

Public Document Pack

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Pen-y-bont ar Ogwr

Bridgend County Borough Council



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

*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 643148 / 643147

Gofynnwch am / Ask for: Mrs Julie Ellams

Ein cyf / Our ref:

Eich cyf / Your ref:

Dyddiad/Date: Tuesday, 6 February 2018

Dear Councillor,

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3

A meeting of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 will be held in the Council Chamber - Civic Offices Angel Street Bridgend CF31 4WB on **Monday, 12 February 2018 at 09:30.**

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 - 10
To receive for approval the minutes of the meeting of the 06 12 17
4. Forward Work Programme Update 11 - 42
5. Town Centre Regeneration Invitees 43 - 54

Mark Shephard, Corporate Director Communities
Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration and Economic Development
Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member Education and Regeneration
Cllr Richard Young, Cabinet Member Communities
Geraint Thomas, Clerk Pencoed Town Council
Representative from Maesteg Town Council
Cllr Richard Collins, Chair of Chamber Trade Maesteg
Justin Jenkins, Bridgend BID

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

By receiving this Agenda Pack electronically you will save the Authority approx. £1.12 in printing costs

transacted at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

Yours faithfully

P A Jolley

Corporate Director Operational and Partnership Services

Councillors:

SE Baldwin

TH Beedle

N Clarke

P Davies

RM Granville

DG Howells

Councillors

A Hussain

DRW Lewis

DG Owen

RMI Shaw

JC Spanswick

RME Stirman

Councillors

G Thomas

E Venables

MC Voisey

JE Williams

Agenda Item 3

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - WEDNESDAY, 6 DECEMBER 2017

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICES ANGEL STREET BRIDGEND CF31 4WB ON WEDNESDAY, 6 DECEMBER 2017 AT 09:30

Present

Councillor JC Spanswick – Chairperson

SE Baldwin
DG Howells
G Thomas

TH Beedle
A Hussain
MC Voisey

N Clarke
RMI Shaw
JE Williams

P Davies
RME Stirman

Apologies for Absence

Officers:

Rachel Keepins	Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny
Joanne Norman	Finance Manager - Education, Transformation and Communities
Satwant Pryce	Head of Regeneration and Planning
Zak Shell	Head of Neighbourhood Services
Mark Shephard	Corporate Director - Communities

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor T Beedle declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-19 to 2021-22 as a member of the Bridgend County Allotment Association and Secretary of Bronfair Allotments, Maesteg

Councillor G Thomas declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 – Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-19 to 2021-22 as he is an allotment holder at Bryncethin.

17. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Scrutiny Officer reported on items which had been prioritised by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee which included the next item delegated to this Committee to consider. She also presented a list of further potential items for comment and prioritisation requested the Committee identify any further items for consideration using the pre-determined criteria form.

Conclusions

1. That the Committee identified additional information it wished to receive on their next delegated to them in the Forward Work Programme (FWP) and determined that it wished to invite the Corporate Director Communities, Group Manager Property and Community Asset Transfer Officer and representatives of Pencoed Town Council and the Awen Cultural Trust to attend to assist in their investigation of Community Asset Transfer;
2. That an officer of RCT Council be invited to attend for the item on Empty Housing Committee considered the completed criteria form and determined that it wished to add to the Forward Work Programme the budgetary impact of Parc Prison on the Council;

3. That the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee be requested to prioritise 5 items from the FWP and one Committee slot be kept free for the time being;

18. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2018-19 TO 2021-22

The Scrutiny Officer introduced a report, the purpose of which was to present the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2018-19 to 2021-22, which set out the spending priorities of the Council, key investment objectives and budget areas targeted for necessary savings. It also included a financial forecast for 2018-22 and a detailed draft revenue budget for 2018-19.

The Corporate Director Communities set out the context for the budget proposals, which was set against a background of seven consecutive years of austerity measures and diminishing resources, which had seen budgets being cut by 35% - 40% in some services.

The Committee commented on what seemed to be a lack of a one Council approach taken to the budget process. The Corporate Director Communities commented that a one Council approach is taken and that the ambition of Corporate Management Board is to find savings across the authority which does not impact directly on the public. Discussions had taken place with Cabinet on budget reductions on the basis of the least agreed corporate priorities.

The Committee requested clarification of the percentage of budget reductions in the Communities Directorate compared to the other Directorates. The Cabinet Member Communities commented that the Communities Directorate has had to make 6.4% budget reductions compared to budget reductions of 1% each to be made in the Social Services & Wellbeing and Education & Family Support Directorates. He stated that the Communities Directorate had to make budget reductions over the past 7 years which were disproportionate compared to the other Directorates. He also stated that it was never palatable to make budget reductions as many of the reductions in the Communities Directorate are visible. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that the Communities Directorate that certain areas had been earmarked for budget reductions and that the Communities Directorate had areas which were not regarded corporately as priority. She also informed the Committee that budget reductions in Economic Development and Regeneration had amounted to 37%.

The Committee commented that the services provided by the Communities Directorate are visible to the public and that other services in the authority also need to take a share of the budget reductions. The Committee expressed concern that reductions are being made to economic development at a time when inward investment should be encouraged in order to generate revenue. The Committee also considered that the Council should look to increase charges in order to make revenue through pursuing development opportunities and not by selling assets. The Committee commented that the Council has a corporate priority to support the local economy and by making budget reductions to the Communities Directorate could deter investment in the area.

The Committee congratulated the Directorate in establishing the new post of Empty Property Officer to bring properties back into beneficial use.

The Committee asked whether other Directorates are forced to look for budget reductions of the magnitude in the Communities Directorate and that Members ultimately have the ability to decide on the budget. The Cabinet Member Communities

commented that it was very difficult to provide services due to budget reductions being made, but was pleased to note the Committee's concern and support of the Directorate due to the visibility of the services it provides. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that different local authorities would make different decisions about which services to protect and which to cut, and therefore, over time, there would be a greater differences between local authority areas.

The Committee considered that there must be scope within the Social Services and Education Directorates to make budget reductions / efficiency savings as they have the two highest budgets. The Corporate Director Communities commented that if the budget reductions earmarked for the Communities Directorate were not implemented they would have to be identified elsewhere in the authority. The Committee recognised that the authority having to make budget reductions would have a consequential effect on Town and Community Councils having to increase their precept as they take on services formerly run by BCBC.

The Committee expressed its concern at the budget pressure of £500k for unsupported borrowing which is to the detriment of the Communities Directorate and that the authority should not borrow in order to fund services. The Cabinet Member Communities commented that the public would only see cuts made to visible services. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services agreed that public trust and confidence in the council as a whole, is inevitably influenced by what people see around them.

The Committee referred to the growth figure in the waste contract for AHP bags and that take up of this service was greater than predicted and questioned why this had not been included in the new contract. The Head of Neighbourhood Services stated that the number of subscribers to AHP collections was what Kier had bid against. More people had signed up to this service straight away than predicted and an increase in budget was therefore required. It was predicted that 4,000 customers would sign up, but 8,000 customers had signed up for the AHP service within the first 6 months. The Committee asked whether take up of the service was reviewed as people no longer require the service. The Head of Neighbourhood Services stated that customers enrolled annually and if the annual enrolment was not made, they would be removed from the service. The Committee questioned what would be the effect if this service was stopped. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the AHP service is an expensive service and that the contract could be varied but this would impact on recycling targets and in his opinion that it would be morally wrong to remove this service and also due to the introduction of the 2 bag rule for residual waste.

The Committee considered that the removal of the AHP service could release funding to enable public conveniences to remain open. The Cabinet Member Communities commented that there had been a step change to introduce an AHP collection service due the introduction of the 2 bag rule. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that withdrawing the AHP service would be a step backwards.

The Committee expressed concern that the removal of subsidy from bus services affects economic development and is an important component in people being able to get to work. The Committee requested detail of the bus routes to be cut and whether consultation had taken place on the proposals. The Committee commented that transport could be provided by operators working around school times and whether Arriva would consider increasing the frequency of trains at peak times. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the Directorate undertakes a number of statutory functions and that service such as public conveniences and subsidised bus routes have to be considered as potential savings measures because

they are non-statutory provision. He stated that consultation on the proposals was being prepared and he advised that the criteria for selecting routes for the removal of subsidy were based on usage and where alternative providers are available. He informed the Committee that previously where the subsidy on routes had been removed, sometimes operators had continued to operate the route.

The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that £200k of proposed savings were being made from management structures in the Communities Directorate. The Committee noted that this was not the case in other Directorates.

The Cabinet Member Communities informed the Committee with the metro project being developed as part of City Deal there would be a need for firm infrastructure plans to be put in place. There was also a need to review whether transport was being supplied on routes to meet demand.

The Committee considered that budget reductions needed to be distributed across the Council and that management savings being put forward by the Communities Directorate also needed to be reflected in other Directorates. The Committee also considered that bus routes should not be cut until there was a greater understanding of the routes to be cut by operators. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that usage of bus routes were considered before the removal of subsidy. The public consultation on bus routes would commence following the consultation on the proposals for public conveniences. The Head of Neighbourhood Services undertook to provide the Committee with information on the scoring criteria for subsidies on bus routes. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that it would not work necessarily operationally for operators to only employ drivers at peak times as they would have to employ drivers for a whole day. The Committee questioned whether the bus routes subject to the removal of the subsidy could be tendered. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the routes had been subject to competitive tender and he confirmed that officers were reviewing the routes which are the subject of subsidy. The Committee requested that it be given the opportunity to scrutinise the proposals for the removal of subsidy following the outcome of consultation and prior to a decision being made by Cabinet.

The Committee considered that it could not support the bid for growth of £65,000 for the Festival of Learning and that the funding could be better utilised to support the functions of the Communities Directorate. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee in response to a question from the Committee that the expenditure on the Festival of Learning was equivalent to deploying an additional gritter.

The Committee questioned the impact of the £40k reduction on Community Asset Transfer in facilitating the transfer of assets. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that the £40k reduction related to where a number of budgets had been brought together.

The Committee questioned how the public conveniences in Maesteg could be transferred to the Town Council when the Town Hall is managed by Awen. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that the Council pays the cost of maintenance of the facilities and this is not picked up by Awen. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the redevelopment proposals for Maesteg Town Hall include the provision of new facilities. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that the existing toilets would be unavailable while the redevelopment takes place. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that consultation would take place on the potential closure of public conveniences. He stated there was

potential for provision to be made through the comfort scheme as an alternative to facilities being transferred to Town and Community Councils. The Committee expressed concern that the removal of funding of £40k was contrary to Directorate encouraging the transfer of assets. Concern was also expressed that Town and Community Councils would have to increase its precept in order to facilitate the transfer of facilities and also many Town and Community Councils would not have the staff and expertise to take on services from the Council and would therefore be detrimental to the progression of CATs. The Corporate Director Communities commented that it could place a potential burden on Town and Community Councils, but the Welsh Government see a wider role for Community Councils due to the move towards regionalising services. Concern was expressed that by transferring facilities to Town and Community Councils, it would lead to a smaller number of people paying for the maintenance of facilities.

Concern was expressed by the Committee that other Directorates were receiving a disproportionately larger amount of capital funding compared to the Communities Directorate. The Corporate Director Communities informed the Committee that the annual cost of maintaining public conveniences is £168k out of a total budget for the Council of £250m. He stated that in the proposed MTFs there is a requirement for the Communities Directorate to save £100k on public conveniences which is the reason for the public consultation.

The Committee questioned the sum of £2m which had been transferred into the Communities Directorate for the Corporate Landlord function, when it was shown as a cut of £0.5m in the revenue budget. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that the Corporate Landlord function had been transferred to the Communities Directorate and that the budget reflects that move and not a growth area. She stated that the sum of £0.5m represents the saving which has to be made to the Corporate Landlord function and its status is currently amber. She informed the Committee of the move towards more cyclical maintenance as opposed to reactive maintenance and there had been some time since the service was last reviewed.

The Committee referred to the scale of investment of £20m over the next 10 years needed in the highway network to maintain current standards when the Council was also proposing to invest a similar amount of budget in ICT services. The Corporate Director Communities stated that £2m of funding per annum for the maintenance of the highway network had provisionally been included in the capital programme. The Committee also questioned the proposed capital investment of £10m for the further roll out of LED streetlights. The Head of Neighbourhood Services informed the Committee that it was the intention to make the County Borough full LED. There was a cost of £55k to ensure the electricity supply is compliant and safe due to the inspection and testing regime in place. He informed the Committee that 20,000 lighting columns already had LED lighting, with a further 8,000 lighting columns to do. New LEDs would not be rolled out until external funding had been secured, when a programme of renewing lighting columns would be looked at.

The Committee requested an update on rationalising Raven's Court. The Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services informed the Committee that it was proposed to relinquish as much of the building as possible, although other services from elsewhere in the Council could be brought into the building, thereby negating the need to vacate building making savings on lease/rental elsewhere. It would still be possible to lease one wing of the building or potentially use it as the base for the proposed MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub.

The Committee thanked the invitees for their contribution.

Conclusions

1. In relation to the budget reductions proposals put forward for 18-19 for the Communities Directorate, the Committee fundamentally do not agree with them in their entirety and recommend that the Social Services and Education Directorates who have the two highest budgets in the Authority be looked at instead to make up these savings.
2. The Committee expressed concerns over the proposals for the removal of subsidised bus services (COM 27), particularly given the fact that bus companies themselves are cutting their own routes and that the Authority's own proposals for service cuts have not yet gone out for public consultation. The Committee therefore recommend:
 - a) Prior to any decision being made on the routes being cut, Cabinet also receive information on what routes bus companies themselves are cutting in order to understand the overall impact of the combined route reductions;
 - b) That no decision is made regarding the proposed budget cuts to the service until public consultation has been completed;
 - c) The Committee also requested that Scrutiny get the opportunity to receive an item on the proposals and the outcome of Consultation for the removal of subsidised bus services as a pre-decision item before going to Cabinet.
3. In relation to COM1, the Committee recognise the work being undertaken to look at various options for public conveniences such as the comfort scheme and the possibility of Town and Community Councils taking these on. However given the focus of this Authority to improve our towns and encourage the public back into them, together with the view that public toilets are an essential necessity, the Committee recommend that no cuts are made to public conveniences within the Local Authority.
4. The Committee made comment on the management savings being put forward by the Communities Directorate and the fact that these are not reflected in other Directorates. In light of sharing the burden of the budget cuts, the Committee recommend that other Directorates also look towards management efficiency savings.
5. The Committee recommend that instead of disposing of the councils land and selling it off, the Authority look at the potential for revenue through development. One suggestion was the need for increased properties for small businesses in the County Borough. Members also recommend considering what land development and income generation other Local Authorities have achieved to determine what areas have been successful.
6. The Committee recommend that the £40,000 reduction proposed for third sector support for with Community Asset Transfer (CAT) be removed given the impact this will have on achieving the savings required from CATs.
7. The Committee did not support the discretionary growth items of £500,000 for schools to replace the Welsh Government reduction in the Education Improvement Grant and the £65,000 proposed for the week long 'Festival of Learning'. At a time of austerity and serious budget cuts the Committee views that these budget growths should not be supported and the money could be better spent elsewhere in the Authority. Should the 'Festival of Learning'

continue to take place, the Committee recommend that it be held in school holiday time so as to reduce the costs for providing teacher cover.

8. The Committee recommend that the Authority explore further whether there are greater opportunities for collaborative working for Community Services in order to achieve savings and at the same time improve these services.
9. The Committee recommend that the Authority consider the services provided by the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) to possibly assist in longer term planning and sustainability of Community Services.
10. The Committee expressed concern that the Authority continues to look to the Communities Directorate for further budget savings that are disproportional to those of other Directorates. The example given was that for 2018-19 the Communities Directorate is being asked for a 6% cut of its own budget whilst other Directorates, which hold around 2/3 of the Councils total budget are only being asked to make between 0.5 and 0.6% savings out of their own budget. Members understand this is due to the fact that the services within the Communities Directorate are not deemed as Council priorities; however the Committee also questioned as to whether the Authority was taking into account what the priorities were for the public. With this in mind the Committee recommend that the Authority reconsider its corporate priorities to take account of the 'public element' and realign Community Services as a Corporate priority.
11. Whilst not wishing to make cuts to Education and Schools and likewise Social Services, the Committee believe that with such large budgets there have to be efficiency savings within these Directorates that could assist with sharing the burden of the Authority's budget cuts. It is therefore recommended that where the Committee have concerns around cuts within the Communities budget, such as those mentioned above such as public conveniences and CATs, the Authority instead look to these other Directorates to make up these savings proposed.

Further Comments

The Committee expressed concern over the £20m predicted cost for the next decade to maintain Highways to their current standards and the unknown of where this funding would come from. The Committee also questioned the similar amount of £10-£20m for ICT in the next decade. Members requested that the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee question the Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services in relation to the predicted ICT cost up against the context of other future budget pressures such as those for Highways.

Future Scrutiny

The Committee recommend that Scrutiny consider a future item on what other Local Authorities are doing to respond to the gap in provision in Community Services.

The Committee requested that a review of the AHP bags be considered when Scrutiny revisit the subject of 'Waste' in approximately 12 months' time to include the monetary against environmental impact.

19. **URGENT ITEMS**

There were no urgent items.

The meeting closed at 12:50

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3

12 FEBRUARY 2018

REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR – OPERATIONAL AND PARTNERSHIP SERVICES

FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

1. Purpose of the Report

- a) To present the items prioritised by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee including the next item delegated to this Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- b) To present the Committee with a list of further potential items for comment and prioritisation;
- c) To ask the Committee to identify any further items for consideration using the pre-determined criteria form.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Objectives / Other Corporate Priorities

- 2.1 The key improvement objectives identified in the Corporate Plan 2016–2020 have been embodied in the Overview & Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes. The Corporate Improvement Objectives were adopted by Council on 1 March 2017 and formally set out the improvement objectives 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.
- 3.2 An effective FWP 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").

Feedback

- 3.3 All conclusions made at Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee (SOSC) meetings, as well as recommendations and requests for information should be responded to by Officers, to ensure that there are clear outcomes from each topic investigated.

- 3.4 These will then be presented to the relevant Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting to ensure that they have had a response. The feedback received for this Committee is attached at **Appendix A**
- 3.5 When each topic has been considered and the Committee is satisfied with the outcome, the SOSC will then present their findings to the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee (COSC) who will determine whether to remove the item from the FWP or to re-add for further prioritisation at a future date.
- 3.6 The FWPs will remain flexible and will be revisited at each COSC meeting with input from each SOSC and any information gathered from FWP meetings with Corporate Directors and Cabinet.

4. Current Situation / Proposal

- 4.1 Attached at **Appendix B** is the overall FWP for the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committees which includes the topics prioritised by the COSC for the next set of SOSCs in Table A, as well as a list of topics that were deemed important for future prioritisation at Table B. This list has been compiled from suggested items from each of the SOSCs at previous meetings as well as the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It also includes information proposed from Corporate Directors, detail from research undertaken by Scrutiny Officers and information from FWP Development meetings between the Scrutiny Chairs and Cabinet.
- 4.2 The Committee is asked to first consider the next topic they have been allocated by the COSC in Table A and determine what further detail they would like the report to contain, what questions they wish Officers to address and if there are any further invitees they wish to attend for this meeting to assist Members in their investigation.
- 4.3 The Committee is also asked to then consider identifying additional items using the criteria form for topics for future consideration on the Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes at meetings following the Annual Meeting in May 2018

Corporate Parenting

- 4.4 Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards looked after children and young people. This is a legal responsibility given to local authorities by the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act 2004. The role of the Corporate Parent is to seek for children in public care the outcomes every good parent would want for their own children. The Council as a whole is the 'corporate parent', therefore all Members have a level of responsibility for the children and young people looked after by Bridgend. ¹
- 4.5 In this role, it is suggested that Members consider how each item they consider affects children in care and care leavers, and in what way can the Committee assist in these areas.

- 4.6 Scrutiny Champions can greatly support the Committee in this by advising them of the ongoing work of the Cabinet-Committee and particularly any decisions or changes which they should be aware of as Corporate Parents.

Identification of Further Items

- 4.7 The Committee are reminded of the Criteria form which Members can use to propose further items for the FWP which the Committee can then consider for prioritisation at a future meeting. The Criteria Form emphasises the need to consider issues such as impact, risk, performance, budget and community perception when identifying topics for investigation and to ensure a strategic responsibility for Scrutiny and that its work benefits the organisation.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework & Procedure Rules

- 5.1 The work of the Overview & Scrutiny Committees relates to the review and development of plans, policy or strategy that form part of the Council's 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. Any changes to the structure of the Scrutiny Committees and the procedures relating to them would require the Bridgend County Borough Council constitution to be updated.

6. Equality Impact Assessment

- 6.1 There are no equality implications attached to this report.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no financial implications attached to this report.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 The Committee is recommended to:

- (i) Approve the feedback from the previous meetings of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 and note the list of responses including any still outstanding at Appendix A;
- (ii) Identify any additional information the Committee wish to receive on their next item delegated to them in the FWP including invitees;
- (iii) Identify any further detail required for other items in the overall FWP at Table B of Appendix B;
- (iv) Consider identifying additional items using the criteria form for topics for future consideration on the Scrutiny Forward Work Programmes at meetings following the Annual Meeting in May 2018;

- (v) Identify any further suitable items for Webcasting from the overall Forward Work Programme.

PA Jolley
Corporate Director - Operational and Partnership Services

Contact Officer: Scrutiny Unit

Telephone: (01656) 643695

E-mail: Scrutiny@bridgend.gov.uk

Postal Address Bridgend County Borough Council,
Civic Offices,
Angel Street,
Bridgend.
CF31 4WB

Background documents

None.

Date of Meeting	Item	Members wished to make the following comments:	Response/Comments	
		Members thanked Officers for their attendance at the meeting and congratulated them and their colleagues on their continued efforts in attracting events to Bridgend County Borough such as the Urdd Eistedfodd, the Senior Open Golf and the Elvis Festival in Porthcawl.	Noted	
		Members were concerned that there were many overgrown trees, branches and hedges in the Borough obscuring road signs, directional signs and road warning signs that warn motorists of road dangers ahead making for potentially hazardous driving conditions for the public	Noted, explained at the meeting that work had to be prioritised in view of limited resources but that safety was the number one criteria	
		Members remained concerned that BCBC were not actively prosecuting people who drop litter and fly tip their rubbish. Members appreciated that Officers were instead focussing on anti-litter campaigns but urged officers to use their powers and prosecute repeat offenders which they thought would also act as a deterrent for future offending	There is a proposal approved by Cabinet to procure an external company to take on this role in due course	Members sought clarification as to when this was going to happen and if any further information could be provided to them and if it was financially viable to keep the service in house
		Members encouraged the update of the Destination Management Plan to fulfil Welsh Government requirement in terms of accessing funding opportunities	An initial 'light' review is proposed as much of the Destination Management Plan is still relevant	Members requested that the light review of the Destination Management Plan is fed back to Members
		Members encouraged joint working with other Local Authorities to promote tourism opportunities and were pleased to hear of BCBC's collaboration with Visit Wales on tourism projects and asked that Officers continue this work to promote the heritage of Bridgend County Borough.	Noted	

13-Sep-2017	Developing Bridgend as a place to live, work and visit	<p>Members were concerned that subject to budget reductions over recent years, there was now only one member of staff that worked on tourism for BCBC. Members stated that they felt this was a service that should be invested in to make Bridgend a better place to work, live and visit and improve the economic prosperity of the Borough.</p>	<p>Noted - this point potentially could be made as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy approval process but would of course require that savings were made elsewhere instead</p>	
		<p>Members wished to make the following recommendations</p>		
		<p>That officers explore with colleagues in the IT department, the development of an app for the public to use, to easily report incidents such as bins needing to be emptied in specific areas, therefore allowing officers to be more effective and take a targeted approach with budgets being reduced.</p>	<p>This is already in scope as part of the Council's Digitisation Programme over the coming years</p>	
		<p>The numbering of all public bins for ease of reporting when they need to be emptied and to easily identify trends</p>	<p>This option will be investigated and considered</p>	
		<p>That officers work collaboratively with Town and Community Councils to promote the Comfort Scheme to businesses and make the public aware of which businesses are signed up to the scheme. Members also recommended working on communications with Town and Community Councils to take over the running of public conveniences under the Community Asset Transfer Scheme to enable them to stay open.</p>	<p>Ongoing engagement already happening with many of the relevant Town and Community Councils re: CAT of public toilets. Public toilet strategy being formulated after initial public consultation exercise. The reinvigoration of the Comfort Scheme is potentially likely to be part of that strategy.</p>	
		<p>A full review of the grass cutting contract for Highways services to ensure the service we are receiving is of the standard set out in the contract. They recommended Officers explore the costs of bringing the service back in house on a like for like basis to ensure the Authority were receiving a quality service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No scope/ capacity currently for a 'full review' • Monitoring does take place to ensure performance meets contractual standards •When contracts are due to end periodically the option of bringing services back in house will be considered but on a like for like basis the option was previously more expensive overall 	

		<p>A review of the Biodiversity Value in open spaces and highway grass verges as Members were concerned at the introduction of a more relaxed regime of maintenance to roundabouts and believed that the meadow effect had resulted in non-native flowers and plants being introduced and it was questionable whether it had improved biodiversity value.</p>	<p>The use of mixed seed varieties of flowering plants, sourced from overseas is now common practice amongst Councils. This increases nectar and pollen sources for pollinators. It has been well received by the public at large. The Council is of course able to end this practice, and allow those areas that are currently seeded to either revert to natural conditions or to be cut as part of the Council's current highway grassed verge cutting regime, as outlined to scrutiny at the meeting.</p>	
		<p>that no further cuts are made to this Directorate. Members were concerned that the Directorate had taken unproportioned budget reductions when compared with other Directorates. Members were extremely concerned that further cuts would result in the deterioration of public facing services and some services not being able to function at all.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
		<p>Further Information Requested</p>		
		<p>Members requested to receive data of incidents of fly tipping in the Borough from December 2016 to date</p>	<p>Date will be provided asap</p>	
		<p>Members asked to receive data on the enforcement action that had been taken by BCBC officers for incidents of fly tipping and littering, including how many incidents of each had been prosecuted in the last year and if they had comparable data with other Local Authorities.</p>	<p>Data will be provided asap</p>	
		<p>Members requested to receive information on the success of the Bridgend Bites and Social Media pages for Bridgend Council including how the information is promoted to the public, the response from the public, and traffic visiting the site</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Please can this be provided to Members</p>

		<p>Members requested the following further information to be included in the Waste report to their next Committee meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on the work of the education and enforcement officers that were recruited. More specifically relating to the education side of their work. Where have they been? How have they engaged with the public? Have they visited any homes? How many officers are there? When is enforcement going to start? 2. Use of vehicles to collect waste and recycling. Do we now have sufficient amount of vehicles? Members were concerned that transit vans were being used for the collection of purple bags and asked for the rationale for this? 3. Information on the Household Waste recycling centres. How has the change in contract impacted on the centres and the staff that work there. Members were concerned at the reported increase in wait times reported by their constituents at the centres. Has there been any increase of staff at these centres? Are the public generally complying with the new way in which the centres work? i.e separating and sorting their waste. 4. How are the areas where communal waste is collected being managed? How are they complying with the new restrictions? Are they generally compliant? What problems are being reported? Members were particularly concerned with Wildmill area. 	<p>These questions will be addressed as part of the Waste Scrutiny report to be presented to Members in due course</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Date of Meeting	Item	Members wished to make the following comments:	Response/Comments
22-Nov-2017	Waste Services	<p>Members remained concerned that the Waste Services contract was now 5 months in and whilst they accepted that services had improved since the beginning of the contract, they were still not at a level that was acceptable for the residents of the Borough. Members stated that whilst the figures showed otherwise, they were still being contacted by residents who had not received recycling materials and who were still having repeat missed collections.</p>	<p>As stated the evidence and the performance indicators and statistics over the recent months have consistently indicated that the service is now performing at a good level, in the main. Certainly the level of customer contact is now as low as it was prior to the new contract commencing in April and also in comparison, missed collection levels are better than other neighbouring local authorities where that information is available. Similarly the backlog of outstanding deliveries has been successfully addressed and the performance of the call centre is much improved and in line with contractual requirements. Importantly the overall recycling rate in the County Borough in quarter 2 was just below 74%, one of the highest in Wales and therefore the UK, with compliance with the 'two bag rule' very high among residents. There are clearly pockets of service performance that still need to be improved and many of these were covered in some detail at the meeting. The Council and the contractor will continue to work diligently to address any performance issues in these areas and also with regard to further changes to collection routes that are bound to cause some disruption early in the new year. Beyond this it is important that it is recognised that a service with over 6 million separate collections from residential properties annually will always create a small level of query and complaint, and that therefore the expectations of residents of the County Borough are managed. Historically in the previous waste contract, generally regarded as running very well, there was an average of about 195 waste related queries/complaints per day to the Council's call centre. It is important therefore that in those isolated cases where residents raise queries that the appropriate channels are used to manage and resolve any issues otherwise if issues continue to be escalated it will give the impression of a service performing at a worse level than it actually is. This is important because even as the service has greatly improved it is obvious that the Council is not always being successful in some of its public relations on the waste contract, leading to a perception that the service is still performing poorly when this is no longer usually the case. It will also be important that the Council continue to provide relevant information to local residents and elected Members to demonstrate that the service is running well and address any outstanding concerns.</p>

		Members also remained concerned that the communication from Kier had not improved and residents had to call several times to get a query/ complaint resolved.	This matter has been raised with Kier and there is clearly some room for improvement. However, as highlighted above it is also important that the appropriate channels of communication are used and that, if possible, multiple copying of queries/complaints to a lot of Kier employees and various Council officers and elected Members is avoided as this creates inefficiencies and often some confusion about who is dealing with the query/complaint. A revised elected Member protocol has been issued to this effect and, as explained at the meeting, the improved web site will ensure that responses to most queries are more readily accessible. These measures will ensure that overall communication is improved.
		Members wished to make the following recommendations	Response / Comments from Officers
		Members recommended that Kier accept responsibility for the mistakes made upon commencement of the contract and issue an apology to the residents of Bridgend County Borough for the disruption caused	Members will recall that both the Council and Kier did issue an apology in June 2017 to the residents of the County Borough for the poor performance at that time. As highlighted the service has greatly improved since that time.
		Members recommended a full review of the AHP collection service to include a streamlined way that members of the public can apply for the service, request bags, report a problem/ missed collections and are provided with an update as to how and when it will be resolved.	The AHP service was a new service introduced as part of the new contract. It has proved particularly popular with local residents with initial uptake greater than envisaged. Undoubtedly the introduction of the service caused some initial issues with registration issues and missed collections, a situation compounded as the rounds changed weekly as more people enrolled. It is anticipated that this situation will stabilise early in the new year allowing the current rounds and use of vehicles to be reviewed and an assessment of the current service to be made. This in turn will ensure greater consistency of service and eliminate many of the problems that have been highlighted.

		<p>Members recommended a separate review of the Kier customer service centre and the way in which they respond to Member and constituent queries, most notably the turnaround time of 10 working days to respond to and conclude an issue/ complaint which members stated was not acceptable for residents to wait a whole collection cycle for a resolution. Members recommended that a new protocol be introduced whereby they are able to contact Kier directly to raise an issue and it then be copied to Member referrals, or other appropriate BCBC officer to monitor and follow up if it is not responded to within the agreed timelines.</p>	<p>For a period of time following service change and the disruption in June, a direct email address for members to contact Kier was made available. However this resulted in a number of issues as members also copied officers and member referrals. The duplication of emails relating to single items resulted in confusion over who was dealing with an issue and sometimes this lead to either inaction or multiple resources being deployed. Along with much wasted officer time in duplicated administration. Following Scrutiny on the 22nd November a new member protocol to simplify the process and to request that all member complaints are directed solely to member referrals was issued on the 24th November. (Copy attached for ease of reference). With regards to the 10 days concern, whilst complex issues may need the 10 day referral timeline, simple missed collections, missed deliveries or other straightforward complaints are typically passed from member referrals to the waste team and issued to Kier for action on the same day.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Members recommended that Kier explore the opportunity of relocating the call centre or diverting calls for residents of Bridgend to the depot in Tondy to allow for better communication.</p>	<p>There is no contractual requirement for the call centre to be located locally. It is therefore a matter for the contractor where he chooses to locate call centre staff. Kier have a national/regional call centre based in Torbay so any request from the Council to move all staff to Tondy is likely to lead to a contractual claim based on greater financial inefficiency. The Welsh language call centre member of staff is based at Tondy, however, a North Wales call centre has been appointed to receive these calls and this will transfer to them shortly, replacing the Tondy arrangement. The more important issue from a customer's perspective is that the call centre operates consistently to a high standard. Clearly initially that was not the case but over recent months that position is much improved and it now performs generally in line with contractual standards. If that continues to be the case the location of the call centre is likely to be less important.</p>
		<p>Members recommended better communication from Kier to residents regarding queries/complaints that are logged, delivery of recycling materials, changes to collection days/points for communal areas and assessments for assisted collections. Members stated that if Kier respond to initial points of contact and provide updates as to how and when reported issues will be resolved this would mitigate residents from using multiple channels of communication and ensure ownership of the complaint.</p>	<p>The vast majority of requests are dealt with within 10 days. Queries are answered during the call if possible e.g. when is my collection day. Complaints are all logged into the Kier Echo system and a record is held on the system. If a repeat request is made after Kier have closed the job as completed e.g. additional container requests, these are now treated as a failure and the previous complaint is re-opened to highlight the issue for urgent resolution. In extreme cases of repeated requests and complaints of non delivery, photos are taken of the containers on the residents property as evidence of delivery should this be required. Changes to collections days are usually advised via the post and a revised collection calendar providing at least 7 days notice. Assisted assessments are targeted to be carried out within 10 days and should a resident not be at home when the assessment is carried out the resident is left a card informing them of the visit. The Kier team will then try again on a different date and in the majority of cases still within the 10 days.</p>

		<p>Members recommended a full review of the collections in communal areas as they were currently not fit for purpose. There were an insufficient amount of recycling and residual waste bins available for the number of residents that use them, therefore residents were having to use recycling bins as overflow bins resulting in them not being collected due to contamination and further heightening the problem</p>	<p>The position concerning communal collection is reviewed on an ongoing basis already leading to some improvements in some areas as highlighted during the meeting. This includes providing additional collection points in parts of Wildmill.</p>
		<p>Members recommended that Kier carry out mystery shopper type exercises to ensure waste and recycling is being collected and materials returned sufficiently. This would assist in identifying if additional training is required or if any improvements to the service could be implemented to allow for more efficient collections.</p>	<p>Two Council cleaner streets officers do as a part of their role monitor the Kier contract and the performance on the ground, visiting area's following collection looking at quality of collection and container return as is being suggested, along with crew inspections at the roadside. The web cameras on each collection vehicle also provide the means for Kier to monitor crew behaviour and performance. Training for all operatives is comprehensive and repeated and reinforced as necessary. For example, the recent training on 'stacking' of recycling bags/boxes after collections.</p>

		<p>Members recommended exploring the opportunity to extend the grass waste collection service to the whole year as residents still produce garden waste throughout the winter months and this would therefore contribute to a further increase in the recycling rates throughout the Borough.</p>	<p>This matter can be looked at but it will not be achievable without increasing the overall cost of the service as the expense of deploying the garden waste collection vehicle and crew for the winter months would be considerable. This cost would be incurred at a time when less residents would require it during the winter months and less material would be generated. A balance would therefore need to be assessed between the additional cost that would be incurred at a time of ongoing austerity and budget pressure, and the impact it would have on overall recycling rates.</p>
		<p>Members recommended a review of the current routes, particularly around schools and ensure that any planned changes to the route in February are carefully planned and considered to minimize disruption to residents and also ensure that any changes are communicated with Members and residents in advance of the changes.</p>	<p>Agreed, any new routes proposed by the contractor will be carefully considered by the Council before approval. Minimising disruption will of course be at the forefront of our thinking, albeit it is important to recognise that some further disruption is inevitable. It is a contractual requirement that Kier seek approval from BCBC to implement significant changes to the collection round structure and it has already been stressed to Kier that they are required to demonstrate that a high level of planning has been undertaken before changes to rounds are approved. All new routes will be fully communicated to both elected Members and local residents.</p>

		<p>Members of the Committee recommended that this item remain on the Forward Work Programme and is revisited in 6 months' time. BCBC and Kier should then be in a position to give members an update on the following within the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impact of the recently recruited senior managers and front line staff 2. Updates to the CRC centre including the instalment of the polystyrene baler and webcam so residents are able to monitor the traffic flow at the site 3. Changes of days for the communal collections 4. Impact of the new collection vehicles 5. The review of BCBC in house Street Scene enforcement activity - solution in place by April 2018 6. Longer term trend of flytipping 7. Full induction of recycling staff that is due to take place in January 2018 	<p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--------------

**Members of the Committee asked to receive the following further information:
Further Information requested**

- How many households were outstanding for the delivery of AHP bags and how long had they been waiting. Members were not confident that they were receiving them within the 10 day deadline and were having to call several times to request them.
- How will the collection work in the future when the new delivery trucks are rolled out?
- The Committee requested to see an un-redacted copy of the Waste Services contract between Kier and BCBC in order for them to effectively scrutinise going forward and ensure that Kier are fulfilling the agreement as set out in the terms of the contract.
- Members asked how the rollout of the new vehicles would affect staffing numbers. Would the number of staff that Kier employ reduce as a result?

- Members asked when new homes and housing estates are built, how this information is communicated to Kier and routes adjusted as many residents moving into newly built properties were left waiting for several months to receive recycling materials and were left with no collections in their streets.

This page is intentionally left blank

Date of Meeting	Item	Members wished to make the following comments:	Response/Comments
06-Dec-2017	Draft Budget Proposals - Communities	<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>1. In relation to the budget reductions proposals put forward for 18-19 for the Communities Directorate, the Committee fundamentally do not agree with them in their entirety and recommend that the Social Services and Education Directorates who have the two highest budgets in the Authority be looked at instead to make up these savings.</p> <p>2. The Committee expressed concerns over the proposals for the removal of subsidised bus services (COM 27), particularly given the fact that bus companies themselves are cutting their own routes and that the Authority's own proposals for service cuts have not yet gone out for public consultation. The Committee therefore recommend:</p> <p>a) Prior to any decision being made on the routes being cut, Cabinet also receive information on what routes bus companies themselves are cutting in order to understand the overall impact of the combined route reductions;</p> <p>b) That no decision is made regarding the proposed budget cuts to the service until public consultation has been completed;</p> <p>c) The Committee also requested that Scrutiny get the opportunity to receive an item on the proposals and the outcome of Consultation for the removal of subsidised bus services as a pre-decision item before going to Cabinet.</p> <p>3. In relation to COM1, the Committee recognise the work being undertaken to look at various options for public conveniences such as the comfort scheme and the possibility of Town and Community Councils taking these on. However given the focus of this Authority to improve our towns and encourage the public back into them, together with the view that public toilets are an essential necessity, the Committee recommend that no cuts are made to public conveniences within the Local Authority.</p> <p>4. The Committee made comment on the management savings being put forward by the Communities Directorate and the fact that these are not reflected in other Directorates. In light of sharing the burden of the budget cuts, the Committee recommend that other Directorates also look towards management efficiency savings.</p>	Recommendations to be presented to cabinet with a response at following meeting of Cabinet

<p>5. The Committee recommend that instead of disposing of the councils land and selling it off, the Authority look at the potential for revenue through development. One suggestion was the need for increased properties for small businesses in the County Borough. Members also recommend considering what land development and income generation other Local Authorities have achieved to determine what areas have been successful.</p>
<p>6. The Committee recommend that the £40,000 reduction proposed for third sector support for with Community Asset Transfer (CAT) be removed given the impact this will have on achieving the savings required from CATs.</p>
<p>7. The Committee did not support the discretionary growth items of £500,000 for schools to replace the Welsh Government reduction in the Education Improvement Grant and the £65,000 proposed for the week long 'Festival of Learning'. At a time of austerity and serious budget cuts the Committee views that these budget growths should not be supported and the money could be better spent elsewhere in the Authority. Should the 'Festival of Learning' continue to take place, the Committee recommend that it be held in school holiday time so as to reduce the costs for providing teacher cover.</p>
<p>8. The Committee recommend that the Authority explore further whether there are greater opportunities for collaborative working for Community Services in order to achieve savings and at the same time improve these services.</p>
<p>9. The Committee recommend that the Authority consider the services provided by the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) to possibly assist in longer term planning and sustainability of Community Services.</p>

	<p>10. The Committee expressed concern that the Authority continues to look to the Communities Directorate for further budget savings that are disproportional to those of other Directorates. The example given was that for 2018-19 the Communities Directorate is being asked for a 6% cut of its own budget whilst other Directorates, which hold around 2/3 of the Councils total budget are only being asked to make between 0.5 and 0.6% savings out of their own budget. Members understand this is due to the fact that the services within the Communities Directorate are not deemed as Council priorities, however the Committee also questioned as to whether the Authority was taking into account what the priorities were for the public. With this in mind the Committee recommend that the Authority reconsider its corporate priorities to take account of the 'public element' and realign Community Services as a Corporate priority.</p>	
	<p>11. Whilst not wishing to make cuts to Education and Schools and likewise Social Services, the Committee believe that with such large budgets there have to be efficiency savings within these Directorates that could assist with sharing the burden of the Authority's budget cuts. It is therefore recommended that where the Committee have concerns around cuts within the Communities budget, such as those mentioned above such as public conveniences and CATs, the Authority instead look to these other Directorates to make up these savings proposed.</p>	
	<p>Further Comments The Committee expressed concern over the £20m predicted cost for the next decade to maintain Highways to their current standards and the unknown of where this funding would come from. The Committee also questioned the similar amount of £10-£20m for ICT in the next decade. Members requested that the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee question the Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services in relation to the predicted ICT cost up against the context of other future budget pressures such as those for Highways.</p>	<p>Taken up with Corporate at their meeting on 14 Dec</p>
	<p>Future Scrutiny The Committee recommend that Scrutiny consider a future item on what other Local Authorities are doing to respond to the gap in provision in Community Services. The Committee requested that a review of the AHP bags be considered when Scrutiny revisit the subject of 'Waste' in approximately 12 months time to include the monetary against environmental impact.</p>	<p>To be considered by Corporate</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Forward Work Programme

Table A

The following items were previously prioritised by the Subject OVS Committees and considered by Corporate at its last meeting where the top three items were scheduled in for the next round of meetings:

Date	Subject Committee	Item	Specific Information to request	Rationale for prioritisation	Proposed date	Proposed rationale for timing from Officers	Suggested Invitees	Prioritised by Committees	Webcast
------	-------------------	------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------	---	--------------------	---------------------------	---------

Page 34	07-Feb-18	SOSC 2	The Economic Prosperity of Bridgend County Borough	To include areas such as Economic Development, Worklessness Programmes, EU Funding for Skills. - Impact of BREXIT on EU Funding; - Impact of BREXIT on current Worklessness Programmes; - Statistics in relation to the Worklessness Programmes.		SOSC 3 - prioritised for next set of meetings 17/07/2017 13/09/2017 SOSC 1 - proposed waiting until the detail of the Revenue Support Grant are known before this item is considered. SOSC 2 - 18/09/2017		Mark Shephard, Corporate Director Communities; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member – Education and Regeneration; Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services; Jeff Peters, Projects and Business Approaches Team Leader; Lisa Jones, Regeneration Funding and Regional Engagement Team Leader Ian Jessop, Bridgend Business Forum; Simon Pirotte, Principal Bridgend College; Matthew Williams, Director of Engage Training and WBL.		SOSC 2 highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.
	08-Feb-18	SOSC 1	School Standards Report 17-18	Annual school performance report from CSC	Annual school performance results form the basis of monitoring of schools which is a primary responsibility of Scrutiny.	Proposed to receive late January/early February once the school results have been formally published.		Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help; Mandy Paish, CSC Senior Challenge Advisor; Mike Glavin, Managing Director CSC		SOSC 2 highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.
	12-Feb-18	SOSC 3	Town Centre Regeneration	To provide members with information on the following responsibilities of the Council and how these are managed and can be developed with reduced resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking review – When is the car parking review going to be undertaken? Charges for staff car parking at all sites - has this been reviewed? If this was taken forward what income would this generate? Residents Parking - when residents permit parking going to be rolled out? Inconsiderate parking in the Borough - where are the problem areas? What are we doing to tackle these issues? Are we prosecuting? Parking outside schools - How are we tackling bad parking at schools? Update on the introduction of the mobile camera van that was purchased to tackle such issues. What areas has this van been at. How many fines have been issued to date? Pedestrianisation - particularly in Bridgend Town Centre. Outcomes of the consultation to allow traffic into the town Business Rates Strategic Building Investment Disabled facilities 		Prioritised by SOSC 3 17 July 2017 13 September 2017 Prioritised by SOSC 2 18 September 2017		Mark Shephard, Corporate Director Communities; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member - Education and Regeneration; Zak Shell, Head of Streetscene; Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration; Rhianon Kingsley, Town Centre Manager; Possible Representative from BID Company; Clerks from each town Council in the Borough; Trader representation; Representative from a Disability organisation. Rachel Bell - Manager of Rhw		SOSC 2 highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.
	07-Mar-2018	SOSC 2	Prevention and Wellbeing and Local Community Coordination	To include information about the number of different initiatives that are available within the community as an alternative to statutory services. LCC projects to be referenced under a heading for each area – Ogmore, Llynfi and Garw Valleys – to ensure ease of reference to what projects are being carried out where. To include information on the work being undertaken with the 3rd Sector. What initiatives are available within the community? What input is provided by AMBU and what is provided by Bridgend Council?		Proposed date March/April 2018		Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member - Social Services and Early Help Cllr Dhanisha Patel, Cabinet Member - Wellbeing and Future Generations; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Andrew Thomas, Group Manager – Prevention and Wellbeing.		
	12-Mar-2018	SOSC 1	School Modernisation Band B	To advise committee on the development of the strategic outline plan for band b of the 21 st century schools modernisation programme How did Band A improve attainment? What were the outcomes for Band A? How were they achieved. What lessons can be learnt for Band B?	Scrutiny to inform the plans and refine the rationale for the development of the schools estate	Proposed by Officers - March 2018		Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help; Gaynor Thomas, Schools Programme Manager		

Page 35	21-Mar-2018	SOSC 3	Empty Properties	<p>How effective has this council been on bringing back into use empty properties over the last five years?</p> <p>Does this council have the appropriate policies and process in place to fully utilise the powers that we already have to tackle empty homes. For example - Empty Dwelling Management Orders and charging council tax premiums on long-term empty homes and second homes?</p> <p>What are the levels of empty homes across Bridgend?</p> <p>What is the potential loss of council tax receipts due to empty homes?</p> <p>Data on levels of empty properties and homes - how long they have been empty for and what contact has been made regarding them;</p> <p>Examples of case studies from Bridgend CBC;</p> <p>Good practice from across Wales;</p> <p>Detail of Welsh Government policies;</p> <p>In relation to empty properties - could a breakdown of service provision be provided? To include contracts that we sub let out;</p> <p>Members queried how many section 215 have been used in relation to blight properties.</p>				<p>Andrew Jolley, Corporate Director Operational and Partnership Services</p> <p>Mark Shepherd, Corporate Director Communities</p> <p>Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration, Development & Property</p> <p>Martin Morgans, Head of Performance and Partnership Services</p> <p>Clr Dhanisha Patel</p> <p>Welsh Government contacts?</p> <p>Helen Picton, SRS (VOG)</p> <p>Jennifer Ellis (RCT)</p>	SOSC 3 and SOSC 1 reprioritised this in Dec 2017 after it was rescheduled to accommodate other report	
	16-Apr-2018	SOSC 1	Early Help and Social Care	<p>The process into how the following information will be presented will be confirmed following meetings with both Directorates Corporate Directors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to date figures presenting the numbers of Looked After Children by Local Authority; A breakdown of referral figures, to include statistics from local pre-school nurseries; Outcome from the review undertaken by Institute of Public Care; What services are being provided post 16, given that research indicates shows that children who have been looked after, have the increased probability that their children will also end up in the care system; <p>To evidence how the two services are working together and the impact on the LAC population.</p> <p><i>Rec from BREP -</i></p> <p>For Scrutiny to receive data relating to the Early Help and Safeguarding Board's joint dataset to evidence how the work being undertaken in relation to Early Help has impacted directly on social services.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of the causes and demands on Children's Social Services. Members commented that if this is not known and understood then the Authority cannot effectively plan for the future and Members cannot be assured that changes that are being introduced are fit for purpose.</p>				<p>Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing;</p> <p>Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support;</p> <p>Clr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration;</p> <p>Clr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help;</p> <p>Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help.</p> <p>Laura Kinsey, Head of Children's Social Care;</p> <p>Mark Lewis,</p> <p>Elizabeth Walton James, Group Manager Safeguarding and Quality Assurance</p>	SOSC 1	
	17-Apr-2018	SOSC 2	Dementia Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include accurate and up to date figures on the people diagnosed with dementia in Bridgend County Borough for comparison with the number of people predicted to be living with dementia; Provide Members with the information which can be found on the Local GP Dementia Register which highlights prevalence of dementia by area throughout the borough and type of dementia. The Panel recommend that these statistics are presented on a map diagram for ease of reference. If possible, Members wish that this data be elaborated upon to include age, and whether the numbers show if diagnosis was received prior to moving into the borough; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide an update on the review of joint intentions with health and the third sector and include information regarding the production of a dementia strategy and delivery plan - stating milestones, target dates and responsible officers. Provide an update on existing discussions with nursing care providers in relation to the development of nursing residential care places for people with dementia; <p>Include facts and figures on people with dementia living in Cardiff as well as Neath Port Talbot and Swansea for comparison to Bridgend.</p> <p>Comparisons with other LAs such as Maesteg and the Vale on dementia awareness training to consider how successful the Authority has been in making Bridgend Dementia friendly.</p>			Proposed change from Directorate from 7 March as will take time to get the detailed information as it is not owned by the LA and needs to be gathered from Health etc.	<p>Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing;</p> <p>Clr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help;</p> <p>Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care;</p> <p>Representative from Age Concern Wales;</p> <p>Representative from ABMU;</p> <p>Representative from Bavo.</p>		Corporate highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.
	19-Apr-2018	SOSC 3	Emergency Housing	<p>Is the current emergency housing provided by BCBC meeting the needs of the service users? Is the current provision a good use of public resources?</p> <p>Should an alternative provision be made to ensure families, in particular children, achieve their potential.</p> <p>Service user numbers</p> <p>Service user demographic –ages, disabilities, gender</p> <p>Outcomes</p> <p>Challenges faced daily by families using provision –health, dentist, mental health, schools</p> <p>*Members have requested a possible site visit</p>	members asked for this item to be prioritised by the Corporate Committee to address the homelessness across the county which has increased and can be seen by the increased number of people sleeping in tents.			<p>Andrew Jolley, Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services;</p> <p>Martin Morgans, Head of Performance and Partnership Services</p> <p>Clr Dhanisha Patel, Cabinet Member - Wellbeing and Future Generations;</p>	SOSC3 SOSC 1	

TBC	SOSC 1	Budgetary Impacts of Parc Prison	<p>How much core funding does BCBC receive to deal with the impact of a prison being located within its boundary? What is the true cost of servicing this need? Is there a different impact due to Parc Prison being privately run as opposed to being run by the Prison Service? Educational aspects in prisons and their impact</p>		Proposed by Directorate for May-June 2018	Ongoing discussions with WG over financial position -more appropriate to receive later in year	<p>Susan Cooper, Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care Cllr P White, Cabinet Member Services and Early Help Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Representative from Parc prison</p>		
TBC	SOSC 2	ALN Reform	<p>When the Bill has been further progressed, report to include consideration of the following points: a) How the Authority and Schools are engaging with parents over the changes to the Bill? b) What the finalised process is for assessments and who is responsible for leading with them? c) What involvement/responsibilities do Educational Psychologists have under the Bill? d) Has the Bill led to an increase in tribunals and what impact has this had? This is set against the context of the recent announcement by the Lifelong Learning Minister that instead of saving £4.8m over four years the Bill could potentially cost £8.2m due to an expected increase in the number of cases of dispute resolution. e) Given that the Bill focuses on the involvement of young people and their parents, what support is available for those involved in court disputes? f) Outcomes from the Supported Internship programme. g) Support for those with ALN into employment. h) Staffing - Protection and support for staff, ALNCO support, workloads and capacity. i) Pupil-teacher ratios and class sizes and impact of Bill on capacity of teachers to support pupils with ALN j) How is the implementation of the Bill being monitored; what quality assurance frameworks are there and what accountability for local authorities, consortiums and schools?</p>	Needs revisiting to monitor implementation of the Bill and if needs are being met as well as impact on future budgets	Proposed by SOSC 1 to be revisited in next years FWP		<p>Lindsay Harvey, Interim Corporate Director - Education and Family Support; Cllr Charles Smith, Cabinet Member for Education and Regeneration; Nicola Echanis, Head of Education and Early Help. Michelle Hatcher, Group Manager Inclusion and School Improvement Third Sector Representatives</p>		SOSC 2 highlighted this item as suitable for webcasting.
TBC		<p>Waste Services Contract</p> <p><i>(Confirmation required as to whether Scrutiny can receive re-dacted contract - If contract being considered, item needs to go to Corporate OVSC, other issues are for SOSC)</i></p>	<p>Members would like the report to include an update on the following: The impact of the recently recruited senior managers associated with the Bridgend contract and front line operative staff. Was recruitment successful? Have all Members now been given full inductions and training Information on the updates to the CRC centre including the instalment of the polystyrene baler and webcam so residents are able to monitor the traffic flow at the site. Change of days for the communal collections - Has this happened? Has the service shown improvements since the change? Impact of the new collection vehicles. Have they made collection rounds more efficient? Outcome of the review of BCBC in house Street Scene enforcement activity Longer term trend of flytipping. What are the figures of flytipping in the Borough? Have they improved? Domestic or business?</p> <p>A review of the AHP bags be considered when Scrutiny revisit the subject of 'Waste' in approximately 12 months time to include the monetary against environmental impact.</p>	Members requested that this item is prioritised by the Corporate Committee for June 2018 so they can monitor the contract and ensure that improvements to the delivery of the service are made. Members requested that this item remain until significant improvements are made and the service is at a satisfactory level for residents.	SOSC 3 proposed revisit item in June 2018		<p>Mark Shepherd, Corporate Director Communities; Cllr Hywel Williams, Deputy Leader; Cllr Richard Young, Cabinet Member – Communities; Zak Shell, Head of Streetscene; Maz Akhtar, Regional Manager Kier Julian Tranter, Managing Director Kier Claire Pring, Kier</p>		

Table B

The following items were deemed important for future prioritisation:

Item	Specific Information to request	Rationale for prioritisation	Proposed date		Suggested Invitees		Webcast
Safeguarding	<p>To include Safeguarding activity in both Children and Adult Services.</p> <p>To also cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Safeguarding Boards Bridgend Corporate Safeguarding Policy CSE DOLS <p>Report to provide statistical data in relation to service demands and evidence how quickly and effectively the services are acting to those needs.</p> <p>To evidence how the two services are working together and the impact on the LAC population.</p> <p>To receive the outcome of the in depth analysis which was currently being undertaken within the Council.</p> <p>To include information on Advocacy for Children and Adults:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outcome from the Advocacy Pilot Scheme The current system Social Services & Wellbeing Act Regional Children Services advocacy Adult Services – Golden Thread Project 	<p>Members stressed that this subject must be considered by Scrutiny on their FWP as is a huge responsibility of the Authority and Scrutiny must ensure the work being undertaken to protect some of the most vulnerable people is effective and achieving outcomes.</p>	<p>Pilot for Advocacy ends April. Therefore proposed date May/June 2018.</p>		<p>Susan Cooper Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Jacqueline Davies, Head of Adult Social Care; Laura Kinsey, Head of Children's Social Care; Elizabeth Walton James, Group Manager Safeguarding and Quality Assurance Richard Thomas, Strategic Planning and Commissioning Officer</p>	SOSC2 Jan 18	
Annual Recommendations/feedback Update to each SOSC	<p>Update on all feedback that required follow up and recommendations - Cabinet and Officer ones</p>		<p>Proposed for March 2018 to inform next years FWP planning</p>		<p>None</p>		
Care and Social Services Inspectorate Wales (CSSIW) Inspection of Children's Services.	<p>The Committee requested that they receive an information report detailing the progress of the plan and update Members whether or not the actions have addressed the issues raised by the Inspectorate.</p>		<p>Going to Corporate Parenting on 24 Jan - Scrutiny Officers to pick up and send to Committee</p>				
Remodelling Fostering Project	<p>Further project as part of the Remodelling Children's Social Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detail regarding the upskilling of three internal foster carers to provide intensive, therapeutic step down placements as part of Residential Remodelling project - Review of the foster carer marketing and recruitment strategy at a draft/early stage to allow members input into the process 				<p>Susan Cooper, Corporate Director, Social Services and Wellbeing; Cllr Phil White, Cabinet Member – Social Services and Early Help; Laura Kinsey, Head of Children's Social Care; Pete Tyson, Group Manager – Commissioning; Lauren North, Commissioning and Contract Management Officer;</p>		
Home to School Transport	<p>To provide assurances on rationalisation of Learner Transport as far as possible in order to make budget savings:</p> <p>Update on pilot that school transport team proposing to run in Spring and Summer terms 2017-2018 - to support the enforcement of bus passes on home to school transport contracts. As part of this pilot, the Authority is also investigating opportunities to track the use of our school bus services by individual pupils.</p> <p>Update on Recommendation from BREP: The Panel recommend the need for the Authority to adopt a Corporate approach in relation to Home to School Transport maximising the LA's minibuses such as those used for day centres. It is proposed that this be supported by slightly amending the opening and closing times of day centres so that the buses can be available for school transport. Other aspects that could be considered include the exploration of whether school staff could transport children and young people instead of hiring independent drivers.</p> <p>To test and scrutinise the current licensing and school transport regime to gain assurances that it provides adequate protection against the potential of putting children and vulnerable children at risk from those who are in a position of trust. Changes to the DBS status of their employees to be scrutinised to ensure that children are not being put at undue risk.</p> <p>To provide robust scrutiny and recommendations on how the current regime can be improved.</p> <p>To provide assurances to the public and maintain public confidence in the system of school transport</p> <p>Report to include</p>	<p>To provide assurances on rationalisation of Learner Transport as far as possible in order to make budget savings.</p> <p>To test and scrutinise the current licensing and school transport regime to gain assurances that it provides adequate protection against the potential of putting children and vulnerable children at risk from those who are in a position of trust. Changes to the DBS status of their employees ought to be scrutinised by an Overview & Scrutiny Committee at the earliest opportunity to ensure that children are not being put at undue risk.</p> <p>To provide robust scrutiny and recommendations on how the current regime can be improved.</p> <p>To provide assurances to the public and maintain public confidence in the system of school transport</p>					

	<p>Update on the current arrangements of how licensing and school transport operates within the County Borough since the change in 2015 to the Police National Policy for disclosing non-conviction information to the local authority. Information to include a report from South Wales Police on its approach to disclosing information it holds about licencees following arrests, charges and convictions.</p> <p>What is the current relationship between the local authority's licensing and school transport departments in relation to the disclosure of information from South Wales police?</p> <p>Is there sufficient oversight on behalf of the local authority and a risk of contractors withholding information which may prejudice the continuation of their contract?</p>						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Further Proposed Items

Highways Services	To include information of efficiency savings and the impact of what the MTFs has on the service				Mark Shepherd, Corporate Director Communities; Cllr Richard Young, Cabinet Member – Communities;		
Community Services	Rec from BREP The Committee recommend that Scrutiny consider a future item on what other Local Authorities are doing to respond to the gap in provision in Community Services.						
Collaboration with Police	<p>The Panel highlighted the need to work more closely with the Police and therefore proposed that a Research and Evaluation Panel be established to look at Policing of the borough on a local level. Members proposed the following points and areas to go to the Research and Evaluation Panel for consideration as part of their ongoing investigative work:</p> <p>a) As the delegated powers to the Police and PCSO's varies between local authorities, the Panel recommend that clarification be provided on what powers have been assigned to the Police and what has been retained be the LA to inform all Members, members of the public, Inspectors and PCSOs;</p> <p>b) How often does the Chief Executive and Leader meet with key people in the Police to discuss and align priorities;</p> <p>c) How often do both the Corporate Director – Operational and Partnership Services and the Corporate Director - Communities meet with their counterparts in the Police to discuss community policing and safety within the County Borough and align priorities.</p> <p>d) The need for a joint plan between Police and the LA;</p> <p>e) How the Police assist the LA in relation to safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.</p>						
Remodelling Children's Residential Services Project	SOSC 1 requested that the item be followed up by Scrutiny in the future for monitoring purposes, incorporating evidence of outcomes.						
CSSIW investigation into LAC	The Committee requested that the outcome of the CSSIW investigation into Looked After Children be provided to Scrutiny for information when it becomes available.						

The following items for briefing sessions or pre-Council briefing

Item	Specific Information to request
Overview of Direct Payment Scheme	To update Members on the Direct Payments Process.
Social Services Commissioning Strategy	<p>To include information on what work has taken place following the Social Services and Wellbeing Act population assessment.</p> <p>To also cover the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Annual Plan Bridgend Social Services Commissioning Strategy
Western Bay Regional Report	Update on situation and way forward with WB and Regional Working?
Residential Remodelling - Extra Care Housing	Site visit to current Extra Care Housing and then to new site once work has begun
Children's Social Services	Briefing for SOSC 1 on Child Practice Reviews - details of latest CPRs over last 12-18 months - what recommendations have come out of them, how have they been responded to, how have they helped inform future work to help safeguard children.

BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT TO OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3

12TH FEBRUARY 2018

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES

TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members with information on the following service responsibilities of the Council and how these are managed and can be developed with reduced resources and how they impact on our three main town centres and their regeneration:
- 1.2 The following specific requests have been made by the overview and scrutiny committee for inclusion in the report.
- Car parking review – When is the car parking review going to be undertaken? Charges for staff car parking at all sites - has this been reviewed? If this was taken forward what income would this generate?
 - Residents' Parking - when is residents' permit parking going to be rolled out?
 - Inconsiderate parking in the County Borough - where are the problem areas? What are we doing to tackle these issues? Are we prosecuting?
 - Parking outside schools - How are we tackling bad parking at schools? Update on the introduction of the mobile camera van that was purchased to tackle such issues. What areas has this van been at? How many fines have been issued to date?
 - Pedestrianisation - particularly in Bridgend Town Centre. Outcomes of the consultation to allow traffic into the town.
 - Business Rates.
 - Strategic Building Investment.
 - Disabled facilities.

2. Connection to Corporate Improvement Plan and other Corporate Priority

- 2.1 To reflect the commitments in the Council's current Corporate Plan:

Priority One – Supporting a successful economy

- To create conditions for growth and enterprise
- To create successful town centres

Priority Three - Smarter Use of Resources:

- To make the most of our physical assets, including school buildings

3. Background

- 3.1 The purpose of the public highway is for the passage of people and goods. The public at large enjoys long established rights to pass and repass and to gain access from the public highway to adjacent property. In urban areas, however, the exercise of these rights has to recognise that

users of vehicles and adjacent property often need to load and unload passengers and goods on the highway and that users may wish to park their vehicles there.

- 3.2 As a result of the above, the control of parking is an important traffic management tool to ensure the free flow of traffic on our highways as well as ensuring that appropriate parking in our towns and villages. It is often the case that parking spaces are at a premium at these locations and, therefore, there is a need to control parking in these areas. This is undertaken by the provision of different types of parking provision, which can include off street parking as well as residents parking schemes.
- 3.3 In 2014 the Council commissioned a review of the public and staff/Elected Member car parking scheme to consider the future parking requirements for the residents of the County Borough.
- 3.4 However, due to significant certain factors at that time, including the Sunnyside and Raven's Court staff moves and the Rhiw Car park redevelopment, the parking review outcomes were not progressed in full. As a result, this report is now being revisited with a view to reporting the findings to Cabinet in Spring 2018.

4. Current Situation

4.1 The following detail seeks to answer the specific questions raised by Scrutiny Committee:

4.2 **Car parking review – When is the car parking review going to be undertaken? Charges for staff car parking at all sites - has this been reviewed? If this was taken forward, what income would this generate?**

4.3 A Car Parking Review Board was formed in September 2017 and has been continually updated on the progress of the works being undertaken and it is the intention of the Board to bring a report to Cabinet in March 2018 with recommendations on the findings.

4.4 Membership and role of the Board is as follows:

Role	Name
Project Sponsor	Zak Shell (Head of Neighbourhood Services)
Senior User	Cllr Richard Young (Cabinet Member Communities)
Senior Supplier	Tony Godsall (Traffic and Transportation Manager) Phil Angell (Traffic Management and Parking Team Leader)
Project Manager	Kevin Mulcahy (Group Manager - Highways Services)

Additional Membership and roles of Project Team to be called on as and when required:

Role	Name
Property	Fiona Blick
HR	Denise Thomas
Finance	Mike Betty
Project Support	Sarah Frampton
Legal	Jane Dessent

- 4.5 This Project Board is in place to develop for the consideration of Cabinet a parking strategy for Bridgend County Borough looking specifically at the following areas:
- Review of staff /Elected Members parking and public parking
 - Progressing residents' permits parking
 - Explore off and on-street "Pay and Display" charging options
 - Streamlining of parking operations
 - Explore structural resilience of car parks
- 4.6 With regard to the specific issue of staff charging for car parking at all sites, this has been considered but is not recommended. For parking at most Authority premises away from the main town centre offices, off-site and on street parking, is generally available to staff as an alternative. Were charges to be introduced, on-street parking by staff would be the likely result. The staff at these locations are free to park legally on-street and outside the workplace. If this occurred, there is a possibility that residents within the surrounding streets would be detrimentally affected as a result of this increased parking.
- 4.7 It is noted that the number of staff registered on the existing BCBC staff permit scheme has reduced from 840 in 2012 to 464 in 2017.
- 4.8 A number of reasons exist which explain the reduction in the uptake of the permit scheme these include: re-organisations at BCBC have reduced the number of staff employed by the Authority considerably between 2012 and 2017. The loss of Sunnyside car park and the loss to staff of parking at the Rhiw, mean staff are having to park in less convenient locations. The cost of a parking permit has increased from £13 a month in 2012 to £16 a month in 2017, making the scheme less attractive.
- 4.9 The Authority does receive complaints about on-street staff parking (albeit legally) in the surrounding area of the Civic Offices as a result of those choosing not to utilise the permit scheme.
- 4.10 Residents Parking - when is residents' permit parking going to be rolled out?**
- 4.11 In April 2014 a report was presented to Cabinet with recommendations of a strategy for the introduction of permit parking throughout the County Borough. That report sought Cabinet approval in respect of the development of a Permit Parking Policy (Residents Parking Scheme) and Cabinet specifically approved the following:
- (1) Adoption of the Permit Parking Policy for Bridgend County Borough
 - (2) Permit tariff charge of £20 per permit to cover the yearly administration costs
 - (3) Noted the need for extra resource if required (both staff and financial)
 - (4) Noted the requirement to prioritise schemes taking into account any budget available
 - (5) Approved that authority be delegated to the Corporate Director Communities to amend paragraph 3.1.2 of the policy to ensure that the parking implications for Health and Social Care staff were considered when on duty and supporting the needs of the local residents
- 4.12 It was envisaged that this provided a mechanism for the Traffic and Transportation Section of the Authority to consider requests and, where appropriate, financially supported to introduce such schemes.

- 4.13 In 2015 a consultation exercise was undertaken to seek residents' views for introducing residents' parking in their streets and, as a result of the replies received, final plans were drawn-up indicating the proposed location of the residents' parking bays and limited waiting bays in the streets where residents agreed that they were happy for resident's parking to be introduced.
- 4.14 However, before public notice was given on these proposals, officers were advised by the Legal Department that, due to various issues related to the proposal, a review of the current main On-Street Order was needed. Additionally, it was identified that it was necessary to consult on certain amendments to existing parking restrictions contained within the On-Street Traffic Regulation Order, which are required to enable the introduction of the proposed Resident Parking schemes in certain streets.
- 4.15 The review has taken a considerable time to complete, due to the complexity of the issues involved and the fact that the main On-Street Traffic Regulation Order covers all of the parking restrictions in the County Borough (excluding moving traffic contraventions).
- 4.16 The review has now been completed and progress can now be made on the proposal. However, as a result of the timescales involved, and the need to consult on the proposed amendments to the existing parking restrictions contained within the main On-Street Traffic Regulation Order which are necessary to enable the introduction of resident parking, there is a need at this stage to re-consult with residents in the streets concerned.
- 4.17 Inconsiderate parking in the County Borough - where are the problem areas? What are we doing to tackle these issues? Are we prosecuting?**
- 4.18 There is often confusion by members of the public and other bodies, including on certain occasions, members of the South Wales Police (101), as to which parking issues the Local Authority, via Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) and the Police, are able to address.
- 4.19 The simplest guide, even though with exceptions, is that, if there are lines or signs supported by a relevant Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) , then CPE is able to address, otherwise it may be the responsibility of the Police to enforce if an offence has been committed.
- 4.20 Parking in contravention of yellow lines, inappropriate use of designated bays, i.e. disabled bays, and loading bays are enforced by the Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) in compliance with Traffic Regulation Orders' and Welsh Government guidelines. This initially encourages drivers to move on and comply with parking restrictions that are in place and if this is unsuccessful, enables enforcement to take place by means of issuing a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN). CPE however does not involve the prosecution of any offences.
- 4.21 Inconsiderate parking is in itself not a parking offence that can be addressed by CPE, the parking may amount to obstruction of the highway, i.e. parking partially on the footpath or blocking residents' private driveways, and obstruction can ONLY be addressed by the Police (unless there are restrictions on parking in place supported by a TRO on the adjacent highway). If a vehicle is parked on any restricted area that is subject to a TRO and causing an obstruction, the Police can enforce even if the circumstances prevent a CEO from enforcing, i.e. if a member of the public is displaying a Blue Badge.
- 4.22 The main identifiable problem areas are schools at drop off and pick up times, even though many other communities i.e. not outside schools, would prefer to see greater presence of CEOs and many requests are received periodically. CEOs work a seven day rota from 0600 hrs until 2130 hrs patrolling and also carrying out other duties relating to their role, in particular car parks.

- 4.23 Parking outside schools - How are we tackling bad parking at schools? Update on the introduction of the mobile camera van that was purchased to tackle such issues. What areas has this van been at. How many fines have been issued to date?**
- 4.24 Parking outside schools continues to be a major problem and area of concern. CEOs attend at a school at every opportunity to address parking concerns and the CEO can enforce on the school keep clear (zig zag) and on the yellow lines if appropriate. However, vehicles can park on the yellow lines at most schools if they are displaying a Blue Badge, even if the parking is causing an obstruction.
- 4.25 Again this is an area that the Police can also assist in that they are able to enforce on the school keep clear areas and they can also enforce on the yellow lines, even if a Blue Badge is displayed, if the vehicle is causing an obstruction.
- 4.26 Generally, when a uniformed CEO is in attendance parking compliance improves. However, given the number of schools across the County Borough, it is not possible to have an officer in attendance daily at all schools. Consequently, as soon as an officer leaves a specific site, the parking problems return, i.e. parents ignoring the school 'keep clear' signs and yellow lines.
- 4.27 The aim of a mobile enforcement vehicle (camera car) is to enforce areas where existing parking enforcement is ineffective, which is the case for both schools (in excess of 60) and bus stop clearways (over 390). However, this will only enforce on the school zig zags and the bus stops, not the yellow lines.
- 4.28 Prior to the purchase of a camera car, it is necessary to employ an additional member of staff with the relevant skill-base to programme the necessary IT equipment to operate such a vehicle at the locations of the school keep clear and bus bays for which the vehicle is intended to be used.
- 4.29 At present the post has been agreed, with the necessary Job Evaluation and advertised, interviews are scheduled for the beginning of January.
- 4.30 Following the appointment of the staff member, the equipment and vehicle will be purchased.
- 4.31 Pedestrianisation**
- 4.32 The de-pedestrianisation of a section of highway within the core of Bridgend town centre has long been a project promoted by traders in the town centre and now supported by the Bridgend Improvement District (BID).
- 4.33 The initial context for this project was set out in a report to Cabinet on 7th June 2016, which acknowledged changes in the function and purpose of town centres throughout the UK, and the specific impact locally on Bridgend town centre. It further acknowledged that, whilst there are many factors responsible for these that are outside the Council's control, it is important that the Council assesses those that are within its control which could bring about positive change to the success and viability of the town centre. The lack of vehicular access to Queen Street, Dunraven Place and Market Street has been cited by town centre traders, property agents and developers as a key issue impacting on trade and lettings.
- 4.34 It was recognised that, in order to change access arrangements in these streets, there would first need to be a thorough understanding of the public safety implications, risks, costs and physical constraints. These were assessed in an independent feasibility report. The report identified a

series of options, the preferred of which (option 3) included bollards and/or street furniture to demarcate the interface between carriageway and footway. This was considered to be the most balanced option in terms of road safety, implementation cost, impact on existing infrastructure, protecting footways from vehicular damage and providing some protection to pedestrians from vehicles mounting the footways.

- 4.35 Officers undertook a full consultation in order to complete the Equality Impact assessment (EIA) on the various options, setting out the rationale for selecting the preferred option. The findings of this consultation concluded that the majority of respondents supported the proposal to re-introduce vehicles into Queen Street, Market Street and Dunraven Place, with the inclusion of parking spaces to improve accessibility during the day and evening. Prior to a Traffic Order being implemented, further consultation and design was required. This included informal consultation on the preliminary design with a number of specified groups and organisations, and others considered likely to be affected by the proposals.
- 4.36 A preliminary scheme detailing the extent of the proposal was produced and sent informally to a number of statutory consultees. In addition, a verbal presentation, including detailed discussions and Q&As, was carried out with a number of groups representing vulnerable people or people with protected characteristics.
- 4.37 There was a wide range of responses arising from the informal consultation with the groups representing vulnerable people, with the following primary themes mentioned by them:
- Time limit and type of parking bays
 - Use of bollards to segregate pedestrians from cars
 - Location of pedestrian crossings
 - Increased pollution as a result of vehicles in the town
 - No difference in level between the footway and carriageway
- 4.38 In summary this consultation identified the following key points:
- Increase the available limited waiting from 30 min to 1 hr
 - Spacing and colour contrast of bollards to be reviewed
 - Agreement with the introduction of formal crossings
 - Exploration of mitigation of pollutants
- 4.39 The findings of this further consultation were presented to Cabinet on the 13th October 2017, where the recommendations to make suggested changes to the design of the proposal have been approved. Corporate feasibility funding of £60k has been agreed in principle to carry out detailed design. The next steps will be to progress the statutory consultation and to finalise detailed design.
- 4.40 The Council must comply with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to undertake a statutory consultation and public notice to implement the changed Traffic Order. It will be necessary to prepare an appropriate letter and plan explaining the proposal and consult formally on proposals in accordance with Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and send out to the statutory consultees. Following the statutory consultation process, the Council will be able to determine if there is sufficient support for the proposed changes and that the proposed solutions will bring the desirable results.
- 4.41 There is at present no Council budget identified for implementing the access proposal and the cost of the works would be entirely dependent on external funding. However, this scheme will form part

of the Council's submission to Welsh Government through the new regeneration framework TRI (Targeted Regeneration Investment) from April 2018. There is a financial commitment of £40k from CF31 BID and £20k from Bridgend Town Council to support the project.

4.42 Business Rates

4.43 Non-Domestic Rates (NDR) are also known as business rates and are taxes to help pay for local services. These are charges on most non-domestic properties. Some premises will be exempt from business rates, while others may qualify for rate relief through specific relief schemes. Business rate liabilities are based on each property's assigned rateable value. Rateable values are normally assessed on the basis of the annual rental value of a property. Rates are normally the third biggest outgoing for many small businesses, after rent and staff costs.

4.44 The most recent revaluation took effect on 1st April 2017, prior to this, the last revaluation was seven years ago. The new valuations have seen a significant decrease for the majority of business rates in Bridgend and Maesteg town centres with decreases as much as 60%, but Porthcawl town centre has seen an overall increase of up to 30%. Such changes could turn unviable businesses into viable ones and vice-versa.

4.45 Bridgend County Borough Council offers a Transitional Rate Relief scheme to help ratepayers whose entitlement to Small Business Rate Relief (SBRR) is reduced or removed due to an increase in the rateable value of their premises following the revaluation. A One-Year Targeted High Street Relief scheme is in addition to the above and is on application. A number of businesses in Bridgend County Borough have taken-up this opportunity.

4.46 It is too soon to measure the impact from the changes in business rates in the town centres. However, anecdotally business rates prior to the 2017 revaluation were cited as the biggest barrier to establishing new businesses and sustaining existing ones in Bridgend and Porthcawl.

4.47 Strategic Building Investment

4.48 The Council continues to ensure that it invests in its strategic buildings and town centre infrastructure as grant funding and inward investment opportunities become available.

4.49 In 2014, Bridgend was one of 18 communities across Wales to receive a share of the Welsh Government (WG) Vibrant and Viable Places Programme (VVP). The principal aim and Bridgend's key project was to generate economic growth by encouraging people to live within town centres, increase footfall and inspire businesses to be more innovative.

4.50 The £9 million Rhiw Gateway development included the creation of a modern multi-storey car park, 28 apartments and commercial gym.

4.51 The Rhiw development is now complete and was officially opened on the 11th January 2018 by Rebecca Evans AM, Minister for Housing and Regeneration.

4.52 There is a real opportunity for significant investment to be made into Maesteg Town Hall, following the transfer of its management to Awen Cultural Trust in 2015. The Council and Awen commissioned feasibility work into the restoration and renovation of the building, and creation of a modern, multi-purpose culture and arts venue. Part of the proposal includes the provision of a new library in the lower ground floor of the building and the closure of the indoor market, with opportunities for traders to relocate into the new outdoor market. The development concept has been the subject of extensive public consultation. A Report on the proposed restoration and

redevelopment of Maesteg Town Hall was presented to, and endorsed by, Cabinet on the 4th October 2016.

- 4.53 The initial feasibility and concept design, funded by Council resources, informed an expression of interest (EOI) made to WG under its Building for the Future programme (B4F), which is supported by European funding. The scheme proposal was prioritised by WG as one of seven projects in south-east Wales, and a full business case for the project is now in preparation. The initial feasibility work and concept design has also informed the submission of a Stage 1 bid to Heritage Lottery in November 2017, on which a decision is expected at the end of February 2018. Whilst the detailed feasibility work is scheduled for completion by March 2018, the scheme is anticipated to cost in the region of £5.5 million, with a potential of over £4 million being levered in grant against this.
- 4.54 There is also opportunity for significant investment of circa £2 million through the B4F programme in Bridgend town centre. A scheme is in the early stages of development to replace both Wyndham and Cambrian House buildings, which have historically experienced high levels of vacancy and negatively impact on their surroundings, by a high quality scheme intended to revitalise the area with new community and commercial facilities, a pocket park and new homes.
- 4.55 If the feasibility study deems the project viable, in partnership with a Residential Social Landlord (RSL), the Council will co-ordinate WG and EU grant funding through the B4F programme. The majority of the initial feasibility funding is coming from Coastal Housing Group, with a relatively small element of funding, up to £14k, from the Council's strategic studies fund as part of the Strategic Regeneration Fund [SRF]. A strong emphasis will be placed on providing opportunities for local employment and apprenticeships as part of the construction works. The provision of new housing will address local housing need and help improve investor confidence in the town centre.
- 4.56 The aspiration is to have an agreed concept and WG agreement by Autumn 2018, with a view to development commencing in 2020.
- 4.57 Further investment in Bridgend Town Centre is happening in partnership with other organisations, such as 11 Nolton Street (the former McDonald's building) which has been demolished and is awaiting a £1.8 million investment from Coastal Housing Group, to include 10 new affordable housing units and 310 sqm of commercial floor space.
- 4.58 Along with Glasgow, Bridgend is one of only two Local Authorities in the UK that have secured five phases of Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI) schemes. The THI is a conservation-led grant programme funded through the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and Cadw, the objective of which is to contribute to the economic regeneration and sustainable development of towns, through the sensitive repair restoration and reuse of historic buildings.





4.59 The THI programme has made a fundamental contribution to the regeneration of Maesteg, Bridgend and Porthcawl and has been successful in leading and supporting the sensitive disposal, repair, restoration and re-use of key vacant and under-used buildings including: Elder Street Cottages and the former Queen Victoria public house in Bridgend; the Jennings Building, Customs House and Look-Out Tower in Porthcawl and Maesteg's Town Hall and Tabor Chapel.

4.60 Between 2003 and 2018, the THI programme across the Council has achieved these significant outputs/outcomes:

- Total cost of schemes - £11,326,425.60
- Total Grant Aid - £4,789,889.70
- Total Private Sector - £6,655,200
- Number of historic buildings restored and repaired - 65
- Number of vacant buildings re-used - 14
- Number of jobs created and safeguarded - 212
- Amount of floor space improved - 18,842 sqm
- Number of businesses supported - 38
- Training in conservation skills - 15 workshops/2 training days

4.61 Critically, for every £1 BCBC has invested, £5.89 has been levered into Bridgend, Maesteg and Porthcawl.

4.62 It is also important to note that the Council has also won several awards for its THI schemes and is held by HLF as an exemplar in delivering THI programmes

4.63 The Council has been notified of the approval of its Porthcawl Regeneration Investment Programme (PRIF) bid through the Tourism Attractor Destination programme, which is a Visit Wales-led, European funded programme. This is within a wider £2.5 million programme approved for PRIF, which includes addressing connectivity and tourism access across Porthcawl. Grant funding of £1.227 million has been awarded for two new buildings in Porthcawl.

- 4.64 At Rest Bay, the proposed Watersports Centre will provide a new hub for watersports activities, including space for a new seaside café, kiosk, changing rooms and commercial facilities for private sector operators.
- 4.65 Detailed designs have been finalised and the construction will be out to tender in Spring 2018, with the scheme programme to be completed ready for summer 2019.



- 4.66 In addition to the refurbishment and enhancement of the existing harbour kiosk building at Porthcawl Marina has been approved as part of the PRIF programme alongside the Rest Bay café and Watersports Centre. The scheme will add value to the current and planned facilities and activities within the harbour area. Work on this £320,000 project will commence in March 2018, with anticipated completion at the end of May 2018.



- 4.67 Over the next five years, if all the projects above come to fruition, the Council could be looking at strategic building investment of circa £17 million.
- 4.68 There are new opportunities for the Council to engage with WG to bring forward strategic investment in town centres. The successor programme to VVP, Targeted Regeneration Investment (TRI), is inviting Local Authorities, together with partner organisations, to apply for capital investment for projects that promote economic regeneration. This programme will operate between 2018 and 2021. Whilst funding will be restricted, with only a small number of key

settlements receiving dedicated financial support, there may be opportunities to demonstrate the need for some key town centre investment in smaller projects. Bridgend Town Centre is, therefore, being considered as a TRI proposal in acknowledgement of its status as a regional settlement.

4.69 Members may be aware that there has been a moratorium on new development on the western side of the railway line in Pencoed. The Council is lobbying UK government to enable the implementation of a designed scheme to replace the railway level crossing with a re-modelled road bridge. This would enable currently unusable land to be brought forward for development with demonstrable economic benefits.

4.70 WG has indicated that it sees regeneration as a long-term investment. The Council is currently working in partnership with the other south-east Wales Authorities to bring forward a regional regeneration strategy, where investment could be programmed for the next 10-15 years.

4.71 Disabled Facilities

4.72 All the Council's paying off-street car parks have at least 6% of the available spaces marked out as disabled spaces, which is the industry standard.

4.73 Disabled facilities have also been provided in Porthcawl town centre (John Street), whereby disabled access is allowed in the pedestrian zone between 5.00 p.m. and 11.00 a.m., with disabled on-street bays available close to the amenities.

4.74 Consideration has been given many times to the extra parking bays within the periphery of Bridgend town centre being reclassified as disabled. However, unfortunately, due to the limited parking spaces available on the town centre's periphery, all existing parking spaces are needed for other purposes, such as loading and unloading. Provision has been made for disability users in the multi-storey car park near Asda where there is a facility (Shopmobility) for people with mobility issues to park their car and use a scooter to access Bridgend town. This facility has been funded by both the Bridgend Town and County Borough Councils.

5. Effect upon Policy Framework & Procedure Rules

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

6. Equality Impact Assessment

6.1 There is no impact on specific equality groups as a consequence of this report.

7. Financial Implications

7.1 This project contributes towards the 2017/18 MTFS: COM12 *Broad review of car park charging including staff and elected member parking passes* - £50,000. In 2017/18 Welsh Government provided a 'one off' sum of money to support town centre parking initiatives. This was used to develop a concession where the first two hours of car parking in the Rhiw multi story car park in Bridgend are currently free. This promotion will need to be reviewed for 2018/19 in the absence of specific WG grant but there is a possibility a different offer could be paid for with contributions from the BID company and the Town Council.

7.2 Funding for the regeneration of town centres is usually bid for in a competitive arena, and is not guaranteed. Therefore uncertainty is a constant. The opportunity to draw down external funding is critically dependent on the availability of match-funding. The primary capital budget for this is the Special Regeneration Fund (SRF) and this amount of £540,000 per annum is fully matched into various EU and other external capital funding for periods of several years. This relatively limited

resource has helped to support multi-million pound regeneration projects in the three main towns, developed the Council's property asset base, and provided investment to help small and medium sized businesses to grow. Opportunities can be lost when there is no capital match funding left in the small pot of SRF. Equally, deadlines for submission of bids can be very short, and not allow time for projects to be developed 'from scratch.' There needs to be sufficient capacity retained in the service to develop priority projects to a sufficient level of readiness, to be able to respond to funding opportunities when they arise.

7.3 The Service also cannot simply chase funding. The SRF 'pot' is limited, and has to be deployed very carefully to ensure that match funding is available to support priority projects. Delivery capacity is also limited, and project management resources have to be carefully targeted towards those areas where the greatest economic impact can be achieved.

8. Recommendation

8.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee is invited to:

8.1.1 Note the content of this report; and to consider and agree any recommendations the Committee may wish to make consistent with its challenge and support role in light of this report.

Mark Shephard
CORPORATE DIRECTOR - COMMUNITIES
January 2018

Contact Officers: Zachary Shell, Head of Neighbourhood Services
Telephone: (01656) 643403

E-mail: Zak.Shell@bridgend.gov.uk

Telephone: Satwant Pryce, Head of Regeneration, Development and Property Services
(01656 643151)

Email: Satwant.pryce@bridgend.gov.uk

Background documents:
None