

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.*



Cyfarwyddiaeth y Prif Weithredwr / Chief Executive's Directorate

Deialu uniongyrchol / Direct line /: 01656 643148 / 643147 / 643694

Gofynnwch am / Ask for: Democratic Services

Ein cyf / Our ref:

Eich cyf / Your ref:

Dyddiad/Date: Tuesday, 13 June 2023

Dear Councillor,

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3

A meeting of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 will be held Hybrid in the Council Chamber - Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend, CF31 4WB / remotely via MS Teams on **Monday, 19 June 2023 at 16:00.**

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 - 42
To receive for approval the minutes of the meeting of the following:
26/09/2022
14/11/2022
12/12/2022
04/01/2023 and;
23/01/2023
4. Update on Shared Prosperity Fund 43 - 52

Invitees

Councillor John Spanswick – Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Environment
Councillor Neelo Farr - Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Wellbeing
Councillor Rhys Goode - Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Regeneration

Janine Nightingale - Corporate Director, Communities
Zak Shell - Head of Operations - Community Services
Ieuan Sherwood – Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability

By receiving this Agenda Pack electronically you will save the Authority approx. £1.64 in printing costs

5. Conclusions and Recommendations
6. Corporate Parenting Champion Nomination Report 53 - 56
7. Forward Work Programme Update 57 - 82
8. 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 transacted at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

Note: This will be a Hybrid meeting and Members and Officers will be attending in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Angel Street Bridgend / Remotely via Microsoft Teams. The meeting will be recorded for subsequent transmission via the Council's internet site which will be available as soon as practicable after the meeting. If you have any queries regarding this, please contact cabinet_committee@bridgend.gov.uk or tel. 01656 643147 / 643148.

Yours faithfully

K Watson

Chief Officer, Legal and Regulatory Services, HR and Corporate Policy

Councillors:

S J Bletsoe
N Clarke
C Davies
P Davies

Councillors

M J Evans
P W Jenkins
MJ Kearn
W J Kendall

Councillors

J E Pratt
G Walter
I Williams
MJ Williams

Agenda Item 3

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2022

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 HELD HYBRID IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET, BRIDGEND ON MONDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2022 AT 16:00

Present

Councillor P Davies – Chairperson

S J Bletsoe	N Clarke	C Davies	P W Jenkins
W J Kendall	J E Pratt	G Walter	I Williams
MJ Williams			

Apologies for Absence

M J Evans and MJ Kearn

Officers:

Lucy Beard	Scrutiny Officer
Richard Hughes	Chief Executive, Awen Trust
Lisa Jones	Regeneration Funding and Regional Engagement Team Leader
Rachel Keepins	Democratic Services Manager
Janine Nightingale	Corporate Director - Communities
Jonathan Parsons	Group Manager Development
Ieuan Sherwood	Economy and Natural Resources Manager
Delyth Webb	Group Manager - Strategic Regeneration

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Norah Clarke – Prejudicial interest declared as former volunteer with Credu Charity.

Councillor Colin Davies – Personal interest declared as involved in SPF bid in Vale.

Councillor Ian Williams – Personal interest declared as Bridgend Town Councillor, should regeneration and funding of the town be discussed.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councillor Norah Clarke advised - point 5b in the Minutes dated 18th July 2022 that PRIF stands for Porthcawl Resort Investment Focus, not Forecast.

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of a meeting of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 dated 16 February 2022 and 18 July 2022 be approved as a true and accurate record.

9. THE UNITED KINGDOM SHARED PROSPERITY FUND

The Corporate Director - Communities introduced the report on the United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) which was the UK Government replacement for the European Structural Investment Fund (ESIF), following the withdrawal of the UK from the European Union (EU) on 31 Jan 2020. She advised that Bridgend's allocation to date was £23 million which had to be spent over three years and was around half of what they were used to receiving from the EU, so it had been a challenge putting the investment plan together. It was important for the Committee to understand that it was for initiatives across the County, they had worked with the third sector and colleges to put the plan together and should have a decision on the investment plan by mid-October.

The Group Manager, Economy, Natural Resources and Sustainability advised the purpose of the report was to provide an update on their work on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund and an overview in Appendix one of the proposals that may go forward. He advised that alongside the People in Skills priority there was a dedicated resource specifically for a UK wide intervention called Multiply, to improve adult numeracy skills within the region.

He explained that local authorities had been invited to collaborate and feed into one overall local investment plan for the area. As part of the agreement, it had been agreed that Rhondda Cynon Taff would assume the role of the lead local authority for the region, so the UK Government would have one funding agreement direct to Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council and they would have back-to-back agreements with each of the other authorities in the region. There was flexibility as to how it was delivered within Guidance from UK Government, with options for grant funding for procurement, commissioning and in house provision.

He advised whilst they as an Authority were not required to develop their own investment plan, it was important to develop the information in Appendix one which set out their priorities and the best deployment of the Shared Prosperity fund monies. He wished to stress to the Committee that the proposals had been developed in the absence of detailed fund guidance from UK Government and as such was subject to change particularly as some of the proposed activities, delivery models and funding values may vary. Looking at delivery Cabinet had agreed a two-tier governance structure, an economic partnership which would draw in multi-sector partners from across the County, within the region and Wales and an internal economic programme board. He explained that whilst they had an overall allocation of £23 million, £3.99M of that was specifically allocated to the Multiply Programme which left £19.1 million for what was considered as core shared prosperity fund activity under three themes. The UK Government suggested that funding was broken down to fixed annual yearly allocations which equated to roughly 12% in year one, 24% in year two and 64% in year three. The multiply allocations were different, in year one 30%, year two 35% and 35% in year three. There was no indication that funding could be rolled forward or that they were going to see multi-annual allocations, which was something they were lobbying hard on, as well as exploring mechanisms with other local authorities in the region and UK Government about how they could develop some flexibility around it.

He advised that 4% of the allocations could be used for administrative purposes. The current profile set out was inclusive of that 4% of Multiply and of an allocation from the Bridgend Shared Prosperity Fund for the delivery of projects by colleagues in Cardiff Capital Region, leaving in the region of £2.5 million over profile. In September, the Communities Directorate had submitted a growth pressure as part of the 2023-2027 MTFS process to try and meet that shortfall in funding to ensure all the activities could be delivered. If the programme remained overallocated, the responsibility for identifying those gaps would sit with their respective leads in each of the Departments. If not found, the funding available would only be the funding that is allocated as they could not exceed the available budgets. He concluded that the Recommendation of the report was for the Committee to note its contents along with Appendix one.

It was asked why the top slice of £330k going to the Cardiff City Region Deal (CCRD) had been agreed, what would Bridgend receive from this funding and why could it not be funded from the contributions the Authority and the nine other partner Authorities had already made.

Referring to the Appendix Members commented that whilst full of good intent it was light on detail e.g., it was not clear what the green or net zero market referred to involved. Lastly with regard to the two-tier governance, Members queried that there had been no

mention of Town and Community Councils and asked what their role would be in governance and their ability to help with delivery.

The Corporate Director and the Group Manager, Economy, Natural Resources and Sustainability advised that there was a small element of £330k going to the CCR as a regional element of the Shared Prosperity Bid and there was recognition that whilst the fund was about local needs and delivery, there were some things better delivered regionally and across Local Authority boundaries. The CCR would look at filling some of the gaps, by bringing the amalgam of money together and having an impactful Regional Programme. The detail of every individual scheme could not be included in the report, and the appendices were an executive summary, however there were detailed cases behind them all. The intention was for a presentation to be made at the Town and Community Council Forum, asking Members of the Forum how best they see their Organisation's engagement suited in the delivery of the programme.

Members referred to the top slice if multiplied by 10 being a proportionate amount of money to deliver the deal, and in paragraph 8.2, Table 1 the percentage allocation was a regional allocation of 8.3%, but the Authority's contribution to the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal was 9.4166%, so asked the reason for the over 1% difference. They also queried why the percentage allocation for Bridgend was 8.3% of the regional allocation and the Administration Authority was receiving 16.2%.

The Corporate Director - Communities advised that the Shared Prosperity Fund was a UK Government Scheme and the CCR City Deal and their contribution were completely different things and not related. The allocation was what had been allocated by the UK Government.

Members requested more detail regarding Bridgend County Tourism event support and Bridgend local destination management and marketing.

Officers advised that the events fund that would be a resource to support event organisers to enhance and develop new events within the County Borough, as well as enhancing existing activities also to bring and attract new ones. It was clarified that the destination management side was in relation to the marketing, PR and promotion of the destination as well as opportunities to work across different businesses to develop products and packages. A revised Destination Management Plan would shortly be reported to Cabinet for consideration.

Members asked on what basis the Authority was getting 8.3% of the regional allocation, who had made the decision and who had put the case forward. Expanding that if 9.4% was their percentage of the Cardiff Capital Regional Deal, 8.3% would be a poor return from the UK Government.

Officers explained the metrics used by UK Government in determining the allocation: 40% of the decision was based on per capita; 30% was used to use the same needs-based index as was used for the Community Renewal Fund, and; 30% was allocated using the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation, to comprise the total allocation awarded.

Referring to page 26 of the report, Members asked what directly the fund was giving to Bridgend Town Centre as it had been identified as needing improvement.

The Group Manager, Economy, Natural Resources and Sustainability advised that at that point in time there was not a Ward by Ward breakdown of the money for two reasons: predominantly it was a revenue based fund, and; saving for the capital proposals, and all of which would take place across the county Team generally. While a

demographic of how many businesses from the Town Centre had applied for the fund would be available, at that point it had not been allocated.

Members requested clarity on the basis and lineage of how things go through Rhondda Cynon Taff Authority as Lead Authority, from the point that the application is made, who the application is made to and the role of the administrating Authority.

Officers advised that a draft legal agreement from Rhondda Cynon Taff had been received which set out how the claims and reporting processes would work and where the accountability would sit. It was clarified that decisions on the allocation and the splits across the region were made by the UK Government first and then within the region, and the local authorities themselves agreed who would be the Lead Authority.

Members asked how confident they could be that they could deliver £23 million in two and half to three years with such a very varied program.

The Corporate Director – Communities responded that it would be very challenging as the £23M would be split into years 1,2 and 3, a decision would not be received until October and the required percentage would need to be spent by next April. While currently they did not have the resources in the Directorate, options were being explored in terms of moving Officers from some activity onto this, to ensure every resource is maximised. Where they had continuity in revenue there was confidence but where there was new revenue and capital there would be challenges, however Officers were dedicated to making it work and if there was a shift from fixed annual allocation to multi annual allocation this key point could make a difference.

Following consideration of the report, the Committee made the following recommendations:

1. That concern is expressed over the risks involved of both insufficient funds to complete the project in addition to achieving the project proposals within the allocated time.
2. That further concern is expressed regarding the lack of resources and expertise within the Directorate and its ability to cope with the additional work associated with the project. Members did not agree that it was appropriate to transfer staff from other roles and projects as this would be counterproductive. The Committee also noted that the landscape for Local Authorities applying for funding is changing with timescales being very limited and criteria issued at a late stage in the process, meaning the Authority has a narrow timeframe to develop and formalise substantial bids. The Committee therefore recommended that priority needs to be given to resources within the Communities directorate to ensure that not only is it able to successfully take forward this project, but to ensure that the infrastructures are in place to enable the Authority to be best placed to apply and make the most of any future funding opportunities. As well as a strategic plan being developed, Members recommend that potential projects underneath this be drafted so that when the opportunity arises, they already have the basis for the application.
3. That strong concerns are expressed over the poor return that Bridgend County Borough had received in their allocation from the Shared Prosperity Fund (SPF) and the unfairness around the funding mechanism behind this.

The Committee therefore agreed to write directly to those within the UK Government responsible for the SPF to highlight the issues including:

- a. The fact that the allocation does not take into account that Bridgend is one of the fastest growing areas in Wales;
- b. The limited time the Authority has had to both put together proposals and then to utilise the fund and achieve its aims, is unreasonable and potentially puts the project and public funds at risk.

The Committee requested that this letter be copied to both local MPs; Dr Jamie Wallis and Chris Elmore.

The Committee requested:

1. A copy of any presentation made to the Town and Community Council Forum on Bridgend's Local Investment Plan proposals.
2. Further information on how claims will be processed by RCT as the Lead Authority as well as detail on the reporting and accountability process.
3. Further detail on the project proposals when available including breakdowns of the funding within each proposal.
4. Clarification as to whether there would be clawback on the funds should the outputs as set out in the proposals, not be achieved.

10. LEVELLING UP FUND PRIORITY PROJECTS

The Corporate Director - Communities introduced the report and explained the fund was the second half of the UK Government's Levelling Up Agenda which had been announced in the UK Government's spending review in 2020. It was a programme of mostly capital works with some revenue up to 2025, with an allocation of £4 billion overall across the UK, with £800 million for Wales. She advised each local authority could put in a bid for up to £20 million for each of their MP constituencies, with BCBC having two; Bridgend and Ogmore. Secondly a major transport bid for up to £50 million could be submitted. It was a capital fund which had some very specific criteria, such as supporting cultural assets, town centre and town and community regeneration and transport. She advised that bids submitted had to be 10% match funded, so money would need to be secured from either a third party, National Lottery funding or Bridgend County Borough Council itself. Two bids had been submitted one for the refurbishment of the Grand Pavilion in Porthcawl and one for the Penprysg Road Bridge in Pencoed to remove the level crossing and put in a new road bridge and footpath.

The Group Manager, Economy, Natural Resources and Sustainability presented an overview of the report, following which Members discussed the following:

Members queried whether £20M would be sufficient for the Grand Pavilion refurbishment project, taking into consideration rising prices and if not, where extra money needed could come from, and also whether Cadw were on board and accepting of the proposed alterations.

Officers advised that when opening up old buildings sometimes other unforeseen issues could become apparent, however lessons had been learned from previous schemes, and it was recognised that this scheme had a significant large contingency in it and a risk contingency against it. If there were unforeseen circumstances or costs rose, there would be a need to relook at the design and re-engineer accordingly, as there were not additional monies to spend on the building. Through value engineering they would look

at the building and what elements they could do in latter phases should more money become available. The Group Manager Strategic Regeneration advised that that Cadw were familiar with the building and were on board along with the Authority's own internal Conservation and Design Team.

Members expressed concern that if the project went ahead the Grand Pavilion would be potentially closed for up to two years and asked whether options were being explored to retain some stability for events to be provided in Porthcawl.

Officers advised once construction commenced on the building it was subject to the contractors' risk and liability insurance, so although it had been considered it was not possible to allow the use of the building during that time. However, they would work with Awen who operate the facility regarding facilities in other places.

The Chief Executive of the Awen Cultural Trust explained that their priority would always be the local users and they would work with colleagues at the Council to try and see what they do, with a possible combination of working with schools and other institutions to see what they can do to support and keep the arts going at a community level as well.

Members enquired if in terms of allocated funding for the Pavilion whether there was any scope to do some feasibility work around a temporary building somewhere in Porthcawl, e.g., Rest Bay playing field was suggested or renting a field or possibly using a car park depending on what it would be used for in the regeneration. There was interest in seeing any report or outcomes, if those discussions had taken place, as Members felt money could still be made while the Pavilion project was taking place and suggested alternative forms could also possibly be explored such as the community benefit aspect of the procurement contract and a Section 106 Agreement.

The Corporate Director - Communities and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration advised there had been conversations regarding exploring venues but unfortunately, they could not use money from the Levelling Up fund for a feasibility at that stage, as all the money had to be spent on the project and they had put a spend profile in.

Members inquired whether the anticipated number of seats would increase once the Pavilion project was completed and had there been any consideration to provide extra parking facilities on site or close to site. If not was that something that could be taken away and brought back for the Committee to look at.

The Corporate Director- Communities advised there were no plans to increase the amount of parking on site, but she did not believe they were removing the existing onsite parking. She explained they had commissioned a parking study for Porthcawl which was an important part of the regeneration.

Members asked for clarification on the one bid per MP's area and when the next funding transit would be. They were also aware that Maesteg Town Hall had a few complications meaning an increase in costs and time scales, so wondered if there would be a time period when neither of them was available, or whether subject to the bid being successful, the Grand Pavilion would not close until Maesteg Town Hall was reopened.

The Corporate Director explained the work had to be completed by April 2025, so assumed the next round would start then but would probably open in the next couple of years to be able to process beforehand. The Corporate Director - Communities and the Chief Executive of Awen Cultural Trust clarified that Maesteg Town Hall would open before the Grand Pavilion closed as if they were successful, they would still have to finish designs, submit any planning permission, go to tender, select a contractor, and get them onto site.

The Corporate Director - Communities and the Group Manager for Planning and Development Services outlined the bid for the Penprysg Road Bridge, explaining they had submitted to the Levelling Up Fund for at least £25 million to put the bridge in place. There were initial designs for the bridge, and they had started going through the Welsh Transport Appraisal Guidance (WelTAG) Process as well as some public consultation. It was a complex scheme as they would be taking away an old Victorian era infrastructure, replacing it with a modern bridge and taking away the existing overbridge at the railway station end of Pencoed, then replacing that with a fully accessible, active travel and pedestrian bridge.

Members expressed concern over whether £25 million would be sufficient for the project, whether it would be completed by 2025 and there being no option to scale back due the nature of the project. They also asked if there were any other sources of funding that could be explored.

The Corporate Director - Communities advised that in exceptional circumstances they would allow a transport bid to go into 2026. She advised that the costs could be more than the maximum bid but they did not have the full and costed design and there were attributes that could affect the amount of funding needed. She advised it was a complex project and there were a lot of unknowns at that time, but they would be heavily reliant on other partners and external agencies to play their part, as having the infrastructure in place would have a regional impact.

With regard to the regional element Members asked whether Welsh Government and Network Rail had been approached for funding support and while fully supportive of the project Members sought reassurance that when the level crossing was removed it would not cause a traffic problem through the lanes, specifically through Hendre and Coity.

Officers advised that with regard to the regional dimension Transport for Wales (TFW) and Network Rail had been involved with the steering group they had set up and were fully supportive but there was not any funding from them. To take the project forward, they had funding from Cardiff Capital Region (CCR). They did not know what was going to happen with CCR, Welsh Government and Transport funding but would be looking for funding programmes as they came forward. As the project developed and there was more certainty, the more opportunity they had of attracting additional funding through other means. With regard to assurances sought regarding traffic, before they looked at any future development proposals, they had to have an idea of what the impact would be, some of which would not be known until the new bridge was in place. However, it was something they were mindful of and recognised there was a separate piece of work that would need to be attached to this project.

Members asked whether a bid for the Ogmore constituency could be included in the next round of plans and funding.

The Corporate Director - Communities advised that over the last twelve months they had put together three different schemes for the Ogmore Constituency, but unfortunately the Levelling Up Fund Officers did not feel any of the three fitted the criteria. She wanted to clarify it was not through the lack of trying and that it had been very disappointing for the Team.

Members asked if it was a lesson learned that Bridgend County Borough Council needed to have a comprehensive strategic investment plan so that aspirations and projects were ready that may or may not fit when an opportunity arises, and whether that was being done.

The Corporate Director - Communities advised that it had been difficult as when the Levelling Up Fund was announced there had been no detailed criteria or guidance, they did not know the individuals involved and they were a new Team, so they had to base on other schemes they had done before. She advised that the Communities Directorate were outstanding at writing funding bids, so it had not been through lack of writing them, but the due to the lack of criteria available. She referred to the 2030 Strategy and the Economic Development Strategy reported to Council in March, which contained a significant number of projects, so they knew what the projects were and would like to take the schemes one step forward and have them ready, but unfortunately the Team were currently busy delivering what was in front of them. However, she would like to think they would hopefully be in a better place in the future.

Following consideration of the report, the Committee made the following recommendations:

1. Similarly, to the discussions around the SPF, concern is again expressed over the tight timescales surrounding the applications for the Levelling Up Fund as well as the timescales to complete the projects, particularly if there was no extension allowed. The Penprysg Railway Bridge was particularly at risk due to the level of work that this would involve to complete.
2. That they strongly supported the work around alternative or temporary arrangements and locations during the interim period of the Grand Pavilion in Porthcawl being closed. Particular emphasis, however, was placed on making sure Porthcawl would not lose footfall and revenue. Members requested feedback on these plans and mitigating measures when available but furthermore recommended that as part of this work, a feasibility study be undertaken on the potential for a temporary facility being put in place in Porthcawl whilst the Pavilion is closed. The proposal was made to explore the option of utilising the Section 106 aspect of the development contract in relation to mitigate the impact of the building closure on the community.

The Committee requested:

1. The timeframe for the completion of the Maesteg Town Hall project. Concerns were raised about whether the Town Hall would be completed before the Grand Pavilion closed for redevelopment. Members also requested information on what this meant for Awen revenue.
2. Further information (including a possible feasibility study requested in the above recommendations) on any proposed temporary facility and alternative arrangements whilst the Pavilion is closed.

Concerns were expressed regarding the Penprysg Railway Bridge around funding, completion and the potential impact of heavy traffic in the area. The Committee requested a briefing paper once the project had been approved, illustrating the plans that were to be put in place to monitor and mitigate the impact of traffic on both sides of the proposed bridge. On the subject of parking in Porthcawl linked to redevelopment projects such as the Grand Pavilion and the aim to increase footfall in the area, the Committee were advised of a Parking study that was currently taking place in Porthcawl as part of its Regeneration and Placemaking plans. The Committee requested that they

be involved in the development of a Strategic Transport Plan for Porthcawl and that this be added to the Committee's FWP.

11. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Having considered the report the Forward Work Programme Update the Committee requested the following items be added to the FWP:

1. An update on Highway Maintenance.
2. Pedestrian safety in historic villages.

Taxi Licensing

The Committee:

- expressed concern that taxis are only permitted to use the one DVSA accredited MOT station appointed by BCBC and that if the vehicle fails, the fixing work cannot be done there so the vehicle has to be booked in to another garage to get the fixing work completed, then rebooked in to the permitted MOT station for an additional fee and a further test, which can result in taxi's being off the road for longer, higher costs and a significant loss of earnings. The garage is also very busy with testing of South Wales Police and BCBC vehicles.
- referred to other Local Authorities, e.g. Cardiff allowing the use of any DVSA accredited MOT station which makes things easier for operators and fairer for all DVSA registered MOT stations.
- expressed concern about the potential further impact this may be having locally regarding the shortness of availability of taxis in the County Borough generally and particularly later at night.
- queried how performance / reliability of taxi's was monitored through licence renewals or otherwise and how the Authority reviews cancellations, late night cancellations, availability after hours and what is being done to enable improvement and a reliable taxi fleet.
- referred the topic to the Licensing Committee for consideration and action.

Porthcawl Regeneration Report

The Committee discussed the forthcoming report on Porthcawl Regeneration scheduled for the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 on 20 February 2023 and requested that the background to the Cosy Corner project be included in the scope of the report.

The Committee requested that representatives of the following organisations be invited to attend for the scrutiny of the report:

- Visit Wales
- Credu Charity Limited, formerly the Community Interest Company, Porthcawl Harbourside

RESOLVED: That the Committee approved the Forward Work Programme in Appendix A, subject to the above additions and requests, noted that the Forward Work Programme and any updates from the Committee would be reported to the next meeting of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee and noted the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet in Appendix B.

12. URGENT ITEMS

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2022

None

The meeting closed at Time Not Specified

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
HELD HYBRID IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET, BRIDGEND,
ON MONDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2022 AT 16:00**

Present

Councillor P Davies – Chairperson

H T Bennett	F D Bletsoe	S J Bletsoe	C Davies
M J Evans	RM Granville	S J Griffiths	M L Hughes
P W Jenkins	M Jones	MJ Kearn	W J Kendall
RL Penhale-Thomas	J E Pratt	T Thomas	G Walter
A Williams	AJ Williams	MJ Williams	

Apologies for Absence

N Clarke and I Williams

Officers:

Lucy Beard	Scrutiny Officer
Lynne Berry	Group Manager Housing & Community Regeneration
Joanne Ginn	Housing Solutions Team Leader
Ryan Jones	Strategic Housing Commissioning Manager
Jessica Mclellan	Scrutiny Officer
Martin Morgans	Head of Performance and Partnership Services
Kelly Watson	Chief Officer Legal, HR and Regulatory Services

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Ross Penhale-Thomas declared a personal interest as a full time employee of a housing and equalities charity of which Invitees were members.

Cllr Jonathan Pratt declared a personal interest as a Crisis Response Volunteer with British Red Cross.

Cllr Alex Williams declared a personal interest as a landlord in the private rental sector.

Cllr Melanie Evans declared a personal interest as a Pencoed Town Councillor.

Cllr Tim Thomas declared a personal interest as a full time employee of an organisation that represents the interests of property agents.

Cllr Martyn Jones declared a personal interest as a landlord in the private sector.

Cllr Amanda Williams declared a personal interest as a friend is on the housing register and in emergency accommodation.

Cllr Steven Bletsoe declared a personal interest as a full time employee of a membership organisation in the private rented sector and would not be taking part in any discussions relating to the private rented sector.

Cllr Heidi Bennett declared a personal interest as a landlord in the private sector.

Cllr Mike Kearn declared a personal interest as a relative is on the housing register.

Cllr Freya Bletsoe declared a personal interest as part of the family's income derived from the private rented sector and a friend is in emergency temporary accommodation.

Cllr Martin Williams declared a personal interest as a friend is in emergency temporary accommodation.

Cllr Richard Granville declared a personal interest as a person known to him is in emergency temporary accommodation.

15. **HOUSING POSITION STATEMENT**

The Head of Performance and Partnerships presented the Housing Position Statement explaining the purpose of the report was to update the Committee on policy changes to the housing services and the current rehousing and homelessness position.

The Chair read the Committee a written response received from the Coastal Housing Group who were unable to attend the meeting.

Referring to a recent statistical release from Welsh Government in which the Authority was the second worst urban local authority in Wales for social housing stock, Members asked what the plans were to reverse this trend and queried whether it was possible that commercial properties that were no longer in use following the pandemic could be converted into flats or apartments. The Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) were asked if it was possible to expand the housing stock in the County Borough to resolve the situation and improve the position.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships responded from the Authority's perspective and referring to the Programme Development Plan, Welsh Government were supporting circa £30 million per annum in terms of delivering social housing with a view to 470 houses being created over a two year period. In addition, there was Government money around the transitional phase which RSLs could bid for to improve the existing stock and fast track some accommodation being brought back into use. Within the Local Development Plan which was under Welsh Government (WG) consultation at the time they were looking at 7000 units within that plan, affordability was the key factor but with the right monies and policy in place they hoped it would take them forward in terms of development of their social housing stock and improve the reported position.

Members questioned whether the Social Housing Allocation Policy (SHAP) was still fit for purpose due to changes in pressures on people and housing since 2017 or whether a review was scheduled.

Officers advised that there was a strategy that would be consulted upon following its reporting to Cabinet and when the responses came in an action plan would be created part of which would be to review the SHAP in consultation with partners.

Members asked what options there were for the Ukrainian refugees, when their six months living with families ended for various reasons, given the social housing register wait time, whether there would an option be for families to make themselves homeless, as it was extremely difficult for them to rent from private landlords that request evidence of 6 months' rent and that potential tenants are in full time employment. It was asked whether the number of refugees in the County Borough was available.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships advised that there was concern in Housing from the refugee perspective and there was a working group led by the Head of Finance, Performance and Change monitoring the situation with multi sector involvement e.g., Social Services, Education supporting.

Officers referred to the war in Ukraine going on longer than initially anticipated by the Home Office when they advertised for hosts for a six-month period and they were seeing multiple such arrangements coming up and possibly exceeding the six month period at that time. Officers did not have the exact number to hand but advised there were around two hundred Ukrainian refugees in the County. Officers would not advise someone to present as homeless and thought it important that the homelessness services were there as a safety net for where relationships or host placements could not continue, which was the route in line with Welsh Government Guidance. In terms of the private

sector, they were seeing some Ukrainian families move into private rental properties and they had been able to support people through that.

Members asked RSLs about their void timescales, and whether all the voids would be turned around in the average number of void turnover days.

The Chief Executive of Valleys to Coast Housing explained that voids were counted from when the keys came in to when the keys go out, and advised that at the end of October they had 114 empty properties though they would always have a churn of voids which was generally around 50 properties a month, so that number would continue to change, but where they were at the end of October and the turnaround from the keys going in and going out was around 69 days in terms of ones that they could turn around.

Members referred to the flats at Parc Derwen being the last of the accommodation to be provided on the site, they did not know which Housing Association had ownership of them but asked why the flats had been left until the end, whether it was due to planning and how did Housing Associations get a say in when these premises become available. They also queried why the properties were all flats as their concern was there would be people on the waiting list waiting for bungalows and asked how the Housing Associations were involved in determining the type of property that was allocated.

The Chief Executive of Valleys to Coast Housing advised that they work with the developers as part of the Section 106 agreement in terms of where the units are, where they are building and when they will be completed as part of the hand over and they knew the need locally was for one-bedroom flats and apartments which was what they were working on with the Local Authority.

Members expressed concern regarding restrictions on people while in emergency accommodation e.g., not having their children visit and curfews at night and asked what was being done to ensure that these residents did not feel like second-class citizens in the meantime and were given as much support to continue their lives.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships explained that some of the difficulties mentioned were concerning safeguarding because temporary accommodation by its nature has a spectrum of service users being accommodated in that time. There had been challenges but he assured that in no way were any persons that present homeless deemed as a second-class citizen, and Officers were working tirelessly to find accommodation that is long term and provides a tenancy and safeguards them going forward.

Reflecting on the 254 adults and 143 children reported to be in temporary accommodation, Officers and Representatives of the RSLs were asked what their ideas were in the short and medium term to address the housing crisis.

RSLs and Officers provided their responses which included:

- Maximising the active development programme in the County: looking at land and opportunities as they came up.
- Working closely with partners in Bridgend as properties become available and allocating to those in need.
- Successfully securing Transitional Accommodation Grant funding to bring voids into use more quickly.
- Actively working with Bridgend County Borough Council (BCBC) to see how can improve processes.

- Working through Trade Bodies with Welsh Government to see how they could be flexible with the funding streams to be able to respond much more quickly.
- All allocations going directly to BCBC and last quarter all available homes went through to the rapid rehousing programme.
- Looking at all opportunities to increase supply.
- Collectively working together to identify potential land or existing buildings for conversion and how to bring through the planning system more quickly.
- A trauma informed relational coaching model of housing management adopted.
- Maximising the Transitional Grant Funding and any other funding from Welsh Government.
- Looking at how to marry up the right type of accommodation with the right support needs.
- Reducing the use of hotels for temporary accommodation.

Members referred to Valleys to Coast Housing retaining 25% of their housing stock for self-allocation and asked if that was taken into consideration along with the 114 voids and whether it restricted their current support to the crisis.

The Chief Executive of Valleys to Coast Housing advised that the allocation to BCBC was 75%, but with the crisis they had been offering all stock to the Authority.

Members questioned whether there had been an increase in homelessness and rehousing applications from ex-armed forces personnel and if so, was there a problem there and what was being done in that case to specifically support them.

Officers responded that they had not historically and did not at present have a great deal of veterans in terms of housing need and therefore they had never tailored a service around that group. They explained their support services were neutral so support could be provided to anyone, but they could probe further to see if numbers had gone up and could circulate the figures to the Committee.

Concern was expressed regarding whether allocation of accommodation for disabled and elderly people was accessible and safe and allowing them to live independently as there appeared to be a delay for older and disabled people who were trying to get modifications and adaptations to their property via a Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG). Members queried what the Authority was doing to address the backlog following the Covid lockdowns.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships assured in terms of new builds going forward they were working hard with the RSLs regarding accessibility, identifying that they want longevity for their accommodation units. They had gone through an extensive period with the disabled facilities grant over the last two years with the prevention of access to people's homes but also on internal basis, taking control of the DFG in-house in the Authority, which meant there had been some challenges. They were going to go out to procure a framework for contractors which would give them that end-to-end engagement. They had also experienced recruitment issues within their Disabled Facilities Team, so it was a balancing act with them wanting to grow in resource but not being able to recruit.

Members asked for an update on the Housing First Scheme; any outcomes and the amount of people accessing it.

Officers summarised the service and advised from a Local Authority point of view they had really committed to it, in terms of investment and have had some really good outcomes both in terms of those who had been in accommodation and supporting those

both rough sleeping and in temporary accommodation to get to a point where they could look at accommodation. They thought it was important to note that Housing First was not the answer for everyone as there was a small cohort that had too complex needs for Housing First, but they were keen to increase the accommodation models as and when the opportunities came around through the development programme.

Concern was expressed that there was difficulty in recruiting staff and a lot of posts still unfilled referred to in the report and if working for a small team could mean bigger caseloads and mistakes were more likely to happen. Members questioned what was being done to get more staff employed, had advertising been increased and was a bigger programme going to be put in place.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships responded that the reason they were going out to expand the Team was to bring a focus to the homelessness provision and the pressure points, that they were working really hard with Human Resources (HR) in terms of reviewing the job descriptions and person specifications to enable them to be proactive and use all relevant media channels supported via HR.

Members asked what the Authority was doing to engage with private rental landlords to enable them to help them help us to support housing shortfalls.

Officers explained the local housing allowance return versus the private rental sector was a big differential and somewhat mitigated the private rentals sector support, but they lobby WG regarding the local levels housing allowance to see if it could be increased. They had also introduced schemes to support service users within the private rental sector and if there are any breakdowns in terms of financial, any concerns from the landlord there would be this neutral partner. They were also looking at expanding a leasing scheme which had worked well and could also support tenants into the private sector with bond and rent in advance.

Members asked when the market did not work for them whether they could be innovative in the way their financial resources could be used, for example purchasing a hotel or a similar facility, and asked if there was a legislative reason this could not be done.

Officers advised that the instance referred to had moved quickly and they were not in position to move that quickly and they needed to look at what accommodation was needed going forward. They explained there were also restrictions on what they could fund and provide going forward. In addition, moving forward WG did not see hotel accommodation as fit for the purpose in terms of delivering a secure tenancy.

In response to a query about his vision to solve the crisis, the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations advised that this was a national crisis across Wales and the United Kingdom and they were in position where they were facing deeper cuts because of external reasons that could not be avoided. He advised they needed to be looking at creative solutions and were working as a Cabinet with the Team to continue to look at different and new solutions going forward as well as with the RSLs.

Members were concerned that the number of people reported as sleeping rough was inaccurate, referencing a WG report which detailed those sleeping rough as of the 31 August 2022.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships clarified that they did not under report and reported in line with WG Guidelines at a point in time on a specific day WG asked to count on. He advised their third sector partner had undertaken the count and they only

recorded as and when WG requested to as per the other Authorities, so there would be differentials either side of that point, it did not mean they were less active in terms of trying to mitigate or reduce those numbers. They were aware of all their rough sleeping community across the borough via their Reset Team.

Members referred to the provision of emergency housing following instances such as natural disaster, flooding, or natural or domestic fire and asked what the Council's strategy and policy is and how quickly they could get people who were victims of those type of scenarios into accommodation. With reference to paragraph 4.8 of the report and the new WG Guidance that deemed hotels unsuitable accommodation it was asked what work the Local Authority were doing for social and private tenants whose landlords did not have sufficient insurances to provide emergency housing and private homeowners who did not have sufficient insurances, so the default was to move to the Local Authority.

The Head of Performance and Partnerships responded that in the case of an individual household, they would deal with it as a homelessness presentation emerging, however if it was on a larger scale, they would invoke their emergency disaster recovery plans whereby they could facilitate short term accommodation within the Life Centre in Bridgend. With regard to the WG perspective that hotel accommodation was not fit for purpose for a long-term tenancy accommodation requirement, they were working with partners and looking at transitional fund opportunities and to not use hotels, which was ultimately their position statement.

Members discussed maintaining demographics across the community in order to reach the widest population. They wondered what was being done with RSLs, in particular, to ensure that they were maintaining sustainability of their communities so that older people can maintain their roots in their communities and enable them to move out of properties that are inhospitable or inaccessible for whatever reason and are able to maintain their independence in the local community in 1 or 2 bedroom properties or properties suitable for their needs.

RSLs responded that they help people stay happy and healthy in their homes, by utilising DFGs and adaptations and supporting third sector agencies like Care and Repair. In addition to the stock that they had in the area at that time, they always looked to develop new accommodation, where they could make ground floor flats in the area as accessible as possible and build smaller accommodation like 1 or 2 bed flats where they could and support through the Social Housing Grant is based on housing need for the area. They advised bungalows could be expensive to develop and there was not always the land to make those developments feasible going forward, but they certainly always looked to try and create mixed communities and where possible keep people in their homes.

With regard to the new Renting Homes (Wales) Act (the Act) which states that social housing properties have to be fit for human habitation, Members asked whether that would increase the void times as the houses needed to meet a specified qualified criteria such as carbon monoxide sensors and wired smoke alarms.

RSLs advised they were doing an assessment in terms of the requirements of the Act coming into effect and the increase in standards, but they would not want to see it impacting on voids. They advised that some of the things Members mentioned such as smoke and carbon monoxide alarms were already ensured. Although the Act did bring in a higher standard for a lot of rental stock and around thirteen different terms of fitness of human habitation and requirements, and they were going through what those standards meant and would bring about.

Members raised concern regarding the backlog of repairs and maintenance of properties that had built up since the Covid pandemic and the need to address general maintenance for the wellbeing of particularly of the older people that were living and had lived in those properties for forty years or more.

The Chief Executive of Valley to Coast Housing assured members they were making headway on the backlog which was a result of the pandemic. She explained that they had a pot of money which they needed to prioritise based on the stock condition surveys for each of their properties. She advised they only received a dowry payment for the first five years following Housing Stock Transfer to meet tenant promises and that loss of investment had been noticeable in Bridgend, but they were addressing it and had been getting the support of the local members of the Senedd to take this forward. She concluded that all their properties had a stock condition survey which they use to prioritise, and they were making improvements, their complaints had reduced and the backlog around routine repairs had reduced.

The Chairperson advised that there were no further questions for the Invitees, thanked Invitees for their attendance and they left the meeting.

Following consideration of the report, the Committee made the following recommendations:

1. That the Committee write to The Group Manager Planning and Development Services and ask how to ensure better consultation between Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) and housing developers regarding the types and corresponding numbers of accommodation being built and the prioritisation for properties for RSLs.
2. That the Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) provide a written response on their short- and medium-term ideas to tackle the housing crisis and how to bring forward more opportunities.

The Committee further requested:

1. Information on how many veterans/ex-service personnel have presented homeless to the Authority and requiring accommodation.
2. Information from Development Control regarding previous social housing developments and how many social housing units had been diminished in return for 106 monies.
3. That the Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) be asked if they could possibly provide information about the availability of the Physical Adaptation Grant (PAG) and the impact it has on housing waiting lists for people with disabilities or awaiting Disabled Facilities Grants.

16. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Scrutiny Officer presented the Committee with the Forward Work Programme (FWP) in Appendix A for discussion and consideration, requested any specific information the Committee identified to be included in the items for the next two meetings, including invitees they wished to attend, requested the Committee to identify any further items for consideration on the FWP having regard to the selection criteria in paragraph 4.3 and asked the Committee to note that the FWP for the Committee would be reported to the next meeting of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2022

There were no further items identified for consideration on the Forward Work Programme having regard to the selection criteria in paragraph 4.3, and this could be revisited at the next meeting.

There were no requests to include specific information in the item for the next meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Committee approved the Forward Work Programme in Appendix A, noted that the Forward Work Programme would be reported to the next meeting of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee and noted The Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet in Appendix B.

17. **URGENT ITEMS**

None

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 12 DECEMBER 2022

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
HELD HYBRID IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET,
BRIDGEND, CF31 4WB ON MONDAY, 12 DECEMBER 2022 AT 16:00**

Present

Councillor P Davies – Chairperson

S J Bletsoe
W J Kendall
MJ Williams

N Clarke
J E Pratt

C Davies
G Walter

M J Evans
I Williams

Officers:

Lucy Beard	Scrutiny Officer
Nicola Echanis	Head of Education & Family Support
Rachel Keepins	Democratic Services Manager
Meryl Lawrence	Senior Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny
Claire Marchant	Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing
Jessica Mclellan	Scrutiny Officer
Janine Nightingale	Corporate Director - Communities
Andrew Thomas	Group Manager Sports & Physical Activity

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Members listed below declared personal interests in Agenda item 3 - Play Sufficiency Duty, Assessment and Action Plan to Secure Sufficient Opportunities in Bridgend County Borough, as indicated:

Councillor Ian Williams, Member of Bridgend Town Council, Governor of Oldcastle Primary School and Brynteg Comprehensive School.

Councillor Jonathan Edward Pratt, Member of Porthcawl Town Council.

Councillor Melanie Evans, Member of Pencoed Town Council, Community Governor of Pencoed Comprehensive and Croesty Primary Schools.

Councillor Paul Davies, Member of Maesteg Town Council, Governor of Caerau Primary and Nantyffyllon Primary Schools.

Councillor Steven Bletsoe, Member of Bridgend Town Council, Member of Coity Higher Community Council and Governor of Penybont School.

Councillor Martyn Williams, Member of Coity Higher Community Council and St Brides Minor Community Council.

20. PLAY SUFFICIENCY DUTY, ASSESSMENT AND ACTION PLAN TO SECURE SUFFICIENT OPPORTUNITIES IN BRIDGEND COUNTY BOROUGH

The Corporate Director - Social Services and Wellbeing presented the report and explained that the right to play was a central right for children in Wales not just for smaller children but through to the age of 25. The report reflected the impact on children and young people of the COVID-19 pandemic and the extended periods of lockdown. She explained that as well as understanding the assessment, it was also important to

note the action plan which was attached and the whole Council and partnership approach, which was required to deliver that action plan.

The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing gave a presentation on the draft assessment, explaining that the draft had been submitted to Welsh Government as required in June, and the process continued through scrutiny and eventually to Cabinet for sign off. This was a three year cycle but there was also annual action planning and an opportunity for engagement on the various matters throughout the year.

The Chair thanked the Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing for the presentation and Members discussed the following:

A Member referred to the phrase “One Council” and asked how this worked in relation to this report.

The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing advised that there was National Guidance on how this should work, with strategic leadership through the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations, a lead Corporate Director and support from both the Communities and Education Directorates. The matters crossed over and all relevant partners should be thinking beyond their own specific area of work and how it interfaced and the impact in terms of a broader Council. The Corporate Director of Social Services and Wellbeing advised that this was demonstrated by the number of Cabinet Members, Corporate Directors and Representatives in attendance at the meeting and that the key partners Halo, Awen, BAVO and schools were all key to the delivery both individually and collectively.

The Chairperson asked for a link to the National Guidance to be circulated to Committee Members.

A Member referred to 4.3c of the report: “To have regard to children and young people with diverse needs, including those living with disabilities or additional needs” and asked if the Authority had been consulting with and involving disabled people, children, parents and carers over the plans for improvement.

The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing advised that he had children with disabilities and was until recently, a Board Member of Disabilities Board, Wales who ran bespoke programmes and that there was feedback from discovery days that shaped the activities and opportunities. They surveyed around 300 young people with additional needs as part of a bigger survey that had provided specific data. They had tried to capture the voices of young people with disabilities, without people speaking for them.

The Member explained that his question was predominantly concerned with playgrounds having accessible equipment for children in wheelchairs and that there was not one piece of wheelchair accessible playground equipment in the Bridgend Central Wards, meaning this part of Bridgend was without any wheelchair accessible equipment.

The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing advised that one of the challenges was when looking at the broader picture, there were just over 40 children attending Heronsbridge in wheelchairs and that school had a wheelchair accessible swing, and roundabout. There were twenty children across both primary and secondary however he was not aware of the number that could transfer from the wheelchair to the equipment. Wheelchair users accounted for one part, there were also 600 young people with autism and 700 with behavioral, emotional and social issues and those with sensory impairments.

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations replied that they had not only to be One Council, but also One County Borough. He welcomed involvement from all Members as this was a growing provision but also recognised the huge amount of consultation that had already been undertaken.

The Cabinet Member for Communities reported that the intention was that every Ward would have at least one area with accessible play equipment across the Borough.

A Member referred to the financial implications in the covering report as this was a comprehensive far-reaching piece of work and that it was unacceptable to read that the financial implications were uncertain and he asked for further explanation.

The Corporate Director of Social Services and Wellbeing replied that there had been significant investment into play areas already as part of the budget for this year. The budget for next year would be set by the Council in the new year once the settlement had been received and the priorities in this plan alongside all the other priorities across the Council would need to be properly costed and considered as part of that budget setting process. The work of the Strategic Leadership Group would need to get into the detail about the budgetary implications of all the elements, but it was a moving picture because of the fact that the money came through in various ways.

A Member referred to the Cabinet Member's comment that it should be looked at as one County Borough rather than individual areas and highlighted the statement made by the Commissioner for Future Generations that people should have access to green spaces within 20 minutes' walk of their house. He advised if they were going to create a low carbon environment then they could not expect those with additional needs to travel long distances, therefore they had to act as Ward Councillors and campaign for local matters.

The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing explained there had always been uncertainty in this area but in recent times there had been significant investment in play facilities. They were looking at how to pool resources to get the best value from them and at ways of bringing in partners. They had costed the plan originally but there was some uncertainty regarding some of the funding.

The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that this was not only about play facilities and that when it came to green spaces they had to ensure that these were fully accessible. This area would take less resources and was often overlooked.

A Member referred to the years 2016 and 2019 on page 30 of the report and asked if these figures were 3 years out of date. The Corporate Director of Social Services and Wellbeing advised that the figures were for the current period and the dates need updating.

A Member referred to the assessment of the population which was based on data in 2019 and asked if the data that was anticipated in early summer 2022, had been received? The Corporate Director of Social Services and Wellbeing replied that they had not updated all the needs assessments with the new data however it was a live document, the assessment was undertaken at a moment in time and engagement would continue leading to changes in the priorities based on fresh data and evidence.

A Member asked if the pandemic was responsible for a number of the indicators changing from green to amber. The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing explained that this was a major contributor. They had surveyed 4,300 people and the negative impact was mainly as a result of lifestyle changes such as reduced levels of activity. He added that there was commonality across data sets.

The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations added that it was not just Covid impacting on delivery or engagement, there was also a raft of new things such as the impact on mental health and lifestyle, and working with communities to rebuild that would be key over the next few years.

The Chairperson asked what steps were being taken to increase involvement. The Corporate Director of Social Services and Wellbeing explained that the Summer of Fun was a major initiative across Wales. The team was working with partners around the most vulnerable on projects such as the Vulnerable Hub and Discovery Days focussing on the children that were most impacted by the pandemic. There were also problems securing a workforce to deliver the summer programmes. There were a range of bespoke packages developing, on the premise that without good wellbeing, a child would be less inclined to engage in play, sport, arts or whatever.

A Member commented that only 5 Town and Community Councils had responded and that the deadline for responses was May 2022 which was the month of the election. If responses were being sought by a deadline, then Officers should be mindful of the timing of deadlines for responses.

A Member referred to the removal of 'no ball games' signs to encourage more children to play in the community. He explained that one of the Social Landlords in the area wrote letters to residents telling them they would be in breach of their tenancy agreements if they allowed their children to play in the street. Residents had raised this, there had been a public meeting where it was accepted they had no right to do so. At this meeting residents explained that they had been waiting almost 5 years for a play park to be funded under Section 106 money, which had already been transferred to BCBC. A Ward Member had been working to resolve this matter and had been advised there could be a direct payment to the Community Council to install the park, but was later advised differently. He asked how they could influence unhelpful behaviour from the Housing Associations and also in light of the One Council conversation, how could they work together to get the park installed.

The Cabinet Member for Communities explained that he had recently met with Officers and that play area was out for tender for design and build. The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations advised that this related to how the Registered Social Landlords (RSL's) were held to account as organisations they had to work with, and agreed to raise the matter with RSL's at the next opportunity.

A Member referred to the provision of open space and asked whether two playgrounds offered sufficient provision for 5.5k residents in the Oldcastle Ward. The Cabinet Member for Communities replied that as in the revised LDP, the Outdoor Play and Space Audit indicated that many Wards had a deficit in play provision, and there was a commitment to refurbish the current areas before creating new ones.

A Member referred to dog fouling and recent incidents in his Ward and suggested that signs indicating play areas might encourage responsible dog owners to keep their pets away from those areas making those areas safer for children to play in. The Cabinet Member for Communities agreed and confirmed that a report was being submitted to Cabinet shortly regarding a Public Spaces Protection Order which would enable the addressing of this issue.

A Member asked if there could be some positive actions proposed in relation to C14 to take it out of red and straight to green, rather than the potential to revisit. The Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations replied that there were a lot of issues being raised in relation to bringing houses up to standard but he would raise this with Registered Social Landlords and continue to raise it going forward.

A Member referred to the cost of school facilities for grass roots sports. At CCYD there were 3 all-weather pitches. Recently grass roots games had been arranged but had to be called off because a pitch was waterlogged, but they were unable to use the all-weather pitches because it was too costly, or there was a perception that it would be too costly. There was a similar example in Coety with a community room, which was seldom used by the community because of the cost of using it. He asked why these facilities could not be more readily available. The Cabinet Member for Education replied that these pitches were for community use. The fees were set by Head Teachers and Governing Bodies. There were guidelines on what community use was and he was happy to work with schools on this matter. It also depended on what the clubs were willing and could afford to pay. Schools were at the heart of the community and should be for community use and the price should reflect that whilst also taking into account cost recovery. The Cabinet Member for Education agreed to talk to the Member following the meeting to discuss the matter further.

A Member asked if there was a mechanism for facilities to be used at short notice. The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing replied that there was a hybrid of arrangements in place. Demand was high for these facilities and the cost to operate was high.

A Member asked about point F8 on page 72 of the report, "The Local Authority has an accessible and well-known way of arranging temporary road closures, to support more children to play outside their homes". He advised that the process was not well known and asked for further information. The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing agreed that it was not well known and should not be amber. Members discussed the cost of a road closure and volunteers to support the scheme and the Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing agreed to look at this issue again.

A Member felt there was a lack of opportunity to have an ambitious open conversation between the Town and Community Council and the Council. The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing, the CAT process and Section 106 Agreements were in different areas, so nothing was joined up and it was not a proper partnership. The Cabinet Member for Communities replied that they needed to do better with regard to working with Town and Community Councils and should work on that area.

A Member asked how the survey for 0-3 years age groups conducted with partner schools was organised. He added that more engagement for activities for 0-3 year olds would be useful. The Group Manager for Prevention and Wellbeing agreed to share the information he had.

The Chairperson advised that there were no further questions for the invitees and thanked them for their attendance and they left the meeting.

RESOLVED:

Following detailed consideration and discussions with Officers and Cabinet Members, the Committee made the following Recommendations:

1. When seeking the views of Town and Community Councils, Officers be mindful of the timing of survey response deadlines, and seek to avoid traditionally busy times for Councils, such as the beginning of May, to ensure maximum engagement. (CM/AT)
2. That consideration be given to whether there should be a mechanism in place to enable clubs/organisations to use community facilities, such as sports pitches,

out of hours, should the weather prevent them from using their usual facilities.
(CM/AT)

3. That consideration be given to how the partnership between Town and Community Councils and Bridgend County Borough Council could be strengthened to ensure more cohesion and a less transactional relationship.
(CM/AT)
4. That Officers reflect on how well known the procedure to arrange temporary road closures is and consider how the procedure can best be promoted. (CM/AT)
5. That consideration be given to revisiting the objective of erecting signs such as Play Priority Signs and exploring with Registered Social Landlords the removal of existing No Ball Games signage where appropriate, to encourage more children to play outside their homes. (CM/AT)

Additional Information:

The Committee requested:

6. The National Guidance on the 'One Council' approach and an explanation of what the 'One Council' process and aspirations are in relation to the report as well as how the model of strategic leadership within the Guidance functions. (CM/AT)
7. Confirmation of how the Local Authority engaged the views of 0-3 year olds or their families in the Family wellbeing survey for 0-3 years age groups conducted with partner schools. (CM/AT)

21. FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Scrutiny Officer presented the Committee with the proposed draft outline Forward Work Programme (FWP) attached at Appendix A to the report for discussion and consideration. The SOSC forward work programme would be included in the next report to COSC with any updates from each meeting included.

The Scrutiny Officer explained that the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet was attached as Appendix B to track responses to the Committee's recommendations. She drew Members' attention to Appendix A and the addition of the Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23 to 2025/26 and Budget Proposals which was on the 23rd of January 2023. She advised that the Homelessness Strategy would now be scheduled for April and with the Committee's agreement, the Bridgend 2030 Net Zero Carbon Strategy, the Biodiversity Action Plan and the Future Waste Services Work Streams would be scheduled for future meetings.

A Member explained that he was disappointed that they had not seen the Just Solutions report into Major Parks for BCBC. This was aimed at Newbridge Fields, Maesteg Welfare Park and Aberfields including Waun Llwyd Playing Fields and he hoped there were no recommendations in that report which overlapped with decisions being made at that meeting. The Chair confirmed that the report was not yet available but it was expected shortly. The Member asked if the report could be included in the Forward Work Programme.

The Democratic Services Manager suggested that when the report was published, they could consider the detail and decide if it should come to a future meeting for consideration or be circulated as an information item. No officers had seen the report but it could be linked to Community Asset Transfers in which case it would be more

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 12 DECEMBER 2022

appropriate to have an item on overall community asset transfers. They could send the report to committee members inviting comments and decide on the best way forward.

A member referred to page 141, the Shared Prosperity Fund and asked if any feedback had been received from UK Government, Dr Jamie Wallis or Chris Elmore in relation to the letter regarding the Shared Prosperity Fund. The Scrutiny Officer replied that she had not seen anything and she would follow it up.

RESOLVED: That the Committee approved the Forward Work Programme in Appendix A, noted that the Forward Work Programme would be reported to a meeting of the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee, following the next cycle of Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings and noted the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet in Appendix B.

22. URGENT ITEMS

None.

The meeting closed at 18:05

This page is intentionally left blank

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - WEDNESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2023

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
HELD HYBRID IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET,
BRIDGEND, CF31 4WB ON WEDNESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2023 AT 16:00**

Present

Councillor P Davies – Chairperson

S J Bletsoe	N Clarke	C Davies	P W Jenkins
MJ Kearn	W J Kendall	J E Pratt	G Walter
I Williams	MJ Williams		

Apologies for Absence

M J Evans, T Thomas

Officers:

Rachel Keeps	Democratic Services Manager
Meryl Lawrence	Senior Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny
Jessica Mclellan	Scrutiny Officer
Kelly Watson	Chief Officer Legal, HR and Regulatory Services

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

25. CALL IN OF CABINET DECISION: BRIDGEND 2030 NET ZERO CARBON STRATEGY

The Senior Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny presented the report the purpose of which was to enable the Committee to scrutinise the decision of Cabinet of 13 December 2022 in relation to the report on Bridgend 2030 Net Zero Carbon Strategy.

She advised that, in accordance with Section 7.23 of the Council's Constitution, three Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, and one Scrutiny Chair, had requested that an Executive decision made by Cabinet on the 13 December 2022 be Called-In.

She advised that the Committee was recommended to consider the Cabinet decision of 13 December 2022 relating to Bridgend 2030 Net Zero Carbon Strategy and to determine whether it wished to:

- i) refer the decision back to Cabinet for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns; or
- ii) decide not to refer the matter back to the Cabinet.

The Chairperson invited the Members who had supported the Call In to speak on the reasons for the Call In.

Members stated the main reasons for the Call In included:

- Shortcomings in the Strategy and in the questioning by the Cabinet when making the Decision.
- There was no real information or understanding of the financial impact of the policy decision.
- A lack of clarity as to how performance would be monitored.

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - WEDNESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2023

- Whether the Strategy was being given the correct oversight and governance and whether it should sit at a higher level.
- There was a lack of clarity about how the delivery of the Strategy would be resourced.
- Concern regarding the 34,000-tonne shortfall in achieving the target of net zero carbon, the cost of it and what was being done to mitigate against it.

The Leader of the Council (the Leader):

- Highlighted the importance of the topic of climate change and the need for all to play a part in the response to it.
- Advised that the monitoring of the target and delivery of the Strategy would be through the Corporate Plan which is scrutinised on at least a quarterly basis through the Corporate Performance framework
- Advised that the performance measures around the net zero plan would be identified and measured at a corporate level and that directorate business plans would also include relevant targets and performance indicators.
- Informed that the Strategy would be owned by full Council at the highest level of planning framework for the Authority.
- Advised that they were committed to fully reviewing the strategy in 2024 and 2027 due to the decarbonisation industry and technology changing and welcomed Scrutiny input into the review.
- Highlighted the volatility of costs and the need to adapt to changes.
- Advised that it was a shared agenda with Welsh Government and the UK Government and recognised that some changes would be expensive, and that significant financial support was required from central government.

The Cabinet Member for Communities:

- Advised that the Strategy was a corporate document and whilst managed by the Communities Directorate, there were regular meetings of the Carbon Reduction Board which were attended by Officers from all Directorates and following which, actions were put into the Corporate Performance Assessment (CPA).
- Highlighted the difficulty in putting a cost on the delivery of the Strategy including its possible inaccuracy and the resource required to reach a figure.
- In relation to performance, highlighted that the Strategy has 6 action plans with lead officers identified for each theme.
- Advised that there was more work and learning to be done to achieve net zero carbon in 7 years.

The Head of Operations - Community Services:

- Agreed that a Strategy would normally be accompanied by costings but that this Strategy was a very fluid, dynamic and developing one.
- Highlighted the dynamic development of technology, the volatility of cost of replacing equipment, and uncertainty around grant funding.
- Advised that any costing would be subject to so many variables that it would only be a 'best guess' and that the focus ought to be on the approach and individual initiatives.
- In relation to performance and monitoring, reminded Members that the topic had been taken to a Scrutiny Committee in July 2021, where discussions were held around key performance indicators (KPIs) and the development of an annual monitoring tool and that much of what was in the Strategy was informed by that Scrutiny discussion.

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - WEDNESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2023

- Highlighted areas of the report which demonstrated performance monitoring and that the level of detail being asked requested would be more appropriate for CPA, Scrutiny meetings and a delivery plan.
- In relation to oversight and governance, he highlighted the journey the Strategy had taken through various meetings and public consultation and the opportunities for Members to be involved in the development of the Strategy before it was approved by Cabinet in December 2023.
- Advised that the Strategy was managed by the Communities Directorate because it was largely evolved from that Directorate but that what was important was for it to be given the resources needed to drive it forward.
- Highlighted that the linear charts in the report were for illustrative purposes and would change with the implementation of initiatives.

The Chairperson invited any other Members who had supported the Call-In to speak and then invited any other Members of the Committee to ask questions or comment.

In relation to a Member query regarding the cost of offsetting the residual carbon and whether the cost would be spread over 7 years or evaluated and paid in 2030, the Head of Operations – Communities Services cautioned against trying to cost individual elements, as each initiative would have cost differentials which could narrow or grow and could produce a wildly inaccurate figure. In terms of offsetting, he advised that it needed to be considered prior to 2030 because there would be a requirement and timescale to deliver the offsetting.

The Cabinet Member for Communities advised that the level of predicted shortfall might also be subject to change as technology changes and highlighted the extent and benefits of tree planting.

The Leader advised that the Council should view carbon offsetting options as opportunities and highlighted the importance of the review due to the changing technology and costs meaning future financial implications were harder to forecast.

Whilst future costs might be difficult to calculate and technology might change, a Member queried why there could be no certainty regarding initiatives and costs for the delivery of the reduction over the next 12 to 18 months.

The Cabinet Member for Communities advised that there were 6 action plans contained within the Implementation Plan with set targets and dates, some of which could be measured by the end of the year.

In response to a question as to whether there had been any discussion about the Strategy being managed by a different Directorate and whether an additional Cabinet post was required for it, the Leader advised that whilst it had evolved, many of the areas requiring significant change were within the Communities Directorate and, therefore, there were natural synergies and links with that Directorate but that there would be a requirement for Officers from across the Authority to contribute. He advised that there were no plans for another Cabinet post and highlighted the commitment and passion of the Cabinet Member for Communities and the Corporate Director for Communities.

A Member felt that an indicative cost needed to be assigned to the Strategy to inform the public and queried why there was no reference in the Strategy to the protection of mature trees, highlighting that they capture more carbon than newly planted trees.

The Head of Operations - Community Services advised that they could put together some broad-brush costs but, due to the volatility, it could show a distorted and misleading picture which detracted from the Strategy itself.

The Cabinet Member for Communities highlighted the work being done to manage mature trees and agreed that the plan may need to be updated to reflect that.

In response to a query why the Strategy contained KPIs agreed in 2021 with the Carbon Trust but no financial or performance targets, the Head of Operations - Community Services clarified the work that the Carbon Trust had been commissioned to do that had been relayed to a Scrutiny Committee in July 2021 and advised that he would only be repeating his earlier points regarding cost.

In response to a query regarding the finance for the Strategy, the Head of Operations - Community Services advised that there was a budget pressure revenue growth proposal of £883,000 for consideration next year or finance would come from the revenue budget which would create its own budget pressure.

In relation to whether the budget pressure would mean a cut to services or an increase in Council Tax, the Leader advised that there was a long list of compelling proposals for budget growth for next year for consideration as part of the budget setting process, but highlighted the need to limit growth in order to keep any Council Tax increase as low as possible.

In response to a concern from a Member that Swansea City Council had put a cost to their Strategy whilst Bridgend had not, the Head of Operations – Community Services advised that whilst they could produce a number and publish it, it would be subject to such variation due to volatility of costs and changing technology that it would almost immediately be out of date.

In response to a question regarding whether there was a financial penalty for failing to reach net zero carbon, he advised that it was not currently statutory so there were no targets or fines. However, he highlighted previous Welsh Government Strategies and targets which had followed a route of introduction of an ambitious target, followed by grant funding to support achievement of the target and then the introduction of a fine for not achieving it.

The Leader advised that the public were more interested in the action taken and delivery rather than the production of a figure and highlighted that the figure produced by Swansea City Council was not a complete figure as it did not include their commitment to decarbonising housing. He continued that they would consider how best to communicate a summary of the action plans and timescales to the public and Members.

In response to a query as to whether there was a need for a study of the complexity and cost of carbon reduction and the necessity for such a forward-looking Strategy, the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing and Future Generations highlighted that the United Nations, UK Government and the Council had declared a climate emergency and that the Strategy is to combat that.

A Member queried whether Council reports should include a carbon cost measure and the Head of Operations – Community Services advised that it had been a recommendation from Scrutiny which had not yet been implemented, but agreed that it should be included in standard report templates.

The Chief Officer - Legal & Regulatory Services, HR & Corporate Policy advised that there was to be a commitment to review the corporate template to align with the Council's duties and new Corporate Objectives, once adopted. It was also hoped that an executive summary would also be included.

The Leader advised that it was important for a carbon consideration to be included in the template as it affected every decision made and suggested that it could sit with the heading in the template regarding the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 implications.

The Chairperson advised that Members of the Committee who wanted to ask questions had all spoken, so as there were no further questions for the invitees, thanked them for their attendance and they left the meeting.

The Chairperson invited Members of the Committee, having regard to whether it was satisfied with the responses, whether it wished to:

- a) Refer the decision back to the Cabinet for reconsideration, setting out the reasons and rationale for the request;
- or
- b) Decide not to refer the matter back to the Cabinet.

Members of the Committee discussed the following:

Members considered that such a significant strategy ought to have some form of credible cost attributed to it. It was acknowledged that there should be a way of communicating indicative costs which would not be too unreliable or too misleading rather than providing no costs at all. It was discussed how costs for the full strategy would evolve over time.

Reference was made to the identified key milestones to be achieved by 2024 within the 'Route map to a Net Zero Bridgend', contained in Appendix 1 to the Strategy, and that Cabinet could consider how best costs could be applied to these planned actions to achieve the significant carbon savings identified.

Members noted that residents would be concerned about the cost of their council tax and impact on council services considering the significant budget pressures expected in the coming years and considered that both the short term and longer-term financial implications of the strategy should be made public to inform residents on where their money would be used.

RESOLVED: Following its examination of the decision, and having regard to the above, the Committee decided to recommend that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration for the following reason:

Concerns were expressed about the lack of costing information contained in the original Cabinet report and Members felt that Cabinet needed to consider the wider financial costs before making the decision, with indicative longer term financial implications and more detail on the costs of achieving the 2024 milestones.

The meeting closed at 18:55

This page is intentionally left blank

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 23 JANUARY 2023

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
HELD HYBRID IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET,
BRIDGEND, CF31 4WB ON MONDAY, 23 JANUARY 2023 AT 16:00**

Present

Councillor – Chairperson

S J Bletsoe	N Clarke	C Davies	M J Evans
P W Jenkins	MJ Kearn	W J Kendall	J E Pratt
G Walter	MJ Williams		

Apologies for Absence

P Davies and I Williams

Officers:

Victoria Adams	Interim Finance Manager – Budget Management: Communities, Education and Family Support
Lucy Beard	Scrutiny Officer
Rachel Keepins	Democratic Services Manager
Meryl Lawrence	Senior Democratic Services Officer - Scrutiny
Jessica Mclellan	Scrutiny Officer
Janine Nightingale	Corporate Director - Communities
Mark Shephard	Chief Executive

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jonathan Pratt declared a personal interest as his wife is a teacher employed by Bridgend County Borough Council, and as a member of HM Coastguard Search and Rescue in Porthcawl.

Councillor Norah Clarke declared a personal interest as a volunteer for Porthcawl RNLI and a member of Rest Bay Lifeguard Club. and that her son is a RNLI crew member and a member of the Rest Bay Lifeguard Club.

Councillor Melanie Evans declared a personal interest as a member of Pencoed Town Council.

Councillor Martin Williams declared a personal interest as a member of Coity Higher Community Council.

28. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2023-24 TO 2026-27

The Chief Officer – Finance, Performance and Change presented a summary of the report, the purpose of which was to present the Committee with the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2023-24 to 2026-27, which set out the spending priorities of the Council, key investment objectives and budget areas targeted for necessary savings. The strategy included a financial forecast for 2023-2027 and a detailed draft revenue budget for 2023-24.

The Chair thanked the Chief Officer Finance, Performance and Change and invited questions.

Members questioned if delivery models would continue into the next financial year and in addition to Community Asset Transfers (CATs) and the City Deal, asked how the Directorate intended to develop alternative delivery models and with whom. Officers advised there was not anything in the pipeline for the year ahead, but it did not mean they would not look at others in future. Members discussed alternative delivery models in particular partnering with Town and Community Councils (TCC) and devolving more services to them. Officers agreed they would be happy to have an open dialogue and advised that the job description of the CAT Officer who liaises with TCCs had been broadened to include those type of discussions, and a corporate position on policy would be reported to full Council / Cabinet Members.

Discussions were held regarding the significant reduction in volume of residual waste which was expected to benefit the Council financially over time and whether it would make a return over the period of this MTFS. Officers advised when talking about reducing tonnage, it was a reduction on an increase and that it was still higher than it used to be pre Covid but was an indication it was moving downwards. Members questioned if more people were working at home whether there was a decrease in waste being generated at their offices and therefore was there an efficiency and saving. Officers informed Members there had been a small reduction in their waste arising at Civic but compared to the entire domestic network of properties they were two quite different scale issues. So, in terms of budgetary settings, any saving tonnage at the civic waste production bins was going to be negligible compared to the overall.

The Committee referred to the Council's strategy to protect and invest in services provided to the most vulnerable and make reductions where it could have the least impact across Council services, and asked whether consideration had been given that it could be false economy for example to remove waste enforcement as it could lead to more fly tipping. They asked how many prosecutions had taken place and penalties issued on yearly basis with regards to fly tipping. Officers expressed they were uncomfortable with putting the waste enforcement team forward as although there may be initial savings not having the team could result in fly tipping, but they did need to produce a balanced budget, so appreciated Scrutiny's consideration going forward. Officers advised the Enforcement team had only been in place for eighteen months and had been concentrating on educating and community campaigns so there had not been a lot of legal enforcements, but as a result of visiting the communities and speaking to people recycling rates had improved. Members expressed that when looking for proposals they would like to propose this budget cut was not considered.

The Committee referred to the Council resolving the previous year to investigate opportunities to restructure or put on hold contributions to the Cardiff Capital Regional City Deal and asked for an update on progress. Officers advised legal advice had been sought, the cost of withdrawing would be excessive and the Authority received more than it contributed. .

The Committee referred to Medium Term Financial principles and the consideration of future income and expenditure scenarios and asked whether within the Directorate there were services that could provide income generation and additional charges. They also questioned if the Directorate was satisfied, they were utilising their partners and organisations to their full potential. Officers advised regarding income generation it was an important principle and they looked at all ways to be robust, they had been good at grant sourcing and had brought in £41M to the Directorate and were definitely trying to use all their partners to their full potential of which examples were given.

Members referred to the principle stated that all services would seek to provide value for money and asked for an explanation as to how they measure value for money and were they satisfied they were fulfilling that measure. Officers responded there were a number

of ways they provided value for money, one was benchmarking in which they look at what other local authorities and partners are providing, they also had to do things within a financial envelope and ensure they have the best product for the monies they pay. Finally, an important thing was longevity, talking about sustainability and future generations.

With regard to timescales, Members asked what was realistic, what measures were in place to ensure delivery and the consequences of not delivering on timescales and unforeseen obstacles. Officers explained in relation to the timescales, ten years previous they would have set their budgets prior to Christmas however they did not have that opportunity now as Westminster were getting later when giving a consequential to Wales, so they would do a budget formulation as quickly as they could in the timescales available to them.

The Committee questioned the proposal to charge Blue badge holders to park and asked whether that proposal maintained the subsidised car parking that was offered to staff and Councillors. Officers advised that Bridgend was one of the only authorities in Wales that currently did not charge Blue badge holders for parking, but were proposing to charge going forward. With regard to staff and Members subsidised parking, the scheme had been suspended during the pandemic. Members expressed that if they were one of the last Councils to offer free parking for Blue badge holders, it should try to maintain this if possible.

The Committee referred to the proposal for closure of Community Recycling Centres for one weekday each and questioned how the week day for each would be decided. They also asked about the new facility being provided on the Pyle industrial estate. Officers advised the Pyle scheme was complete and had been for fourteen months but Kier as the operators were still waiting on a license to operate from Natural Resources Wales. Officers advised that regarding the days of closure they would look at the day there was least amount of traffic and demand in each of the sites as well as doing a separate consultation on the proposal before implementation.

Members raised the potential cost pressure mentioned in a previous meeting relating to net zero carbon next year of in the region of £800k which they could not see itemised in Appendix A and questioned whether that was in addition to what was listed there. Officers explained it had been difficult as they had £20M worth of pressures put forward in all Directorates and only £10 M had gone forward, meaning £10M had not gone forward, sixteen of which belonging to Communities.

Discussions were held by Members regarding proposed reductions in Appendix B and recalling the Kier contract and conversations regarding paying £150k, which would be shared 50/50, to run their fleet on biodiesel. Members were concerned that as a budget pressure for biodiesel it was not going to help them deliver 2030 target. Officers assured Members what had been suggested was £70k for the vegetable biodiesel for the fleet, so split with Keir would be £35,000. This would give them a 95% carbon reduction on that fleet so would contribute, although it did not mean it was something they wanted to pursue for the future completely as they would like to look at ultra-low emission vehicle fleet.

Members discussed the number of volunteers who litter pick around the county borough and whether their organisation worked with those volunteers. Officers advised their litter pick initiatives in Bridgend went through Keep Wales Tidy who train, provide insurance, risk assessments and kit for people who want to volunteer litter pick.

There was a discussion regarding two wings of Ravens Court being let to partner organisations, and it was asked how likely was it that this would happen considering that

the Authority as an organisation were working from home. Officers confirmed the Corporate Landlord Department had put the two wings out with a commercial property letting company, were marketing and fielding inquiries and were positive that there did seem to be a lot of interest in them.

Members discussed and expressed their concern around the proposal to remove support to the Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) lifeguards at Porthcawl Beaches. They queried how the Authority could pay to sponsor a high-profile golf event in the area but were withdrawing essential support for life. Officers explained that when an event of that size came into the Borough there were services including litter picks, road closures, ensuring the borough could deal with additional traffic and visitors that they had to deal with. A sponsorship deal was agreed with the Senior Open that £50,000 would be paid over 2 years and that money would be then used for the things they would have done anyway. They expressed how difficult the decision had been regarding the RNLI, but they had been provided with statistics of the work done and the increase in the contribution requested, and they did not know how they could fund additional monies. It was not being taken lightly but it was a non-statutory responsibility, so they had proposed they reduce the amount of support they gave towards Rest Bay. Members were concerned Rest Bay was a dangerous beach mainly because of the rip tides and it being a rocky area and wanted to express they would not want to see the removal of the lifeguard service.

Members referred to the reserves in line with the Medium Term Financial principle and that the Council Fund would normally be maintained at the level of 5% of the Council's net budget excluding schools. They asked if the 5% went in there every year or was it discretionary and how the use of the money put aside for reserves was being monitored, and what pressures the Local Authority had from Welsh Government Guidelines on reserves. Officers advised that the Council fund was a working balance for the Council and not allocated for anything in particular. If anything changed during the year, they had some money there that could be allocated, there was not a contribution made year on year into those reserves, like all of the other reserves it had been built up over the years and the 5% was the Guidance with regards to how much they should hold in that fund. The Officers explained that earmarked reserves were money that had been put away over many years and have been built up and earmarked as decisions had been made about the priorities that the Council wanted to follow and therefore money was put aside so they could meet those priorities when they became a reality. They advised that any pressures to reduce those reserves were a decision for the Council with regards to the level of money that they keep in reserves.

Members discussed using reserves and capital reserves rather than revenue reserves more skilfully and where possible insourcing rather than outsourcing. They queried if there were those opportunities being looked at where they could make capital investments to see revenue. Officers responded that they did a significant amount to build into the capital programme in revenue and gave the following examples:

- Putting in energy efficient measures into schools
- Changing all the light bulbs and streetlamps across Bridgend
- Fleet replacement

Members also discussed that there were a lot of budget pressures in the document especially the impact of the war in Ukraine and the cost-of-living crisis. Members asked of all the difficult decisions how many of the proposed cost savings could have been avoided if the previous year's administration had not frozen Council tax in the election year.

Officers responded that they did not know the financial position they would be in and did not know about the cost-of-living crisis at the time the budget for the current year was agreed. It had been hoped that that things were returning to normal after the pandemic, then the cost of living crisis hit the economy and things remained very fluid. Westminster were only that week supporting services in relation to energy costs, schools and care provision.

The Chairperson advised that Members of the Committee who wanted to ask questions had all spoken, so as there were no further questions for the invitees, thanked them for their attendance and they left the meeting.

RESOLVED: Following consideration of the report and appendices, the Committee made the following Recommendations for consolidation and inclusion in the report to Cabinet on the draft MTFS, including the proposed budget pressures and budget reduction proposals within the remit of this Scrutiny Committee, as part of the budget consultation process:

Recommendations

Collaboration with Town and Community Councils

1. The Committee highlighted the potential benefits of working collaboratively with TCCs to alleviate future budgetary pressures and maintain services. It was therefore recommended that the Authority utilise the TCC Forum more effectively and efficiently to develop this, commencing with the creation of an Action Plan to demonstrate the various collaborative work that is currently being undertaken by the Authority with TCCs. Members requested that this be presented alongside guidance and explanation on what the Authority can offer and how collaborative work with TCCs can be expanded further. Additionally, the Committee stressed that it was essential that these discussions take place as soon as possible in the new financial year so as to inform the TCC precept. The Committee agreed that this work would be monitored by the Scrutiny Committee as it advanced.

Budget Reduction proposal – COM5

- 2a. The Committee expressed concern over the proposed reduction to support to the RNLI for Lifeguards at Porthcawl Beaches, particularly given that Officers reported that this was focused primarily at support to Rest Bay. Given the dangerous Rip tides at Rest Bay, the increased popularity of water sports at this beach and the number of visitors each summer, Members were alarmed at the risk any reduction to support for the RNLI would pose. The Committee therefore recommend that the reduction not be progressed.
- 2b. The Committee recommended that discussion be held with Town and Community Councils within the County Borough regarding potential funding for the RNLI.
- 2c. There was also a minority view from some Members of the Committee recommending that the reported £35,000 funding to Kier for biodiesel be considered as an alternative to the RNLI budget reduction as it was felt that the use of biodiesel would not have an

immediate benefit or contribute to the Council's 2030 net zero carbon target.

Budget Reduction proposal – COM8

3. The Committee expressed concern over the removal of the Waste Enforcement Team and the impact this could have on tackling waste management issues such as fly-tipping, and particularly given the potential counterproductive nature of the reduction where it could result in an increase in costs. The Committee therefore recommend that this budget reduction not be progressed.
4. The Committee supported education in terms of tackling waste management, however recommend that the Local Authority look towards its partner organisations to assist with this rather than relying on Council staff, who could then look more towards their enforcement role, thus utilising all resources to their full potential.

Council Reserves

5. Whilst appreciating that the Council Fund should be maintained at a level of 5% of the Council's net budget, Members queried the size and use of the Authority's reserve budgets, given the difficult financial situation this year and future budget forecast. The Committee recommend that a review be undertaken of the Council's reserves, particularly historical reserves, with consideration and explanation of how they are managed and operated.

Consultation

6. The Committee expressed disappointment at being unable to receive any outcome of the public consultation of the MTFS 2023-27 and recommended that this be sought for next year's annual scrutiny budget meetings to apprise the Committee of the views of the public to enable them to make more informed and effective recommendations.

Further Comments and Requests

The Committee requested:

7. That going forward they receive performance measures in order to scrutinise effectively and make more informed decisions.
8. Information in relation to the interest paid on the Council's borrowing as well as interest earned on investments.
9. The Committee endorsed the following COSC Recommendation:
In relation to COM5, the Budget Reduction Proposal of £38,000 by removal of support to RNLI for Lifeguards at Porthcawl Beaches, the Committee expressed concerns about funding provided to a golf tournament to actively encourage the public to visit Porthcawl and that this Budget Reduction Proposal would put the public at risk.

29. **URGENT ITEMS**

SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3 - MONDAY, 23 JANUARY 2023

None

The meeting closed at 19:26

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Meeting of:	SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
Date of Meeting:	19 JUNE 2023
Report Title:	UPDATE ON THE SHARED PROSPERITY FUND
Report Owner / Corporate Director:	CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES
Responsible Officer:	IEUAN SHERWOOD, GROUP MANAGER, ECONOMY, NATURAL RESOURCES & SUSTAINABILITY
Policy Framework and Procedure Rules:	There is no effect upon the Council's policy framework or procedure rules as a result of this report.
Executive Summary:	<p>The purpose of this report is to update on the progress with the delivery of the Bridgend County Local Investment Plan, funded through the United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF)</p> <p>This will include progress against the 3 main objectives of the Investment Plan, People & Place, Supporting Local Businesses and People & Skills. It will also set out the new grant funds that are being launched, these include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bridgend Valley Placemaking Property Improvement Grant• Empty Property Survey Grants• Community Feasibility Fund• The Business Development Grant• Bridgend County Business Future Scoping Programme• Bridgend County Tourism Events Support

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to update Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 on the Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) and to provide an overview of proposed grant schemes that are to be commenced.

2. Background

2.1 In September 2022, Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 (SOC3) received a report on the United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) which provided an overview of the proposals that may go forward via the UKSPF.

2.2 The UKSPF was described as a key part of the UK government's Levelling Up agenda, forming part of complementary funding, including the Levelling Up Fund and Community Ownership Fund. The UKSPF was intended to support the UK government's wider commitment to level up all parts of the UK by delivering on each of the levelling up objectives to:

- Boost productivity, pay, jobs and living standards by growing the private sector, especially in those places where they are lagging
- Spread opportunities and improve public services, especially in those places where they are weakest
- Restore a sense of community, local pride and belonging, especially in those places where they have been lost
- Empower local leaders and communities, especially in those places lacking local agency

2.3 It was outlined that the primary aim of the fund was to build pride in place and increase life chances across the UK. Underpinning this aim are three investment Priorities: communities and place; supporting local business and people and skills.

- The **Communities and Place** investment priority will enable places to invest to restore their community spaces and relationships and create the foundations for economic development at the neighbourhood-level. The intention of this is to strengthen the social fabric of communities, supporting in building pride in place.
- The **Supporting Local Business** investment priority will enable places to fund interventions that support local businesses to thrive, innovate and grow.
- The **People and Skills** investment priority will help reduce the barriers some people face to employment and support them to move towards employment and education. Places can also target funding into skills for local areas to support employment and local growth.

As part of the People and Skills priority there is a dedicated and ringfenced element of the UKSPF called Multiply which seeks to improve adult numeracy skills.

2.4 Within the context of the Fund's primary aim there is the flexibility to invest across a range of activities that represent the right solutions to improve local pride in place, increase life chances, to help spread and create opportunity, and a sense of community and belonging. The balance of priorities should reflect local need and opportunity.

- 2.5 The report set out the operating arrangements for the UKSPF in the Cardiff Capital Region (CCR). The 10 Local authorities were invited to collaborate and feed into one regional Local Investment Plan for CCR that sets out proposals to deliver the UKSPF to March 2025. As part of this, at its meeting in July 2022 Bridgend County Borough Council's Cabinet agreed to support Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council (RCTCBC) assuming the role of the 'Lead Local Authority' for the UKSPF for the Cardiff Capital Region.
- 2.6 As a result of this Bridgend was not required to develop its own Local Investment Plan to submit to UK Government. However, we did develop a Bridgend County Borough Local Investment Plan and submitted this to RCTCBC to inform the region's Local Investment Plan. That provided clarity at the local level on the Bridgend County specific proposals the Council wants to achieve through the UKSPF. This information was presented to Cabinet in July 2022 and Cabinet delegated authority to the Corporate Director Communities to submit to Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council the Bridgend County Borough Local Investment Plan information (July 2022), for delivering the Bridgend County UKSPF funding allocation to feed into the development of the CCR Local Investment Plan submission to UK Government.
- 2.7 The proposals that were submitted were discussed with the County Borough's Economic Partnership and the Public Service Board (PSB), in addition to being shared and discussed with Members of the Senedd and Bridgend County's two Members of Parliament, whose support is required for the proposed activity outlined in the Bridgend County Borough Local Investment Plan information.
- 2.8 The Local Investment Plan for the CCR was submitted to UK Government on the 1 August 2022. The funding offer was eventually approved on the 28th of March 2023, with the current delivery period for the UKSPF to be upto March 2025. Which meant that year 1 could not be spent and this is now proposed to be rolled forward into Year 2 subject to agreement with UK Government.
- 2.9 Table 1 overleaf sets out the UKSPF that was allocated to the CCR local authorities. Bridgend's allocation was 8.3% of the total allocation for the region. Guidance from UK Government suggested that funding had to be broken down to a fixed yearly allocation for core UKSPF; 12% in Year 1 (22/23), 24% in Year 2 (23/24) and 64% in Year 3 (24/25). For Multiply allocations, the breakdown is 30% in Year 1 (2022/23), 35% in Year 2 (2023/24) and 35% in Year 3 (2024/25).

Table 1: UKSPF allocation in CCR

Individual authorities	Core UKSPF £	Multiply £	Total £	% of regional allocation
Blaenau Gwent	23,301,572	4,863,920	28,165,492	10.11
Bridgend	19,116,296	3,990,295	23,106,591	8.30
Caerphilly	28,272,298	5,901,499	34,173,797	12.27
Cardiff	34,587,594	7,219,740	41,807,334	15.01
Merthyr Tydfil	22,698,977	4,738,136	27,437,113	9.85
Monmouthshire	5,919,533	1,235,631	7,155,164	2.57
Newport	27,177,563	5,672,986	32,850,549	11.79
Rhondda Cynon Taf	37,320,994	7,790,305	45,111,299	16.20
Torfaen	20,431,241	4,264,774	24,696,015	8.86

Vale of Glamorgan	11,606,505	2,422,717	14,029,222	5.04
Total for the region	230,432,573	48,100,003	278,532,576	100.00

- 2.10 Bridgend's allocation through the UKSPF was £23,106,591, inclusive of a 4% administration budget. This was profiled over three years and is set out in table 2 below. This did include some programming that over-committed BCBC by £2,188,754.00. This was set out in the Cabinet Report in July 2022, where it was acknowledged that a growth pressure bid would need to be made as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). If this was not approved, and the programme remained over-allocated, then the responsibility for identifying gap funds for each of the proposed areas of delivery rests with the respective BCBC lead directorates. It also sets out that should gap funds not be identified prior to delivery then available budgets for delivery will only be those available through the UKSPF and the proposals delivered will be those already developed in line with the UKSPF funding allocation as spend cannot exceed available budgets. If however gap funding was identified then it would be possible to enhance delivery.

Table 2: Bridgend County UKSPF allocation

	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Totals
Core UKSPF	£2,293,955.52	£4,587,911.04	£12,234,429.44	£19,116,296.00
Multiply	£1,197,088.50	£1,396,603.25	£1,396,603.25	£3,990,295.00
Totals	£3,491,044.02	£5,984,514.29	£13,631,032.69	£23,106,591.00
	15%	26%	59%	100%

3. Current situation / proposal

- 3.1 As the agreement for the UKSPF was not received and signed off until the 28th of March 2023, it was not possible for BCBC undertake projects and schemes in year 1 as planned. As set out in paragraph 2.9 above, we have now approached UK Government to see whether this funding can be rolled over into year 2. We are awaiting a decision on this in July 2023. In addition, the growth pressure bid for the additional £2.1m to cover the over committed schemes as set out above, was unfortunately not successful, set against the Council's other pressures in the MTFS. Therefore, BCBC's allocation for SPF reverted to the original £23,106,591.
- 3.2 There has been some real significant progress against the three main themes of the UKSPF fund however and these are detailed in the paragraphs below.
- 3.3 Under the **Communities and Place theme** a grant scheme has been developed in relation to the Thriving Communities project (set out in detail below) and it has been recommended to Cabinet that authority be granted to officers to launch this fund. The Green Spaces project has appointed an officer who takes up post on 1st July 2023. The credible plan submitted to RCTCBC for consideration by UK Government involved roll forward of 2022/23 underspend into the Bridgend Prosperity Framework. Discussions have been held with BCBC Procurement officers to establish a suitable commissioning framework to take forward this project.
- 3.4 Under the **Local Business theme** grant schemes have been developed (set out in detail below) and it has been recommended to Cabinet that authority be granted to

officers to launch these grant schemes during the summer of 2023. These grants relate to the Prosperity Programme and the Future Scoping Programme. The Bridgend Local Enterprise Support Programme is now live and officers took up post in April 2023. Commissioning is underway through the Bridgend County Local Destination Management and Marketing project and officers have developed a grant fund through the Bridgend County Tourism Events Support Project, with a recommendation to Cabinet that authority be granted to officers to launch this fund.

3.5 Under the **People and Skills theme**, staff have been employed and the Employability Programme and Inspire projects are now mobilising and supporting potential beneficiaries. The launch of the re-shaped Employability Programme is the 29 June 2023. The Multiply Programme has appointed key roles with more staff in the process of recruitment and discussions are on-going with Torfaen County Borough Council in relation to options about the future approach towards any potential regional procurement.

3.6 In addition to the above, the Council is also about to launch a series of grant funds as part of the delivery programme for the Bridgend Local Investment Plan. These are the subject of a Cabinet Report on the 20th June 2023, which seeks delegation to be granted to the Corporate Director Communities to establish, deliver and award the grant funds.

3.7 The following projects are to be delivered, either in part or wholly, via these grant funds:

- Bridgend County Thriving Communities
- Bridgend County Community Future Scoping Programme
- Bridgend County Business Prosperity Programme
- Bridgend County Business Future Scoping Programme
- Bridgend County Tourism Events Support

3.8 The grant funds include the following:-

Name of Project	Bridgend County Thriving Communities
Name of fund	Bridgend Valley Placemaking Property Improvement Grant
Purpose of fund	<p>There are two elements to this:</p> <p>1) To enhance building frontages and bring vacant commercial floor space back into beneficial use, by supporting commercial property frontage improvements, along with other external and internal works.</p> <p>2) To convert vacant upper-floor space into new residential accommodation above commercial units, including internal and</p>

	external works to bring vacant space back into use for residential purposes.
Areas covered	The District Centres & Local Service centres in the valleys of the Llynfi, Garw and Ogmore (excluding Maesteg Town Centre).
Grant Rate	The grant will be a maximum of 80% of reasonable eligible costs, up to a maximum grant award of: o £30,000 for occupied properties o £50,000 for properties that have been vacant for more than 6 months. This will be subject to on-going review
Maximum Grant	As above
Total funds available in grant	Minimum of £270,000

Name of Project	Bridgend County Thriving Communities
Name of fund	Empty Property Survey Grants
Purpose of fund	To offer applicants the opportunity to undertake building condition surveys/architectural assessments and concept designs in order to progress the redevelopment of empty commercial properties.
Areas covered	The District Centres & Local Service centres in the valleys of the Llynfi, Garw and Ogmore (excluding Maesteg Town Centre).
Grant Rate	100% of reasonable eligible costs
Maximum Grant	Up to £2,000 for Condition Surveys (depending on size of property) Up to £3,000 for Architectural Assessments and Concept Designs This will be subject to on-going review
Total funds available in grant	Minimum of £20,000

Name of Project	Bridgend County Community Future Scoping Programme
Name of fund	Community Feasibility Fund
Purpose of fund	The fund has been set up to test the feasibility of longer-term community-led ideas. It will provide communities in the Borough the opportunity to gather evidence to support locally led community project ideas. Focusing on Health, Climate and Economy they will provide the required data,

	knowledge and understanding with the ambition to lead to future funding bids and continue community resilience planning.
Areas covered	Whole County
Grant Rate	Up to 100%
Maximum Grant	Up to £35,316
Total funds available in grant	£282,531

Name of Project	Bridgend County Business Prosperity Programme
Name of fund	The Business Development Grant
Purpose of fund	The Business Development Grant will support Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Bridgend County Borough to diversify, decarbonise and grow which will contribute to creating a vibrant and strong local economy.
Areas covered	Whole County
Grant Rate	Provides 50% of eligible capital projects costs. The minimum grant is £5,000 and the maximum grant available is £25,000 (excluding VAT).
Maximum Grant	Up to £25,000 (excluding VAT).
Total funds available in grant	£392,377

Name of Project	Bridgend County Business Future Scoping Programme
Name of fund	The Business Feasibility Grant
Purpose of fund	The Business Feasibility Grant is to support businesses to explore feasibility of longer-term options to diversify, decarbonise and grow including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of plans and studies, e.g. Business Plans/Feasibility Studies - Before purchasing a piece of machinery, the study could determine the market for increased production or new product is financially viable. - Explore using space in retail, hospitality to introduce new service / product e.g. new hotel spa - Cost benefit analysis to introduce Green procurement
Areas covered	Whole County
Grant Rate	Provides 100% of eligible revenue projects costs. The minimum grant is £5,000 and the maximum grant available is £25,000 (excluding VAT).
Maximum Grant	Up to £25,000 (excluding VAT).
Total funds available in grant	£255,000

Name of Project	Bridgend County Tourism Events Support
Name of fund	Bridgend County Tourism Events Support
Purpose of fund	To support tourism events which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have strong potential to attract visitors from outside the local area, whether that is from other regions or other countries. - have a positive impact on the local economy, such as by generating revenue for local businesses, creating jobs, or promoting the region as a tourist destination. - have cultural significance or highlight a unique aspect of the local area's history, culture, or identity. - have the potential to raise the profile of the county borough in a positive way
Areas covered	Whole County
Grant Rate	Tier 1 - Up to 50% of eligible revenue costs Tier 2 - Up to 20% of eligible revenue costs
Maximum Grant	Tier 1 - Up to £2,500 Tier 2 - Up to £10,000
Total funds available in grant	Up to £100,000

3.9 A grant panel will be set up to oversee and make recommendations for approval for the grants and the panel will include relevant BCBC departments, e.g. finance, regeneration and enterprise. All decisions relating to award of grants will be made in line with the Scheme of Delegation and the Council's Grants Policy. Each scheme will have its own assessment criteria, which will be robust but proportionate, depending on the different level of financial assistance available. Assessment criteria will be agreed by the grant panel. Any required statutory consents (e.g. planning permission, SuDS Approving Body) remain the responsibility of any grant applicant for any of the grant funds. The allocations of funding available through each grant fund and their associated criteria and processes will be kept under review and should changes be required these will be considered in line with BCBC policies and procedures.

4. Equality implications (including Socio-economic Duty and Welsh Language)

4.1 An initial Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) screening has identified that there would be no negative impact on those with one or more of the protected characteristics, on socio-economic disadvantage or the use of the Welsh Language. It is therefore not necessary to carry out a full EIA on this policy or proposal.

5. Well-being of Future Generations implications and connection to Corporate Well-being Objectives

5.1 BCBC is committed to promoting sustainable development and to discharge its duties under the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. A summary relating

to the five ways of working and how they connect to the Corporate Well-being Objectives is below:

Long-term: The grant funds outlined in section 3 that are included within the Bridgend Local Investment Plan have been identified following discussion with key stakeholders and in relation to current understanding of the potential long-term challenges on the County Borough. Building on the process of developing and creating the Economic Strategy, the Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Wellbeing Plan for the County Borough it has been possible to set out a long-term response.

Prevention: BCBC has for many years worked closely with stakeholders and the local business community to support the local economy in a wide variety of proactive ways. As well as a continuation of BCBC's ability to react to local situations, the development of the UKSPF Local Investment Plan and the grant funds contained within it builds on strengths to plan for the future, take proactive action and support local businesses and local communities.

Integration: The work to develop the UKSPF Local Investment Plan is closely aligned with the BCBC Corporate Plan, the Local Development Plan and the Public Service Board's Well-being Plan and the Bridgend County Economic Strategy.

Collaboration: The development of the UKSPF Local Investment Plan has been steered by a BCBC officer group and will be delivered in partnership with key stakeholders.

Involvement: For the UKSPF Local Investment Plan to successfully operate it will require the involvement of senior members of local public sectors organisations, community leaders, business leaders, representatives of business sectors and trade bodies and other key stakeholders.

6. Climate Change Implications

- 6.1 The grant funds outlined in 3, will contain within the criteria detail relating to the expectations of applicants to support BCBC Climate Change and Decarbonisation ambitions. Assessment of applications will consider the relevance of proposals to the criteria and decisions made as a result.

7. Safeguarding and Corporate Parent Implications

- 7.1 There are no safeguarding or corporate parent implications arising from this report.

8. Financial Implications

- 8.1 Bridgend County Borough's allocation of UKSPF funding is outlined below:

Individual authorities	Core UKSPF £	Multiply £	Total £
Bridgend	19,116,296	3,990,295	23,106,591

- 8.2 The amounts available through the grant funds outlined within section 3 are contained within the overall programme budget which is set out in the funding agreement which is in place with RCTCBC and its ancillary documents.
- 8.3 Regular monitoring, reporting and claims will ensure that commitments and expenditure are in line with the funding agreement and its associated annual profiles.
- 8.4 There is a potential impact of losing the year 1 monies from the programme, that is £3.491m (15%) if UK Government do not approve the rolling forward of the fund into year 2. This decision should be known in July 2023.

9. Recommendation

- 9.1 It is recommended that the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 notes the report and the progress with the delivery of the Bridgend County Local Investment Plan, funded through the United Kingdom Shared Prosperity Fund.

Background documents

None

Agenda Item 6

Meeting of:	SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
Date of Meeting:	19 JUNE 2023
Report Title:	CORPORATE PARENTING CHAMPION NOMINATION
Report Owner / Corporate Director:	KELLY WATSON CHIEF OFFICER – LEGAL & REGULATORY SERVICES, HR & CORPORATE POLICY
Responsible Officer:	MERYL LAWRENCE SENIOR DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER – SCRUTINY
Policy Framework and Procedure Rules:	The work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees relates to the review and monitoring 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.
Executive Summary:	<p>Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards care experienced children and young people. This is a legal responsibility given to local authorities by the Children Act 1989 and the Children Act 2004.</p> <p>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 care experienced children and young people in Bridgend.</p> <p>In order to further develop and enhance the Council’s Corporate Parenting role with its partners, a Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting comprising all Members of Cabinet was established by Cabinet on 4 November 2008.</p> <p>The Committee is being asked to nominate one Member as its Corporate Parenting Champion to represent the Committee as an invitee at meetings of the Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting.</p>

1. Purpose of Report

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

2. Background

- 2.1 Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards care experienced 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 care experienced children and young people in Bridgend.
- 2.2 In order to further develop and enhance the Council's Corporate Parenting role with its partners, a Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting comprising all Members of Cabinet was established by Cabinet on 4 November 2008.
- 2.3 The inaugural meeting of the Cabinet Committee was held on 27 November 2008 where it was agreed that the Cabinet Committee will meet quarterly. The terms of reference for the Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting are:
- to ensure that care experienced children and young people are seen as a priority by the whole of the Authority and by the Children and Young People's Partnership;
 - to seek the views of children and young people in shaping and influencing the parenting they receive;
 - to ensure that appropriate policies, opportunities and procedures are in place;
 - to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Authority in its role as Corporate Parent against Welsh Government guidance.
- 2.4 At its inaugural meeting, the Cabinet Committee requested that a Corporate Parenting "Champion" be nominated from each of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees to become permanent invitees to the Cabinet Committee.

3. Current situation / proposal

- 3.1 The Committee is requested to nominate one Member as its Corporate Parenting Champion to represent the Committee as an invitee at meetings of the Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting.
- 3.2 The role of the Corporate Parenting Champion is to represent their Overview and Scrutiny Committee, partaking in discussions with Cabinet over items relating to care experienced children and young people.
- 3.3 It is also suggested that in this role each Champion considers how all services within the remit of Scrutiny affect care experienced children and young people and encourage their own Committee to bear their Corporate Parenting role in mind when participating in Scrutiny.

3.4 Scrutiny Champions can greatly support the Committee 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.

4. Equality implications (including Socio-economic Duty and Welsh Language)

4.1 The Protected characteristics identified within the Equality Act, Socio-economic Duty and the impact on the use of the Welsh Language have been considered in the preparation of this report. As a public body in Wales the Council must consider the impact of strategic decisions, such as the development or the review of policies, strategies, services and functions. It is considered that there will be no significant or unacceptable equality impacts as a result of this report.

5. Well-being of Future Generations implications and connection to Corporate Well-being Objectives

5.1 The Act provides the basis for driving a different kind of public service in Wales, with 5 Ways of Working to guide how public services should work to deliver for people. The following is a summary to show how the 5 Ways of Working to achieve the well-being goals have been used to formulate the recommendations within this report:

- Long Term – The establishment of the Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee demonstrates the Authority’s long-term commitment to improving and strengthening their role as Corporate Parents to care experienced children and young people.
- Prevention – The Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee are preventative in their nature and ensure that appropriate policies, opportunities and procedures are in place for all care experienced children and young people.
- Integration – This report supports all the Well-being Objectives.
- Collaboration – All Members are Corporate Parents and this report supports collaborative working with Cabinet and Members of Scrutiny and emphasises the role of Corporate Parents for all Elected Members.
- Involvement – Corporate Parent Champions provide practical support and guidance to care experienced children and young people to ensure they achieve their well-being goals.

5.2 Nomination of a Corporate Parenting Champion assists in the achievement of the following of the Council’s 7 Wellbeing Objectives under the **Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015:-**

1. A County Borough here we protect our most vulnerable

Seeking for children in public care, the outcomes every good parent would want for their own children. All Members have a level of responsibility for care experienced children and young people in Bridgend.

4. A County Borough where we help people meet their potential

Being ambitious for care experienced children and young people and encouraging and supporting their learning and development to fulfill their potential, whether through education, training or employment and ensuring that care experienced children and young people are seen as a priority by the whole of the Authority and by the Children and Young People's Partnership.

6. A County Borough where people feel valued, heard and part of their community

Seeking the views of children and young people in shaping and influencing the parenting they receive, supporting voice, choice and control in all aspects of Corporate Parenting through a children's rights approach.

7. A County Borough where we support people to live healthy and happy lives

Taking steps to reduce or prevent people from becoming vulnerable or dependent on the Council and its services. Supporting individuals and communities to build resilience, and enable them to develop solutions to have active, healthy and independent lives.

6. Climate Change Implications

6.1 There are no Climate Change Implications arising from this report.

7. Safeguarding and Corporate Parent Implications

7.1 The Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting addresses any impact on children or young people within the care of the Authority, under the Council's responsibility as a Corporate Parent. Safeguarding is everyone's business and means protecting peoples' health, wellbeing and human rights, and enabling them to live free from harm, abuse and neglect.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

9. Recommendation

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

Background documents

None.

Agenda Item 7

Meeting of:	SUBJECT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 3
Date of Meeting:	19 JUNE 2023
Report Title:	FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE
Report Owner / Corporate Director:	CHIEF OFFICER – LEGAL & REGULATORY SERVICES, HR & CORPORATE POLICY
Responsible Officer:	MERYL LAWRENCE SENIOR DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER – SCRUTINY
Policy Framework and Procedure Rules:	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.
Executive Summary:	<p>The Council’s Constitution requires the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee to develop and implement a Forward Work Programme for the Committee.</p> <p>The Council’s Constitution also provides for each Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee to propose items for the Forward Work Programme having regard for the Council’s Corporate Priorities and Risk Management framework, for the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee to have oversight and refer any cross-cutting topics to a Committee or Research and Evaluation Panel.</p> <p>The Committee is asked to consider and agree its Forward Work Programme, identify any specific information it wishes to be included in and any invitees they wish to attend for the reports for the next two Committee meetings, identify any further items for consideration on the Forward Work Programme having regard to the criteria set out in the report, consider the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet and note that the proposed draft Forward Work Programmes for the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committees will be reported to the next meeting of COSC.</p>

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

- a) Present the Committee with the proposed draft outline Forward Work Programme (**Appendix A**) for discussion and consideration;
- b) Request any specific information the Committee identifies to be included in the items for the next two meetings, including invitees they wish to attend;
- c) Request the Committee to identify whether there are presently any further items for consideration on the Forward Work Programme having regard to the selection criteria in paragraph 3.6 of this report;
- d) Present the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet (**Appendix B**) to track responses to the Committee's recommendations made at previous meetings;
- e) Note that the proposed draft Forward Work Programme, any feedback from the Committee and the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet will be reported to the next meeting of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee (COSC), with the comments from each respective Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee (SOSC), following consideration in this cycle of Committee meetings.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Council's Constitution requires the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee to develop and implement a Forward Work Programme for the Committee.
- 2.2 The Council's Constitution also provides for each Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee to propose items for the Forward Work Programme having regard for the Council's Corporate Priorities and Risk Management framework, for the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee to have oversight and refer any cross-cutting topics to a Committee or Research and Evaluation Panel.

Best Practice / Guidance

- 2.3 The Centre for Governance and Scrutiny's (CfGS) Good Scrutiny Guide recognises the importance of the Forward Work Programme. In order to 'lead and own the process', it states that Councillors should have ownership of their Committee's work programme, and be involved in developing, monitoring and evaluating it. The Good Scrutiny Guide also states that, in order to make an impact, the scrutiny workload should be coordinated and integrated into corporate processes, to ensure that it contributes to the delivery of corporate objectives, and that work can be undertaken in a timely and well-planned manner.
- 2.4 Forward Work Programmes need to be manageable to maximize the effective use of the limited time and resources of Scrutiny Committees. It is not possible to include every topic proposed. Successful Scrutiny is about looking at the right topic in the right way and Members need to be selective, while also being able to demonstrate clear arguments for including or excluding topics.
- 2.5 The CfGS's guide to effective work programming 'A Cunning Plan?' makes the following reference to the importance of good work programming:

'Effective work programming is the bedrock of an effective scrutiny function. Done well it can help lay the foundations for targeted, incisive and timely work on issues of local importance, where scrutiny can add value. Done badly, scrutiny can end up wasting time and resources on issues where the impact of any work done is likely to be minimal.'

3. Current situation / proposal

Draft Outline Forward Work Programmes

- 3.1 Following the approval of the schedule of Scrutiny Committee meeting dates at the Annual Meeting of Council on 17 May 2023, the standing statutory reports to this Scrutiny Committee of: the Corporate Plan, the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Budget, Performance and Budget Monitoring, etc. have been mapped to the appropriate timely meeting dates into a draft Forward Work Programme.
- 3.2 The draft outline Forward Work Programme for each Scrutiny Committee have been prepared using a number of difference sources, including:
 - Corporate Risk Assessment;
 - Directorate Business Plans;
 - Previous Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme report topics / minutes;
 - Committee / Member proposed topics;
 - Policy Framework;
 - Cabinet Work Programme;
 - Discussions with Corporate Directors;
 - Performance Team regarding the timing of performance information.
- 3.3 There are items where there is a statutory duty for Policy Framework documents to be considered by Scrutiny, e.g., the MTFS including draft budget proposals scheduled for consideration in December 2023 and January 2024, following which the Committee will coordinate the conclusions and recommendations from each of the Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committees in a report on the overall strategic overview of Cabinet's draft Budget proposals to the meeting of Cabinet in February 2024.
- 3.4 An effective Forward Work Programme will identify the issues that the Committee wishes to focus on during the year and provide a clear plan. However, at each meeting the Committee will have an opportunity to review this as the Forward Work Programme Update will be a standing item on the Agenda, detailing which items are scheduled for future meetings and be requested to clarify any information to be included in reports and the list of invitees. The Forward Work Programme will remain flexible and will be revisited at each COSC meeting with input from each Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee reported and any updated information gathered from Forward Work Programme meetings with Corporate Directors.
- 3.5 The Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee Draft Forward Work Programmes will be reported to the next meeting of COSC, with the comments from each respective Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee for coordination and oversight of the overall Forward Work Programme. The SOSC Forward Work Programmes will be

included in the standing FWP Update report from then on with any feedback from each SOSC meeting included.

Identification of Further Items

- 3.6 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 maximise the impact scrutiny can have on a topic and the outcomes for people. Criteria which can help the Committee come to a decision on whether to include a referred topic, are set out below:

Recommended Criteria for Selecting Scrutiny Topics:

PUBLIC INTEREST:	The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny;
ABILITY TO CHANGE:	Priority should be given to issues that the Committee can realistically influence, and add value to;
PERFORMANCE:	Priority should be given to the areas in which the Council is not performing well;
EXTENT:	Priority should be given to issues that are relevant to all or large parts of the County Borough, or a large number of the Authority's service users or its population;
REPLICATION:	Work programmes must take account of what else is happening in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort.

Reasons to Reject Scrutiny Topics:

- The issue is already being addressed / being examined elsewhere and change is imminent.
- The topic would be better addressed elsewhere (and can be referred there).
- Scrutiny involvement would have limited / no impact upon outcomes.
- The topic may be sub-judice or prejudicial.
- The topic is too broad to make a review realistic and needs refining / scoping.
- New legislation or guidance relating to the topic is expected within the next year.
- The topic area is currently subject to inspection or has recently undergone substantial change / reconfiguration.

Corporate Parenting

- 3.7 Corporate Parenting is the term used to describe the responsibility of a local authority towards care experienced 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 care experienced children and young people in Bridgend.

- 3.8 In this role, it is suggested that Members consider how each item they consider affects care experienced children and young people, and in what way can the Committee assist in these areas.
- 3.9 Scrutiny Champions can greatly support the Committee in this by advising them of the ongoing work of the Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting and particularly any decisions or changes which they should be aware of as Corporate Parents.
- 3.10 The draft outline Forward Work Programme for the Committee is attached as **Appendix A** for the Committee's consideration.
- 3.11 The Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet to track responses to the Committee's recommendations made at previous meetings is attached as **Appendix B**.

4. Equality implications (including Socio-economic Duty and Welsh Language)

- 4.1 The Protected characteristics identified within the Equality Act, Socio-economic Duty and the impact on the use of the Welsh Language have been considered in the preparation of this report. As a public body in Wales, the Council must consider the impact of strategic decisions, such as the development or the review of policies, strategies, services and functions. It is considered that there will be no significant or unacceptable equality impacts as a result of this report.

5. Well-being of Future Generations implications and connection to Corporate Well-being Objectives

- 5.1 The Act provides the basis for driving a different kind of public service in Wales, with 5 Ways of Working to guide how public services should work to deliver for people. The following is a summary to show how the 5 Ways of Working to achieve the well-being goals have been used to formulate the recommendations within this report:
- Long-term - The approval of this report will assist in the planning of Scrutiny business in both the short-term and in the long-term on its policies, budget and service delivery.
 - Prevention - The early preparation of the Forward Work Programme allows for the advance planning of Scrutiny business where Members are provided an opportunity to influence and improve decisions before they are made by Cabinet.
 - Integration - The report supports all the wellbeing objectives.
 - Collaboration - Consultation on the content of the Forward Work Programme has taken place with the Corporate Management Board, Heads of Service and Elected Members.

- Involvement - Advanced publication of the Forward Work Programme ensures that stakeholders can view topics that will be discussed in Committee meetings and are provided with the opportunity to engage.

5.2 When setting its Forward Work Programme, the Committee should consider how each item they propose to scrutinise assists in the achievement of the Council's 7 Wellbeing Objectives under the **Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015** as follows :-

1. A County Borough where we protect our most vulnerable
2. A County Borough with fair work, skilled, high-quality jobs and thriving towns
3. A County Borough with thriving valleys communities
4. A County Borough where we help people meet their potential
5. A County Borough that is responding to the climate and nature emergency
6. A County Borough where people feel valued, heard and part of their community
7. A County Borough where we support people to live healthy and happy lives

6. Climate Change Implications

6.1 The Committee should consider how each item they scrutinise affects climate change, the Council's Net Zero Carbon 2030 target and how it meets the Council's commitments to protect and sustain the environment over the long term. There are no Climate Change Implications arising from this report.

7. Safeguarding and Corporate Parent Implications

7.1 The Committee should consider how each item they scrutinise affects care experienced children and young people, and in what way the Committee can assist in these areas. Safeguarding is everyone's business and means protecting peoples' health, wellbeing and human rights, and enabling them to live free from harm, abuse and neglect. There are no Safeguarding and Corporate Parent Implications arising from this report.

8. Financial Implications

8.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

9. Recommendation

9.1 The Committee is recommended to:

- a) Consider the proposed draft outline Forward Work Programme for the Committee in **Appendix A**, make any amendments and agree the Forward Work Programme.
- b) Identify any specific information the Committee wishes to be included in the items for the next two meetings, including invitees they wish to attend;

- c) Identify whether there are presently any further items for consideration on the Forward Work Programme having regard to the selection criteria in paragraph 3.6 of this report.
- d) Consider the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet (**Appendix B**) to track responses to the Committee's recommendations made at previous meetings;
- e) Note that the proposed draft Forward Work Programme, any feedback from the Committee and the Recommendations Monitoring Action Sheet will be reported to the next meeting of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee (COSC), with the comments from each respective Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee (SOSC), following consideration in this cycle of Committee meetings.

Background documents

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Draft Outline Forward Work Programme
Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3:**

<u>Date of Meeting:</u>	<u>Report Topics:</u>
Monday 19 June 4.00pm	- Update on the Shared Prosperity Fund - Corporate Parenting Champion Nomination Report - Draft FWP
Monday 25 September 4.00pm	- Update on the Heat Network
Monday 27 November 4.00pm	- Emerging Valleys Regeneration Strategy - Future Waste Services Work Stream
Monday 22 January 4.00pm	- MTFS & Budget Proposals
Monday 26 February 4.00pm	- Levelling Up Fund - Porthcawl Pavilion
Monday 22 April 4.00pm	- Bridgend 2030 Net Zero Carbon Strategy - Strategic Transport

Members briefing session

- Infrastructure Delivery that has an area specifically on the deterioration of the road surfaces and potholes – Looking to schedule in the Autumn.

Information reports to be provided

- Electric charging points, where this is currently within the three phases and what happens after phase three is completed.

Potential Items

- Homelessness Strategy (TBC - timeline being reviewed)
- Housing
 - Affordable
 - Accessible
 - Social
 - Energy efficiency housing
- Information and update on where the Directorate are with Asset and Community Asset Transfer (CAT)
- Asset Management Audit Wales inspection report
- Local Biodiversity Action Plan
- Green Spaces
- Porthcawl Regeneration Update
- Transforming Towns
 - Masterplans (Bridgend Town Centre – other masterplans)
 - Tourism (attracting tourism including capacity for mobile accommodation)
 - Transport Plan Porthcawl
 - Maesteg Town Centre
- Net Zero Carbon
 - Council Electric Vehicles
 - Air Quality Action Plan
 - Flood Mitigation
- Corporate Joint Committees Regional Responsibilities
- Play areas / opportunities

Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3

RECOMMENDATIONS MONITORING ACTION SHEET

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
18 July 2022	Corporate Parenting Champion Nomination	Councillor Jonathan Pratt was nominated to represent Subject Overview and Scrutiny Committee 3 as an invitee to meetings of the Cabinet Committee Corporate Parenting.	Scrutiny / Chief Officer – Legal and Regulatory Services, HR and Corporate Policy	ACTIONED – Membership of Corporate Parenting Cabinet Committee updated and formally reported to Cabinet 19 July 2022.
18 July 2022	Nomination to the Public Service Board Scrutiny Panel	Councillor Colin Davies was nominated to sit on the Public Service Board Scrutiny Panel.	Scrutiny	ACTIONED – Membership of Public Service Board Scrutiny Panel updated and initial Briefing session arrangements underway.
18 July 2022	Forward Work Programme Update	The Committee requested the following representatives be invited for the following reports scheduled for the September meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the Shared Prosperity Fund report, the appropriate lead Officers. - For the Levelling Up Fund report, the appropriate lead Officers and a representative of Awen Cultural Trust, as management of the Grand Pavilion, Porthcawl. 	Scrutiny	ACTIONED – Requested Invitees have been invited to attend the September meeting of the Committee.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
26 Sep 2022	Shared Prosperity Fund	The Committee Recommended that concern is expressed over the risks involved of both insufficient funds to complete the project in addition to achieving the project proposals within the allocated time.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.
26 Sep 2022	Shared Prosperity Fund	The Committee Recommended that further concern is expressed regarding the lack of resources and expertise within the Directorate and its ability to cope with the additional work associated with the project. Members did not agree that it was appropriate to transfer staff from other roles and projects as this would be counterproductive. The Committee also noted that the landscape for Local Authorities applying for funding is changing with timescales being very limited and criteria issued at a late stage in the process, meaning the Authority has a narrow timeframe to develop and formalise substantial bids. The Committee therefore recommended that priority needs to be given to resources within the Communities directorate to ensure that not only is it able to successfully take forward this project, but to ensure that the infrastructures are in place to enable the	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
		<p>Authority to be best placed to apply and make the most of any future funding opportunities. As well as a strategic plan being developed, Members recommend that potential projects underneath this be drafted so that when the opportunity arises, they already have the basis for the application.</p>		
<p>26 Sep 2022</p>	<p>Shared Prosperity Fund</p>	<p>The Committee Recommended that strong concerns are expressed over the poor return that Bridgend County Borough had received in their allocation from the Shared Prosperity Fund (SPF) and the unfairness around the funding mechanism behind this. The Committee therefore agreed to write directly to those within the UK Government responsible for the SPF to highlight the issues including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The fact that the allocation does not take into account that Bridgend is one of the fastest growing areas in Wales; b) The limited time the Authority has had to both put together proposals and then to utilise the fund and achieve its aims, is unreasonable and potentially puts the project and public funds at risk. <p>The Committee requested that this letter be copied to both local MPs; Dr Jamie Wallis and Chris Elmore.</p>	<p>Scrutiny / Chair of SOSC 3</p>	<p>Scrutiny requested contact details for the letter and will liaise with Chair of SOSC 3. Chased.</p>

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
26 Sep 2022	Shared Prosperity Fund	The Committee requested a copy of any presentation made to the Town and Community Council Forum on Bridgend's Local Investment Plan proposals.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.
26 Sep 2022	Shared Prosperity Fund	The Committee requested further information on how claims will be processed by RCT as the Lead Authority as well as detail on the reporting and accountability process.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.
26 Sep 2022	Shared Prosperity Fund	The Committee requested further detail on the project proposals when available including breakdowns of the funding within each proposal.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
26 Sep 2022	Shared Prosperity Fund	The Committee requested clarification as to whether there would be clawback on the funds should the outputs as set out in the proposals, not be achieved.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager – Economy, Natural Resources & Sustainability	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.
26 Sep 2022	Levelling Up Fund	The Committee Recommended similarly to the discussions around the SPF, concern is again expressed over the tight timescales surrounding the applications for the Levelling Up Fund as well as the timescales to complete the projects, particularly if there was no extension allowed. The Penprysg Railway Bridge was particularly at risk due to the level of work that this would involve to complete.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager Planning & Development Services	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.
26 Sep 2022	Levelling Up Fund	The Committee Recommended that they strongly supported the work around alternative or temporary arrangements and locations during the interim period of the Grand Pavilion in Porthcawl being closed. Particular emphasis, however, was placed on making sure Porthcawl would not lose footfall and revenue. Members	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager Strategic Regeneration	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
		<p>requested feedback on these plans and mitigating measures when available but furthermore recommended that as part of this work, a feasibility study be undertaken on the potential for a temporary facility being put in place in Porthcawl whilst the Pavilion is closed. The proposal was made to explore the option of utilising the Section 106 aspect of the development contract in relation to mitigate the impact of the building closure on the community.</p>		
26 Sep 2022	Levelling Up Fund	<p>The Committee requested the timeframe for the completion of the Maesteg Town Hall project. Concerns were raised about whether the Town Hall would be completed before the Grand Pavilion closed for redevelopment. Members also requested information on what this meant for Awen revenue.</p>	<p>Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager Strategic Regeneration</p>	<p>Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.</p>
26 Sep 2022	Levelling Up Fund	<p>The Committee requested Further information (including a possible feasibility study requested in the above recommendations) on any proposed temporary facility and alternative arrangements whilst the Pavilion is closed.</p>	<p>Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager Strategic Regeneration</p>	<p>Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.</p>

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
26 Sep 2022	Levelling Up Fund	Concerns were expressed regarding the Penprysg Railway Bridge around funding, completion and the potential impact of heavy traffic in the area. The Committee requested a briefing paper once the project had been approved, illustrating the plans that were to be put in place to monitor and mitigate the impact of traffic on both sides of the proposed bridge. On the subject of parking in Porthcawl linked to redevelopment projects such as the Grand Pavilion and the aim to increase footfall in the area, the Committee were advised of a Parking study that was currently taking place in Porthcawl as part of its Regeneration and Placemaking plans. The Committee requested that they be involved in the development of a Strategic Transport Plan for Porthcawl and that this be added to the Committee's FWP.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director, Communities / Group Manager Planning & Development Services	Recommendations circulated requesting response - to be provided. Chased.
26 Sep 2022	Forward Work Programme Update	The Committee: - expressed concern that taxis are only permitted to use the one DVSA accredited MOT station appointed by BCBC and that if the vehicle fails, the fixing work cannot be done there so the vehicle has to be booked in to another garage to get the fixing work	Scrutiny / Licensing Committee	ACTIONED – referred to Chair of Licensing Committee and Bridgend's Licensing Officer. Acknowledgement received that a paper would be brought to the Licensing Committee on this topic.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
		<p>completed, then rebooked in to the permitted MOT station for an additional fee and a further test, which can result in taxi's being off the road for longer, higher costs and a significant loss of earnings. The garage is also very busy with testing of South Wales Police and BCBC vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - referred to other Local Authorities, e.g. Cardiff allowing the use of any DVSA accredited MOT station which makes things easier for operators and fairer for all DVSA registered MOT stations. - expressed concern about the potential further impact this may be having locally regarding the shortness of availability of taxis in the County Borough generally and particularly later at night. - queried how performance / reliability of taxi's was monitored through licence renewals or otherwise and how the Authority reviews cancellations, late night cancellations, availability after hours and what is being done to enable improvement and a reliable taxi fleet. <p>The Committee referred the topic to the Licensing Committee for consideration and action.</p>		

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
14 Nov 2022	Housing Position Statement Report	That the Committee write to The Group Manager Planning and Development Services and ask how to ensure better consultation between Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) and housing developers regarding the types and corresponding numbers of accommodation being built and the prioritisation for properties for RSLs	Scrutiny / Group Manager – Development	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 23 February 2023.
14 Nov 2022	Housing Position Statement Report	The Committee further requested information on how many veterans/ex-service personnel have presented homeless to the Authority and requiring accommodation.	Housing Solution Manager	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 6 December 2022.
14 Nov 2022	Housing Position Statement Report	The Committee requested information from Development Control regarding previous social housing developments and how many social housing units had been diminished in return for 106 monies.	Scrutiny / Head of Partnerships Services	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 30 March 2023.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
14 Nov 2022	Housing Position Statement Report	The Committee requested that the Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) be asked if they could possibly provide information about the availability of the Physical Adaptation Grant (PAG) and the impact it has on housing waiting lists for people with disabilities or awaiting Disabled Facilities Grants.	Scrutiny / Head of Partnerships Services	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 30 March 2023.
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	The Committee recommended when seeking the views of Town and Community Councils, Officers be mindful of the timing of survey response deadlines, and seek to avoid traditionally busy times for Councils, such as the beginning of May, to ensure maximum engagement.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	That consideration be given to whether there should be a mechanism in place to enable clubs/ organisations to use community facilities, such as sports pitches, out of hours, should the weather prevent them from using their usual facilities.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	The Committee recommended that consideration be given to how the partnership between Town and Community Councils and Bridgend County Borough Council could be strengthened to ensure more cohesion and a less transactional relationship.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	That Officers reflect on how well known the procedure to arrange temporary road closures is and consider how the procedure can best be promoted.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	That consideration be given to revisiting the objective of erecting signs such as Play Priority Signs and exploring with Registered Social Landlords the removal of existing No Ball Games signage where appropriate, to encourage more children to play outside their homes.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	The Committee requested the National Guidance on the 'One Council' approach and an explanation of what the 'One Council' process and aspirations are in relation to the report as well as how the model of strategic leadership within the Guidance functions.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.
12 Dec 2022	Play Sufficiency Assessment	The Committee requested confirmation of how the Local Authority engaged the views of 0-3 year olds or their families in the Family wellbeing survey for 0-3 years age groups conducted with partner schools.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director Social Services and Wellbeing / Group Manager Sports and Physical Activity	ACTIONED: response and information circulated 11 April 2023.
4 Jan 2023	Call In of Cabinet Decision: Bridgend 2030 Net Zero Carbon Strategy	Following its examination of the decision, and having regard to the above, the Committee decided to recommend that the decision be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration for the following reason: Concerns were expressed about the lack of costing information contained in the original Cabinet report and Members felt that Cabinet	Scrutiny / Cabinet	ACTIONED: Cabinet agreed to confirm the decision made at its meeting on 13 December 2022.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
		needed to consider the wider financial costs before making the decision, with indicative longer term financial implications and more detail on the costs of achieving the 2024 milestones.		
23 Jan 2023	Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-24 to 2026-27	The Committee made recommendations, comments, and requests.	Scrutiny / Chair of COSC	ACTIONED: Recommendations formally reported to COSC and onward to Cabinet 7 February 2023 for consideration and response to be provided to COSC.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	That the Committee accept the offer from the Corporate Director - Communities to attend a site visit/walk around the Porthcawl Regeneration area.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	That when seeking to dispose of sites, that the authority utilise the same procurement exercise which was used in the disposal of the Salt Lake site which was described to the Committee as a two-stage approach: 1) Design; and 2) Best consideration	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	Given the anticipated increased tourism to Porthcawl due to the regeneration and that there were only plans to replace existing car parking spaces not to make additional car parking spaces available, that consideration be given to the prospect of a rise in coach day trips to Porthcawl and to the possible need for the addition of coach parking spaces in the town or surrounding areas and that this be built into the strategy.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	Concerns were expressed regarding the very limited and infrequent train services at Pyle train station and the Committee highlighted that Bridgend train station not only had more frequent services but was also the changing point for many valley line services. The Committee also noted that the proposed park and ride facility at Pyle train station was no longer proceeding and that an upgrade of the station would not take place in the foreseeable future and, therefore, recommended that it would be more beneficial for the Metrolink to link to Bridgend train station rather than Pyle, until Pyle Station is upgraded.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities / Group Manager Planning and Development Services	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	The PowerPoint presentation slides presented at the meeting	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	That the owners of Coney Beach fairground be asked whether they would provide figures of consumer spend, the number of visitors and the average seasonal footfall to the fair.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	How much revenue was spent in the town as a result of the fair and how much would be lost, and the economic impact the loss of the fair will have on the town.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	Due to concerns regarding the lack of sea defences in Newton, a written response in relation to the Shoreline Management Plan for Newton to include detail of whether Officers were searching for grant funding and what is the forward plan.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities / Destination Management and Coastal Operations Team Leader	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.

Date of Meeting	Agenda Item	Action	Responsibility	Outcome
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	A written response on what schemes originally formed part of the Porthcawl Regeneration Investment Focus, what is their current status and, if there are elements that have not yet been constructed, what the plans are for these.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities / Group Manager Economy, Natural Resources and Sustainability	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	A written response to summarise the source of each of the individual funding streams that fund the various aspects of the Porthcawl Regeneration to include details of what funding comes from the private sector and what funding comes from elsewhere (including any grants)	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.
20 Feb 2023	Porthcawl Regeneration	A confidential briefing to better understand the history of Cosy Corner and why Officers were precluded from responding to some questions in the meeting.	Scrutiny / Corporate Director of Communities / Chief Officer – Legal, Human Resources and Regulatory Services	Information request circulated requesting response – to be provided. Chased.