The Council commission adequate independent support from the Third Sector to provide detailed advice and guidance to CAT applicants on issues such as:
 - Options appraisals and feasibility studies
 - Business and financial planning

- Legal structures and governance arrangements
 - All aspects of asset management
 - Partnership/consortia working
 - Income generation and funding advice
10. That the Council explores the possibility of developing a co-operative approach to the ownership and maintenance of playing fields and open spaces across the County.
- 4.3 The key barriers identified to hindering progress for CAT fall under four broad headings:
1. Barriers to participation- issues such as affordability and condition of buildings, and potential upfront exploratory costs.
 2. Clarity of Bridgend County Borough Council (BCBC) policy objectives - understanding what provision and service will look like in the future and clarity on the direction of travel for community assets/facilities/services.
 3. Governance and procedure- Reviewing the process to ensure it is more user friendly, open and transparent.
 4. Advice and guidance – providing advice and guidance to groups at critical points.
- 4.4 The recommendations and subsequent actions will be considered by relevant officers and Cabinet Members over the forthcoming months and actions will be developed to address the issues and priorities raised. Already work is underway to speak with stakeholders and partners, mapping current provision and identifying potential gaps in support. This exercise will then inform a commissioning exercise to provide a support service for groups during the CAT process and afterwards, which will be resourced from the Council's Strategic Regeneration Fund (SRF) and could include:
- a. Intense business planning support and training for CAT projects. The support may be required for both the CAT applicant and Council departments, both of whom need assurance on the long-term sustainability of the proposed transfer.
 - b. Technical and specialist professional support services, such as Traffic Impact Assessments (TIAs), ecology assessment reports, engineering issues and condition surveys.
 - c. Skills development and training for Management Committees on new areas of responsibility.
 - d. Specific advice and support for CAT applicants relating to legal status and governance requirements.
- 4.5 Timescales
- At present the programme operates on a rolling basis and there are currently no timescales or deadlines in place for groups to make applications. The Wales Cooperative Centre review highlighted that groups and clubs would

prefer having a set timeframe and clear understanding of BCBC's future intention, to inform their decision to progress (or not) with the CAT process.

4.6 Currently the Parks Department are undertaking a Strategic Review of Parks and Playing Fields which will inform the strategy for future provision and in turn impact on how CAT is implemented. It is inevitable that the findings and recommendations that arise from this work will impact on timescales and implementation dates for issues such as charge increases and potential closure of buildings.

4.7 Alternative Options to CAT

Should organisations and communities not want to take up the offer of the asset transfer, or other barriers prevent transfer, there are a number of alternative options that may also be considered. It is probably sensible to assume that CAT is one option in a menu of alternative options to safeguard and maximise the use of our community buildings, however, other potential alternative models may include the following. These options apply to parks pavilions and playing fields but also potentially to other assets held by the Council:

- a) Do nothing - continue as we are. Unlikely to be an option due to the scale and pace of the budget reductions that need to be realised
- b) Full cost recovery - charges for services could be increased to reflect the full cost of provision, for example for pavilions and playing fields. This will be difficult if it is not implemented in a phased approach, however, this will hinder/slow down the impetus around CAT if the Council are still part subsidising the service moving forward, as there would be less incentive for clubs to pursue transfers.
- c) Closure of buildings - clearly not the Council's preferred model, however, should be explored in instances where:
 - 1) No interest for CAT is being displayed by users,
 - 2) Where the state of repair is so poor the transfer would be a liability to the group
 - 3) Where the facility is poorly used and its outgoings heavily outweigh the benefit it brings. In this instance co-location should be suggested
 - 4) Where groups have submitted a business case which is unviable and would be too risky for the Council and the group. Depending on the scale of required budget reductions some closures may be inevitable regardless of the above.
- d) Co-location of clubs - encouraging clubs to move to other premises to safeguard their teams
- e) Town and Community Councils - encouraging Town and Community Councils to take over ownership of community buildings to safeguard them for groups and clubs and exploit the opportunity to raise the precept for such activity. This could be as part of the CAT process.

- f) Provide a rationalised service, only providing support in strategic sites/hubs around the County - identify a limited number of key sites/hubs where buildings are multi-functional with broader community use, in good state of repair in good locations, well used, who have capable committees and capacity and opportunity for growth.
- g) Promote school facilities for alternative use – in particular 21st century schools which would have capital funding to develop all weather pitch facilities. There are already good practice examples within the Borough where school facilities are used by the wider community including Y Dderwyn and Archbishop McGrath Comprehensive Schools.
- h) Open call for interest through a competitive tender process - where interest from groups is not forthcoming compile asset packs and put the asset transfer out for tender. This is an approach that is adopted in other areas such as South of England.
- i) Full stock transfer to an alternative body - seek a partner to take over the transfer of all remaining stock or look at other models of delivery such as Land Trusts or Cooperatives to take over and manage the facilities.
- j) Asset guardians - work with organisations such as Coalfields Regeneration Trust to support groups in the interim period by taking on a lease in the short term whilst groups build their capacity and confidence to manage the asset.
- k) Sell assets on the open market - dispose through public auction.

This list is not exhaustive and will need to be flexible and evolve in line with the findings and recommendations defined by the Parks Strategic Review.

- 4.9 In the MTFs 2013-14 to 2016-17 the Parks department successfully secured £1 million of funding from the Council's Capital programme to provide upfront capital investment for sports pavilions. This funding is prioritised where it is proposed to transfer the asset through the CAT process. The purpose of this investment is to minimise the risk to the voluntary groups in terms of the repair liabilities and in turn minimise the risk of the building being returned to BCBC due to operational aspects of the building being unviable for the group. Groups are expected to apply for capital funding through their business and financial plan submission (See paragraph 3.6 of the report) which makes the process more streamlined for the applicants. Groups are aware of the fund and it has proved to be a positive incentive to engage groups.
- 4.10 Currently we are drafting guidance on the management of this capital fund to provide greater clarity to groups engaged in the process.
- 4.11 Affordability of running and maintaining assets is constantly highlighted as a barrier to taking on CAT, and the issue of grant subsidy for revenue funding is often raised to overcome the risk period during the first 3 years of transition.

This has proved positive with the self-management of community centres and bowls pavilions. There are no scheduled plans, and no existing budget, to support CAT revenue funding. It may be necessary, however, to consider moving forward whether some mechanism could be agreed to provide initial revenue support when groups who take on CAT are at their most vulnerable in the first couple of years after transfer.

- 4.12 The Property Department have started a new programme of condition surveys which commenced in May 2016, therefore all assets up for consideration for CAT will have up to date condition surveys.
- 4.13 In terms of Governance, the CAT programme has an established Steering group with representation from key internal departments such as Finance, Parks, Communities, Legal, and Property with the Head of Neighbourhoods acting as the Senior Responsible Officer. The group currently meet on a 4/6 weekly basis during the implementation stage, where a monthly update and risk register is reported to Senior Officers. Applications for CAT are considered at Corporate Property Group and Strong Communities Connecting Services Boards.
- 4.14 During the implementation stage a number of visits and contacts have been made with neighbouring local authorities to understand how CAT has been adopted in other areas. A visit was held on the 16 June with the Cabinet Member for Communities and Resources to Blaenau Gwent (one of the local authorities held as best practice) to speak with the Corporate Director and Property Managers implementing CAT. Additionally, a study visit to a boxing gym in Neath Port Talbot which was attended by 5 clubs was organised to share best practice and develop their networks. Contact has also been made with Welsh Governments Asset Transfer team and a meeting is anticipated shortly. The transfer of Carnegie House in Bridgend to Bridgend Town Council is already highlighted in the Welsh Government's CAT guidance as a core study demonstrating good practice.
- 4.15 **Risks, issues and mitigation measures:** the types of issues and risks we have to manage or be mindful of are:
- Lack of engagement from the community sector to take on assets.
 - Clubs going into dissolution, or return the keys, and the asset is in a worse state of repair.
 - Limited staff resource to deliver a comprehensive and wide programme of work. The risk of not frontloading the service at early stages to manage the risk.
 - Business cases not sustainable – already 2 business cases have been withdrawn due to financial viability and we sense this is likely to happen more frequently as groups go through the financial and business planning phase.
 - Lack of skills and capacity within the sector to develop financial and business plans as well as manage the asset.
 - Risk that groups do not comply with statutory requirements and put users at risk.

- Groups don't have money to match fund refurbishment, or their fundraising plans are long term and can hinder CAT progress.
 - State aid implications.
 - Asset becomes non inclusive and doesn't benefit the wider community.
 - Fragmented disposal of assets could make a strategic approach to future rationalisation of service more difficult and in turn more expensive and restrictive.
 - Limited economic benefit due to the geographical area and user group for facilities which could therefore impact on sustainability.
 - Reliance on one champion/leader and volunteer base- risk of burn out and non-delegation.
 - Proposed use for the asset transfer is not in line with strategic direction of the Council.
 - Insufficient corporate resources to deal with a high volume of CAT applications.
 - Confusion over roles between the community organisation and the Council.
 - Restrictive organisational culture where assets have always been within public ownership by public bodies, and a culture shift in facilitating a transformational programme at this scale.
- 4.16 At the time of drafting this report the most significant risk, for which mitigating measures are being developed, is the risk of making the process too onerous and burdensome for groups, who should be noted are managed by voluntary committees. It is appreciated that there needs to be a level of robustness and scrutiny undertaken at due diligence stage, but this needs to be balanced with a culture internally which appreciates measured risk which is weighed up by potential social benefit.
- 4.17 However, where there is capacity within groups then there are already signs that CAT is a positive and sustainable way forward. Two examples where the skills and drive of groups is evident are Bryncethin RFC and Caerau FC who have shown strong interest and commitment in transferring their respective pavilions, and in Caerau's case the pitch also, in order to upgrade the asset and therefore have a better community facility.
- 4.18 CAT is an option being considered by numerous other councils in Wales in light of financial pressures and one of the first to establish a CAT approach was Blaenau Gwent CBC. Officers from that authority have kindly shared their experiences so that good practice can be replicated and approaches that do not work can be avoided. Blaenau Gwent confirmed that CAT can be very rewarding, bring numerous benefits, and mitigate against financial cuts. However, they also acknowledge that the process can take a long time and therefore could report that only 4 CATs had successfully taken place in Blaenau Gwent at this stage, although many more are underway which reflects the complexities which arise from both local authority and community groups perspectives.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework & Procedure Rules

- 5.1 There is no effect upon the Policy Framework and Procedure Rules.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

6.1 None required for an information report.

7. Financial Implications

7.1 There are a variety of funding sources available to support the CAT process as outlined in the report.

7.2 There is a £1 million allocation in the Council's Capital Programme for Parks/Pavilions. No allocations from this funding have been approved as yet. Criteria for allocating the grant funding to groups has yet to be determined but will need to adhere the Council's Grants Policy (2016) and will need to be include

- Robustness of business and financial plans
- Leverage for other funding
- Current and potential asset usage

7.3 £200,000 has been ring-fenced to employ a designated officer for CAT and to cover additional legal and property support if necessary. The CAT officer came into post November 2015.

7.4 There is an allocation of £100,000 annually until 2018-19 (and £50,000 thereafter) for capital works for Town and Community Councils exploring CAT.

8. Recommendation

8.1 It is recommended that the Scrutiny Committee note the progress that has been made over the last 8 months since the Community Asset Transfer programme has been accelerated since November 2015.

Mark Shephard CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

Contact Officer: Carly McCreesh CAT Officer
Telephone: 01656 815323
Email: carly.mccreesh@bridgend.gov.uk
Postal Address: Communities Directorate
Bridgend County Borough Council
Civic Offices
Angel Street
Bridgend
CF31 4WB

Background Documents

- Asset Management Plan 2021
- Copy of the Community Asset Transfer Officer Assessment matrix
- Wales Cooperative Centre Report - Review of sustainable Venues and Assets in Bridgend County Borough (Commissioned by Rural Development Programme)
- Cabinet Report – 14th July 2015
- CAT Update report - Comprehensive version with all interested parties included – up to date as of 6th July 2016
- CAT Risk Register
- Grants Policy (March 2016)
- Cabinet report – Refurbishment and management of sports pavilions – 4TH February 2014
- Council report – 7th October 2015- Increase of Town and Community Council capital funds from £50k to £100k

This page is intentionally left blank

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

28 JULY 2016

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR – OPERATIONAL AND PARTNERSHIP SERVICES

FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2016-17

1. Purpose of Report.

- 1.1 To present the Committee with its draft Forward Work Programme for 2016-17 for consideration and approval.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives/Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The improvement priorities identified in the Corporate Plan 2016-2020 have been embodied in the Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes. The amended Corporate Plan adopted by Council on 10 March 2016 formally set out the improvement priorities that the Council will seek to implement between 2016 and 2020. The Overview and Scrutiny Committees engage in review and development of plans, policy or strategies that support the Corporate Themes.

3. Background.

- 3.1 Under the terms of Bridgend County Borough Council's Constitution, each Overview and Scrutiny Committee must publish a Forward Work Programme (FWP) as far as it is known. This FWP period runs from May 2016 – May 2017.

4. Current situation / proposal.

- 4.1 An effective Forward Work Programme will identify the issues that the Committee wishes to focus on during the year and provide a clear rationale as to why particular issues have been selected, as well as the approach that will be adopted; i.e. will the Committee be undertaking a policy review/ development role ("Overview") or performance management approach ("Scrutiny")?
- 4.2 On 8 April 2015, a report was presented to Council where it was agreed that:
- i) Each of the following topics be considered by only one Scrutiny Committee:
 - Performance Monitoring
 - Corporate Plan
 - Business Planning
 - Budget Monitoring
 - ii) There would only be 6 scheduled meetings during the year for each Scrutiny Committee, which will look at a maximum of 12 service area topics. Without

the capacity to support additional meetings there is a need for each of the Scrutiny Committees to:

- Identify 12 topics for consideration which will provide the most significant value for the Authority and to the residents of the Borough of Bridgend;
- Prioritise their workloads i.e. if a key topic arises one of the existing planned topics will have to be removed from the programme;
- Focus their investigations to make best use of available resources;
- Determine appropriate recommendations which will support the delivery of the appropriate outcomes.

iii) Once the Forward Work Programmes for each Committee have been determined, the Scrutiny Chairs will monitor the programmes of each Committee at their monthly meeting to ensure that the corporate priorities are being met. Proposals to consider a corporate priority topic will be included in the Forward Work Programme report submitted to every Scrutiny Committee meeting.

iv) There are 12 meetings allocated to Research and Evaluation Panels (REPs) as laid out below:

- 2 meetings for the Public Service Board Scrutiny REP
- 4 meetings for the School Engagement REP
- 6 meetings of the Budget REP

4.3 There is also the potential for Collaborative Committees to deal with cross-cutting issues such as Supporting People or Child and Adolescent Mental Health. These will need to be piloted in the first instance with a single item to determine the future capacity for further Collaborative Committees.

4.3 During April, planning workshops were held to enable Overview and Scrutiny Committees to carry out a review and planning exercise.

The aim of these workshops was to:

- Review outcomes and impacts that their committee had made during the previous year.
- Assess information they have received over the previous year.
- Identify suggestions for future items.
- Identify potential invitees to attend for specific items/subject areas.

4.4 These workshops were informed by the following sources in order to select potential items for inclusion:

- *Committee Requests for Scrutiny from previous Forward Work Programmes;*
- *Committee conclusions and recommendations 2015-16*
- *Wales Audit Office Corporate Assessment Report 2015: Bridgend County Borough Council*
- *Wales Audit Office Annual Improvement report 2014-15: Bridgend County Borough Council*
- *Corporate Plan*
- *Directorate Business Plans;*

- *Performance Reports to Scrutiny Committees;*
- *Annual business planning and budget setting process;*

4.5 From these workshops, a draft list of items have been produced for each Scrutiny Committee using a set of criteria, (attached at Appendix A), and have subsequently been shared with Corporate Directors for proposed dates, additional information and suggestions.

4.6 The draft list for the Community Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee is attached at Appendix B.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework& 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 wellbeing in the County Borough of Bridgend.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

6.1 There are no equality impacts arising directly from this report.

7. Financial Implications.

7.1 The delivery of the Forward Work Programme will be met from within existing resources for Overview and Scrutiny support.

8. Recommendation.

8.1 The Committee is recommended to:

1. Consider the suggested topics for inclusion on the Committee's Forward Work Programme 2016-17;
2. Identify the 12 Primary topics for inclusion on the Forward Work Programme and prioritise those topics for presentation to the Committee;
3. Propose items for consideration for a Collaborative Committee pilot.

Andrew Jolley
Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services

Contact Officer: Sarah Daniel
 Scrutiny Officer

Telephone: (01656) 643387

E-mail: scrutiny@bridgend.gov.uk

Postal Address Bridgend County Borough Council,

Civic Offices,
Angel Street,
Bridgend,
CF31 4WB

Background documents

None

Potential items proposed for the Forward Work Programme - questions to consider

Page 13

Proposed Item	
Is this item within the remit of the Committee?	
Is it a Corporate Priority?	
Is it a public interest item?	
What are the questions that need answering?	
Then:	
What is the expected outcome from receiving the item?	
What can be achieved?	
What impact can Members have on this area?	
What information should be reported to the Committee? I.e. data, case studies, examples of outcomes, challenges etc.	
How should information be presented at the meeting? I.e. PowerPoint/Prezi presentation, audio/visual formats, photos, graphics, charts, maps etc.	
Who should be invited to contribute to achieve a representative picture? I.e. front line staff, users, carers, young people, representatives from partner organisations, business representatives etc.	
Is the item particularly suitable for webcasting?	

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT & LEISURE (CEL) OVSC – DRAFT ANNUAL FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

	Date	Topic		Invitees
1	28 July 2016	Waste Management	To provide an update on the dispensation policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr C Reeves, Cabinet Member – Communities; • Mark Shephard, Corporate Director – Communities; • Zak Shell, Head of Neighbourhood Services; • Andrew Hobbs, Group Manager Street Works.
2	28 July 2016	Community Asset Transfer and Management of Sports Pavilions	To provide a report to present a position statement in relation to Community Asset Transfer – to include how many applications have been received and whether a timeline/implementation date has been presented to potential organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr C Reeves, Cabinet Member – Communities; • Mark Shephard, Corporate Director – Communities; • Andrew Hobbs, Group Manager Street Works; • Carly McCreech, Community Asset Transfer Officer.
3	8 September 2016	Porthcawl Harbour	Porthcawl Harbour and its operation has been put forward for consideration as an item for the FWP. The purpose of the report is to tenable Members to understand how the project is working, how many staff are employed, whether it is breaking even, losing money, or indeed bringing in some income into the authority. Also the long term “pit falls” i.e. having to dredge the harbour, how often, how much will it cost, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr C Smith, • Mark Shephard, Corporate Director – Communities; • Sue Cooper, Corporate Director - Social Services and Wellbeing.
4	8	Homes in	From the CEL OVSC meeting on 27 January 2016 -	

	Date	Topic		Invitees
	September 2016	Town	Revisit in 6-7 months' time to consider how the risks, issues and mitigating measures have been progressed.	
5	20 October 2016	Halo	From the CEL OVSC meeting on 8 October 2015 - Members would like this item to be added to the list of future potential items for the Committee Forward Work Programme.	•
6	20 October 2016	Rhiw Gateway	Measure of Success report – to include information on any impact on the town centre, footfall, how people have moved into the town centre etc.	• Mark Shephard, Corporate Director – Communities; •
7&8	19 December 2017	MTFS	MTFS Proposals for 2017-18	•
9	26 January 2017			•
10	26 January 2017			•
11	30 March 2017	Cultural Partnership Project		•
12	30 March 2017			•

Extra items**Non Service Area Reports**

Date	Topic	
28 July 2016	Scrutiny Annual FWP	To present to the Committee with suggested topics for consideration in the development of its Forward Work Programme for 2015-16.
28 July 2016	Corporate Parenting Champion Nomination	To cover nominations for Corporate Parenting Champion
1 April 2017	BREP Nomination	To cover nominations for SSARF and BREP
TBC	Annual Recommendations Monitoring Report	

For prioritisation and Scheduling

Highways Maintenance

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

28 JULY 2016

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR – OPERATIONAL AND PARTNERSHIP SERVICES

FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

- a) present the items due to be considered at the Committee's meeting to be held on 8 September 2016; and
- b) present a list of further potential items for prioritisation by the Committee.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

2.1 The improvement priorities identified in the Corporate Plan 2016-2020 have been embodied in the Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes. The amended Corporate Plan adopted by Council on 10 March 2016 formally set out the improvement priorities that the Council will seek to implement between 2016 and 2020. 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 28 July 2016, the Community, Environment and Leisure Overview and Scrutiny Committee will determine its Annual Forward Work Programme for 2016/17.

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 8 September 2016, the table below lists the items to be considered and the invitees due to attend should the Committee agree it's proposed annual forward work programme.

Topic	Invitees	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
Porthcawl Harbour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr C Smith, • Mark Shephard, Corporate Director – Communities; • Sue Cooper, Corporate Director - Social Services 	Porthcawl Harbour and its operation has been put forward for consideration as an item for the FWP. The purpose of the report is to enable Members to understand how the project is	

Topic	Invitees	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
	and Wellbeing	working, how many staff are employed, whether it is breaking even, losing money, or indeed bringing in some income into the authority. Also the long term "pit falls" i.e. having to dredge the harbour, how often, how much will it cost, etc	
Homes in Town		From the CEL OVSC meeting on 27 January 2016 - Revisit in 6-7 months' time to consider how the risks, issues and mitigating measures have been progressed.	

4.2 The table below lists all potential items that the Committee has considered during their planning workshop and, subject to any changes from the approval of the Annual Forward Work Programme, are put forward for reprioritisation as appropriate.

Topic	Proposed Date	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
Halo	20 October 2016		
Rhiw Gateway	20 October 2016	Measure of success report – to include information on any impact on the town centre, footfall, how people have moved into the town centre etc	
MTFS	19 December 2017	MTFS Proposals for 2017-18	
	26 January 2017	From the CEL OVSC meeting on 8 October 2015 - Members would like this item to be added to the list of future potential items for the Committee Forward Work Programme.	
	26 January 2017		
Cultural Partnership	30 March 2017		

Topic	Proposed Date	Specific Information Requested	Research to be Undertaken by the Overview & Scrutiny Unit
Project			
	30 March 2017		

Corporate Parenting

- 4.3 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
- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 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 wellbeing in the County Borough of Bridgend.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 None

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 None.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 The Committee is recommended to:

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

- (i) Note the topics due to be considered at the meeting of the Committee 8 September 2016 and confirm if it requires any additional specific information to be provided by the invitees listed or the Overview & Scrutiny Unit;
- (ii) Determine the topics, invitees to be invited to attend and any specific information it would like the invitees to provide as well as any research that it would like the Overview & Scrutiny Unit to undertake in relation to its meeting for 8 September 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,
Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services

Contact Officer: Sarah Daniel, Scrutiny Officer

Telephone: 01656 643613

Email: scrutiny@bridgend.gov.uk

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

Background documents: None

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO COMMUNITY, ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

28 JULY 2016

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR – OPERATIONAL AND PARTNERSHIP SERVICES

CORPORATE PARENTING CHAMPION NOMINATION REPORT

1. Purpose of the Report.

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to request the Committee to nominate one Member as its Corporate Parenting Champion to represent the Committee as an Invitee to meetings of the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives.

- 2.1 The key improvement objectives identified in the Corporate Plan 2013-2017 have been embodied in the Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes. The Corporate Improvement Objectives were adopted by Council on 25 February 2015 and 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 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
- 3.2 In order to further develop and enhance the Council's corporate parenting role with its partners, a Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee comprising all Members of Cabinet was established by Cabinet on 4 November 2008.
- 3.3 The inaugural meeting of the Cabinet Committee was held on 27 November 2008 where it was agreed that the Cabinet Committee will meet bi-monthly. The terms of reference for the Cabinet Committee are:

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

- to ensure that looked after children are seen as a priority by the whole of the Authority and by the Children and Young People's Partnership;
- to seek the views of children and young people in shaping and influencing the parenting they receive;
- to ensure that appropriate policies, opportunities and procedures are in place;
- to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Authority in its role as corporate parent against Welsh Government guidance.

3.4 At its inaugural meeting, the Cabinet Committee requested that a Corporate Parenting "Champion" be nominated from each of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees to become permanent invitees to the Cabinet Committee.

3.5 At its meeting on 27 May 2014, Cabinet agreed that the Chairperson of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee be appointed as an invitee to the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee, in addition to the Corporate Parenting Champion.

4. Current Situation / Proposal.

4.1 The Committee is requested to nominate one Member as its Corporate Parenting Champion to represent the Committee as an invitee at meetings of the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee.

4.2 The role of the Corporate Parenting Champion is to represent their Overview and Scrutiny Committee, partaking in discussions with Cabinet over items relating to children in care and care leavers.

4.3 In this role, it is suggested that Members consider how the services within the remit of their Committee affect children in care and care leavers, and in what way can the Committee can therefore assist in these areas.

4.4 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 wellbeing in the County Borough of Bridgend.

6. Equality Impact Assessment.

6.1 There are no equality impacts arising from this report.

7. Financial Implications.

7.1 None.

8. Recommendation.

The Committee is asked to nominate one Member of the Committee as its Corporate Parenting Champion to represent the Committee at meetings of the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee

P A Jolley,
Corporate Director – Operational And Partnership Services

Contact Officer: Sarah Daniel, Scrutiny Support Officer

Telephone: 01656 643387

Email: scrutiny@bridgend.gov.uk

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

Background Documents

Bridgend County Borough Council Constitution

Part II of the Local Government Act 2000: Executive Arrangements

Report of the Corporate Director – Children to Cabinet, 4 November 2008: Establishment of a Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee

Report of the Corporate Director – Children to the Inaugural Meeting of the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee, 27 November 2008

This page is intentionally left blank