

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
<b>General Points and Report Presentation</b>			
<b>1</b>	The Panel discussed the different approaches of reporting between the Education, Early Years and Young People and the Social services and Wellbeing Directorates (and a different approach to Adult and Children Social Care within the Directorate. The Panel <b>recommended</b> that there needed to be consistency in the reporting style from each Directorate and that a Corporate Template might assist the Panel and members of the public in understanding the financial position of each Directorate and the Council as a whole. <b>(BREP)</b>	There is a corporate presentation template which services will be reminded should be used.	Partially accepted
<b>2</b>	The Committee <b>recommended</b> :  a. that all financial reports be accompanied by a glossary which is also made available on the Council's website in order to assist residents in their reading and understanding of the reports;  b. that when reductions are referenced in the report that there is clarity about whether they are in net or real terms;  c. that charts/graphics be included showing:	Some reports e.g. the Treasury Management Strategy and Budget Book already include glossaries. A Local Government Finance Terms glossary can be pulled together going forward.  Agreed, we will be clear in reports in terms of net or gross, and real or nominal terms.	Partially Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the percentage increase in Council Tax over the period referred to;</li> <li>ii. the demographic growth in the borough;</li> <li>iii. the demographic growth compared to other Welsh local authorities and nationally; and</li> <li>iv. the reduction in use of agency staff.</li> </ul> <p>d. that comparison data be provided demonstrating the difference between the proposed increase to Council Tax and the average staff wage increase across the authority. <b>(COSC)</b></p>	<p>Where possible we will endeavour to include additional information in the MTFS as outlined.</p> <p>Further information on council tax increases can be included in the report. As there are a number of staff pay negotiating bodies, and staff pay increases change at different times during the year, and for different periods a comparison for all staff is not straightforward.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<p><u>Zero-based budgeting</u> The Committee <b>recommended</b> piloting zero-based budgeting in a select area of Directorate to be determined by senior Officers. <b>(COSC)</b></p>	<p>This recommendation, as set out to the committee, is already in tow, and will be trialled in some specific service areas of Social Services and Wellbeing initially.</p>	Accepted
<b>4</b>	<p><u>Budget Settlement and Fully Funding National Policy Commitments</u> The Committee <b>recommended</b> that a letter be sent on behalf of the Committee to Welsh Government and the UK Government regarding the following:</p> <p>a. expressing that national policy commitments</p>	<p>Letters have been written to Welsh Government on a regular basis over recent years on various budgetary issues. In addition representation is made on an ongoing basis through the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) and in scheduled meetings with the Local Government and Finance Minister, including on these specific matters.</p>	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<p>resulting from legislative changes should be fully funded both in terms of capital funding and ongoing revenue funding including a commitment to fund employer national insurance payments for individuals employed by agencies who provide services to the Council which currently results in a £1.5m cost pressure; and</p> <p>b. expressing concern regarding the repeated lateness of the settlement and requesting a commitment to bring forward the settlement date and to request that consideration be given to providing indicative multi-year settlements. <b>(COSC)</b></p>	A further letter will be sent from the Leader setting out these issues.	
<b><u>Auto-Enrolment to Benefits and External Communications</u></b>			
<b>5</b>	The Committee <b>recommended</b> that a letter be sent on behalf of the Committee to Welsh Government and the Department for Work and Pensions strongly recommend that they implement auto-enrolment of individuals to all benefits to which they are eligible/entitled when they apply for another benefit. <b>(COSC)</b>	The Council is currently part of a pilot project with Welsh Government, entitled Streamlining Welsh Benefits, which is aimed at creating a simpler and more consistent system for the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, Free School Meals and School Essentials Grant by mapping relevant legislation, policy and processes.	Accepted
<b>6</b>	The Committee recognised that the funding to the Council and schools was being disadvantaged by individuals not claiming all benefits to which they are entitled and <b>recommended</b> that Council-wide external communications be issued encouraging residents to claim all benefits to which they are	The Council does use its external communications channels to raise awareness of benefits available to encourage uptake. Letters are also sent to individuals known to the Council who could be eligible for additional benefits.	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	entitled including Pension Credit, Housing Benefit and Eligible Free School Meals and promoting the Council's auto-enrolment process. <b>(COSC)</b>	This will be continued	
<b>7</b>	<u>Engagement with Town and Community Councils</u> The Committee <b>recommended</b> that detailed discussions are held with town and community councils before suggestions are made in meetings that town and community councils may be able to assist when discussing funding gaps. <b>(COSC)</b>	Engagement with Town and Community Councils (TCCs) is ongoing, including recent meetings to discuss how this Council and TCCs can work more effectively together moving forward. However, it is not realistic to have detailed discussions with individual TCCs prior to suggestions being made in meetings that they may be able to assist when discussing funding gaps. Initial suggestions, on a generic basis, of where TCCs may be able to assist will need to continue to be made, but detailed discussions with each TCC would always be a necessary as a pre requisite, prior to any firm commitment.	Partially accepted
<b>8</b>	<u>Prioritising Procurement</u> While the Committee recognised that there was a budget growth proposal for a Procurement Assistant (CEX 5) in central Procurement, they reflected that there appeared to be insufficient capacity, at times, within Directorates to provide timely contributions to the Procurement process and <b>recommended</b> that more urgency needed to be placed on procurement highlighting it was critical to a one-council approach.	Overall resources within Directorates to deal with procurement have, like many other areas, been subject to budget cuts over many years, from savings in back office and managerial capacity. The importance of procurement is recognised and there are existing corporate plans and processes that reflect it is a priority. The corporate team (subject to the proposed budget pressure) would not need additional resource. However, there is 'insufficient capacity' within service areas and that cannot be	Partially accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
		properly dealt with without additional resource at the service level.	
<b><u>Projecting Demand and Complexity of Need</u></b>			
<b>9</b>	The Panel expressed concern regarding the Directorate's significant overspend projection at the end of Quarter 1, soon after the setting of the 2024/25 budget. The Panel were concerned that the Directorate's demand projection framework, utilising the Population Needs Assessment and demographic growth, was insufficient and <b>recommended</b> that the Directorate consider a more robust, forward-looking demand forecast framework and statistical models to provide a more strategic look when setting the budget. ( <b>BREP</b> )	Services are experiencing increased demand but also increased complexity of demand, both of which impact on the budget position. Services do have models in place to project service demand but the complexity of that demand is more difficult to predict.  There has been improved working between services and finance to model these changes which has been reflected in the 2025/2026 budget planning process.	Accepted
<b>10</b>	<b><u>Grant funding</u></b> The Committee requested a breakdown of value of the grant funding which the Council could expect to receive from the UK and Welsh Government in 2025/26 including the expected timeline for receipt and whether this represented an increase or decrease from previous years.  The Committee were advised that although some headline figures had been received on an all-Wales basis, it was, as yet, unknown what Bridgend's allocation from these would be. The Committee <b>recommended</b> that should this information be	As outlined in the draft MTFS Welsh Government only provided all-Wales grant figures in the provisional local government settlement. The report outlined that the majority of these had stayed at the same level, but others e.g. the Local Authority Education Grant had increased. This is in line with WG announcements on additional funding for education. Others have increased to reflect pay and price increases over the past year(s). We are still awaiting Bridgend allocations for a number of grants, and these will continue to be received up to the start of, and during, the 2025-26 financial year. Grants are received on an individual basis from	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	available prior to the setting of the budget, that Cabinet consider it as part of the full financial outline during the budget setting process. <b>(COSC – 28 Jan 2025)</b>	different WG departments so there is no specific timeframe for their receipt.	
<b>BREP Process</b>			
<b>11</b>	<p>The Panel expressed concerns regarding the effectiveness and late commencing of the BREP process and that their concerns are expressed year on year without change. The Panel therefore <b>recommended</b> that there be a meeting of Group Leaders and Scrutiny Chairs, before the start of the next financial year, to discuss the future BREP process and consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. that BREP commence immediately following the budget setting and that accurate forecasts be provided to the Panel allowing Members to understand the pressures and to start deep dives into particular areas of concern/risk at an early stage;</li> <li>ii. that BREP be a standing Panel, meeting on a monthly or bimonthly basis and that they have a Forward Work Programme allowing Members to own the process and request the information they want to see, negating the need to request and arrange meetings on an</li> </ul>	<p>The process this year was amended to address the concerns raised that most members are not sighted on the budget position of the budget setting process. To address this, quarterly all member budget briefings have been held which have been well attended. Also meetings with political groups have taken place to share the budget setting process during the year.</p> <p>Further work can start early in the new financial year to look to improve the BREP process for the 2026-27 budget setting round.</p>	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	ad hoc basis; and  iii. the different approaches of reporting, the need for consistency in the reporting style from each Directorate the proposal for a Corporate Template to assist the Panel and members of the public in understanding the financial position of each Directorate and the Council as a whole, as referred to in Recommendation 1 above. <b>(BREP)</b>		
<b>Budget Reduction Proposals</b>			
<u>Chief Executive's Directorate and Council Wide:</u>			
<u>CEX 6 – Provision of CCTV</u>			
<b>12</b>	With reference to the budget reduction proposal, CEX 6, the Committee <b>recommended</b> that a letter be sent on behalf of the Committee to the Police and Crime Commissioner to ascertain her reliance on the CCTV service created and managed by the Council and whether the Police and Crime Commission's contribution to CCTV has been cut and requesting a response prior to the next meeting of the Committee on 28 January 2025. <b>(COSC)</b>	The proposed saving on CCTV does not apply until the 2026-27 financial year. A meeting has already been arranged with the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) to discuss this matter in February. If it is necessary, a follow up letter can be sent after that meeting.	Partially Accepted
<b>13</b>	The Committee expressed concern that all budget savings proposals within the Chief Executives Directorate and Council Wide were red and	The RAG [ Red, Amber, Green ] status of each proposal has been reviewed to reflect that there are some savings where a staff consultation will not be	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	possibly difficult to achieve. The Committee were advised that the vast majority of the spend in these areas is on staffing and the savings would be subject to consultation and therefore would remain red until these were complete and were then likely achievable. The Committee <b>recommended</b> that the narrative in the budget savings proposals to reflect that position and its red status. <b>(COSC)</b>	necessary (vacant posts) etc, meaning that there are now more proposals where the status is amber or green.  Narratives are also reviewed prior to the final budget being presented and will be updated if required	
<b>Budget Reduction Proposals</b>			
Education, Early Years and Young People:			
<u>Proposed 2% Cut:</u>			
<b>14</b>	The Panel <b>recommended</b> that any opportunity to reduce the proposed 2% cut should be explored and any savings identified to achieve the reduction should be put towards schools delegated budgets not towards central services. <b>(BREP)</b>	Through the budget consultation and scrutiny process, there will be an opportunity for Cabinet to review and consider the savings that are deemed to be least popular, provided a balanced budget can still be presented.	Accepted
<b>15</b>	Members discussed in depth the efficiency savings against School Delegated Budgets – 1% for 2025-26 and 1% thereafter.  Members expressed concern over School Deficit budgets in that between 50% and 75% of schools are reporting deficit budgets for 2024-25 and this will only be further exacerbated by further budget reductions. Some schools were even reporting in	While Cabinet is also concerned about the school deficit budgets, it should be noted that removing the proposed 1% reduction in budgets will not resolve the problem.  The proposal does not go against our priorities of protecting the most vulnerable as we are putting almost £10 million more into the Education budget for 2025-26 compared to the current year.	Not accepted



**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<p>their recovery plans that were simply not going to recover, meaning the Local Authority (LA), after 5 years, would have to cover the deficit.</p> <p>Members also expressed concern over the fact that this reduction went against the Council's own priority to protect vulnerable children and young people and could result in cuts to key supportive services to these individuals.</p> <p>Members noted that whilst Welsh Government funding would be provided for pay and price increases this year, this was one-off funding that could not be guaranteed for next year and would not resolve the ongoing deficit budget issue for schools. Linked to this and for the future, just as areas such homelessness is being considered for growth proposals due to reductions in Welsh Government grant funding, so should schools and education be considered for potential growth and solutions to replace and help mitigate against their reductions in Welsh Government grant funding in various areas. Alternatively, the Local Authority needed to push back with Welsh Government in relation to the pressure on local authorities to administer new schemes and implement new</p>	<p>Further work needs to be undertaken with schools where there is a large deficit projection to look at all options to recover the position, but it also needs to be recognised that pupil numbers, and the funding associated with this, can have a much greater impact on a school's budget.</p> <p>Finally to remove the 1% reduction could result in an increase to the proposed Council tax of 1% and it's not clear within these Scrutiny recommendations whether Scrutiny members are proposing a Council Tax of 5.5%.</p> <p>Cabinet are recommending that an independent review of the Schools Funding Formula alongside the Financial Regulations for Schools be undertaken. The review will ensure equity across all schools and identify best practice to support schools deliver best possible outcomes for the pupil population.</p>	

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<p>legislation without the continued supporting funding behind it.</p> <p>Based on their concerns, the Committee were in consensus and strongly <b>recommended</b> that Cabinet are asked to do all they can to remove the 1% budget saving proposed for schools. (<b>SOSC 1</b>)</p>		
<b>16</b>	<p>The Members discussed representations received from headteachers regarding the detrimental impact that the further 1% cut would have on their ability to deliver a wide range of service and on their already significant deficit budgets including the significant impact on staffing and their wellbeing, potentially larger class sizes, the narrowing of the curriculum and potential impact on additional provisions such as, extracurricular activities. Therefore, the Committee <b>recommended</b> that SOSC 1's recommendation <i>that the Cabinet are asked to do all they can to remove the 1% budget saving proposed for schools</i> be wholly endorsed by COSC, and that Cabinet reconsider this significant proposed budget reduction for the reasons above. (<b>COSC – 28 Jan 2025</b>)</p>	<p>As stated above, all staffing costs including pay increases, inflation and pension costs are fully covered with the increased budget proposed. Therefore, all staff costs are covered and any decision on staffing numbers is a matter for each governing body.</p>	Not accepted
<b>17</b>	<p><u>Capacity to Reduce Proposed Budget Cuts</u> Members asked for clarification on whether the underspend now projected for 2024 as reported</p>	<p>Information regarding the impact of the improved position at the end of Q3 on the budget for 2025-26 has been shared with members.</p>	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	under Q3 meant there was any capacity to reduce any proposed budget cuts. If this was the case the Committee <b>recommended</b> that School Delegated Budgets, Music Services and Counselling Services be prioritised for reduction in saving, if not full removal of saving if possible, in the proposed budget for 2025-26. ( <b>SOSC 1</b> )	There will be an opportunity for Cabinet to review and consider the savings that are deemed to be least popular, provided a balanced budget can still be presented.	
<b>18</b>	<p><u>Music Services</u></p> <p>Members discussed in detail the importance to maintain both the Counselling and Bridgend Music Service.</p> <p>Members highlighted that both services were vital in supporting pupils who experience mental health issues, as whilst this was obvious with Counselling services, evidence was heard about how Music services also helps children and young people who have difficulties with their mental health. Members therefore pointed out that these proposals to reduce or remove these services was against the LA's priority to protect vulnerable individuals.</p> <p>It was further highlighted by both Headteachers and Members, that Music provision now formed a significant part of the new curriculum and provided valuable enrichment to pupils.</p>	<p>Alternative funding mechanisms are currently being explored but these will not result in significant savings during 2025-2026.</p> <p>Cabinet are minded to retain the music service while an alternative delivery method is being explored.</p>	Partially accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<p>Concerns were raised that schools might not be able to afford to fund Counselling or Music services going forward and provide valuable opportunities to their pupils.</p> <p>The Committee <b>recommended</b> that opportunities be explored further to find alternative delivery models such as not-for-profit or commercial partnerships, in order to continue providing these important services. <b>(SOSC 1)</b></p>		
<b>19</b>	<p>The Committee discussed the overwhelming number of representations they had each received from headteachers, parents and learners regarding the powerful impact the Bridgend Music Service has had on the lives and wellbeing of all who use it and also highlighted its importance for those learners who find academia or sport difficult.</p> <p>The Committee <b>strongly recommended</b> that Bridgend Music Service be retained as a fully subsidised service.</p> <p>However, whilst recognising that it was a significant budget pressure, the Committee considered that the value provided by the Service was such that they <b>recommended</b> that the budget reduction</p>	<p>There has been high number of email contacts from pupils, teachers and the public to the Cabinet and we are looking at how best this proposal can be removed from the final budget presented to Council. It is also recognised that the service needs to look at a range of delivery models for the future and work on this will commence as soon as possible.</p> <p>See response to 18 above.</p>	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<p>proposal EEYYP 12, at least, be deferred pending exploration of all possible alternative delivery models to ensure that the Service can continue long term.</p> <p>The Committee further <b>recommended</b> that any alternative delivery model, whether or not involving other stakeholders or parental contribution models, should maintain the free provision of the Service, at the very least, for learners from low income families. (COSC – 28 Jan 2025)</p>		
<b>20</b>	<p>In addition to the comments made by SOSC 1 regarding Budget Reduction Proposal EEYYP 3: <i>that opportunities be explored further to find alternative delivery models such as not-for-profit or commercial partnerships, in order to continue providing these important services</i>, COSC stressed the importance of working with partners and <b>recommended</b> that the Authority work closely with Cwm Taf Morgannwg University Health Board in providing support for the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people across the county borough. (COSC – 28 Jan 2025)</p>	<p>Following a joint inspection by CIW/Estyn/HIW of mental health services for children and young people in the Cwm Taf Morgannwg region, a joint action plan has been developed to support how partners will work together to improve the mental health and wellbeing of people in the county borough.</p> <p>The narrative on the budget proposal will be reviewed and amended, in line with the outcome of the recent inspection.</p>	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
<b>Budget Reduction Proposals</b> <u>Social Services and Wellbeing Directorate:</u>			
<b>21</b>	<p>The Committee expressed grave concerns regarding budget reduction proposals SSW 12 and 13, highlighting the widespread ramifications that would follow from redundancies and impact on the caseloads and wellbeing of remaining staff and the reputational risk they would create. The Committee therefore <b>recommended</b> that budget reduction proposals SSW 12 and 13 be removed and not pursued as savings. (<b>SOSC 2</b>)</p>	<p>The commissioning team is driving transformational changes to meet MTFs savings, but the risk lies in the uncertainty of funding, especially with the transition of the Eliminate Agenda. Although there's assurance that grant funding for Social Services will cover these risks, it's not guaranteed.</p> <p>There's a balance between ensuring manageable caseloads for case holders and the risk of increased workload or burnout. However, we are assured that caseloads are at manageable levels, which should prevent an additional burden on the case holders.</p> <p>The new statutory Code of Practice for commissioning care and support from Welsh Government could pose a risk, especially if the requirements cannot be fully met. This is crucial for compliance, and we are assessing how to adapt to meet those demands, but we remain confident that the grant funding, as above, will be forthcoming to support this work.</p> <p>The restructure of business support aims to reduce the administrative burden on social workers,</p>	Partially accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
		<p>allowing them to focus on direct care tasks. However, reducing these resources could risk pushing more administrative work onto the social work staff, potentially impacting service delivery however this will be monitored closely and the : Artificial Intelligence Agenda is being fast-tracked to support the workforce administratively and mitigate the risks associated with any reduction in business support.</p> <p>The most crucial risk is ensuring the safety of residents while maintaining fiscal responsibility and meeting budget targets. The budget needs to be balanced with the potential risks arising from the savings, including service delivery impacts but we are confident that we are adequately addressing any risks with the actions above.</p>	
<b>Budget Reduction Proposals</b>			
<u>Communities Directorate:</u>			
<b>22</b>	<p>Members discussed the ongoing reduction in income across parking services and the specifics on the general downturn in car park income.</p> <p>Officers explained that since the pandemic the Authority had seen a drop in its entirety across all the car parks with the exception of Porthcawl, in</p>	<p>A report on Car Parking Charging across the Borough is currently being prepared, including the free parking offer currently available at the Rhiw and John Street. This will be discussed initially with Cabinet but can also form part of a future scrutiny discussion.</p>	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	<p>Salt Lake and Rest Bay car parks where the number of visitors has increased.</p> <p>Members expressed that in their own experience, the car parks in Bridgend were very often full and considering the regeneration plans for Bridgend Town Centre, more car parking provision would be vital. The Committee <b>recommended</b> that further exploration be undertaken and evidence examined and reported to the Committee with regard to the car parking offer in the town centre and the budget pressure as a whole. <b>(SOSC 3)</b></p>		
<b>23</b>	<p>Members discussed at length the reduction in staff who undertake enforcement activities relating to waste. The Committee were concerned with the failure to issue enforcement notices at present and feared what the outcome would be should the enforcement team be cut by such a significant amount.</p> <p>Recognising the difficulty there was with the burden of proof, Members were greatly concerned there was a risk that the ability to react to these issues would be reduced if the cut was made and therefore the Committee urged and <b>recommended</b> the Cabinet revisit the reduction with a view to removing or reducing the proposal. <b>(SOSC 3)</b></p>	<p>The enforcement activities of this team can continue with the proposed reduction in staff, with the emphasis being on education and prevention of incidents, which has been the focus of works over the past two years.</p>	Not accepted



**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
<b>24</b>	Members expressed concern over the budget reductions relating to increasing fees on Bereavement services, i.e. burial charges by 20%, and stopping the bi-annual supply of blue refuse sacks to all residents. The Committee felt that these proposals, particularly the increase in burial fees, could have a significant impact on the public and <b>recommended</b> that if there is any leeway or additional funding potentially available, or changes to budget proposals, that these reductions be prioritised for reconsideration and either removed, or, in the instance of the 20% proposed increase in burial fees, at least reduced. <b>(SOSC 3)</b>	A key principle of the MTFs is to look to cover the costs of the services we provide wherever possible. The cemetery services are not cost neutral and this proposed increase in burial fees will assist, but will not provide that cost neutral position. In the County Borough currently approximately 30% of bereavement demand is burials and 70% is cremation. Investment is required in the cemeteries within our Borough and a new Cemetery Strategy will be brought forward in 2025 to address future issues such as burial capacity.	Not accepted
<b>Budget Pressures</b>			
<u>Education, Early Years and Young People Directorate:</u>			
<b>25</b>	Subject to the Directorate response to the Committee on Base Budget Pressures in Recommendation 15 above, Members wished to support the budget pressure proposals. <b>(SOSC 1)</b>	Noted.	Accepted
<b>26</b>	Further to SOSC 1's support for the budget pressure proposals, the Committee specifically wished to support the budget growth for Additional Learning Needs (ALN). However, the Committee <b>recommended</b> that the budget growth proposal of providing additional support for those with ALN needed to be carefully balanced with the demand	We will ensure that the impact of the proposed budget reductions in respect of ALN provision is monitored carefully. Similarly, we will ensure the proposed additional funding for ALN provision will be targeted to meet the requirements of pupils as identified by the Access to Education Panel.	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	and impact that the budget reductions proposals regarding ALN would have on staffing and support for learners. ( <b>COSC – 28 Jan 2025</b> )		
<b>Budget Pressures</b> <u>Communities Directorate:</u>			
27	<p><u>Waste Service</u>  Members discussed in detail the additional revenue funding required, over and above the current budget, to operate the waste service as an in-house service from 2026-27, as agreed by Cabinet in November 2024. Following consideration of the Future Waste report on the 30 September 2024 by the Committee, Members had felt that more investigation was needed to provide further analysis on whether the service should be brought in-house or not, and also recommended that a potential extension of the existing contract be considered.</p> <p>There was disappointment from Members that the previous recommendations made by the Committee had not appeared to have been considered and that there was now a £1.2 million budget pressure sooner than it was necessarily needed.</p>	<p>A decision was made by Cabinet on the 19th of November 2024 to insource the waste services for the Borough. A Waste Transition Board has been established and meets every two weeks and work is ongoing on the project to look at a transition from the current contractor to Council provision by April 2026. The Cabinet have agreed to seek an extension with Plan B, as recommended by Scrutiny, as a contingency position should it not be possible to transition within this very challenging timescale, to ensure a continuity of this essential public service.</p> <p>The estimated costs for 2026-27 are the result of modelling from within the consultant's report and require more detailed work to be undertaken to determine accurate costs and projections. Extending the contract by a further year is not going to change the actual costs once they are determined.</p>	Not accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	The Committee <b>recommended</b> that the insourcing of the service be looked at again, that modelling and further analysis be done and that the current contract be deferred for a further year to get a better understanding of the situation. Members were concerned that the costs predicted and associated budget pressure for this set for 2026-27 could potentially manifest itself during 2025-26 and also, whether there then could potentially be further recurring pressures for next year. <b>(SOSC 3)</b>		
<b>28</b>	<p><u>COM 1 – Bridgend Market</u> Members discussed the recurrent budget pressure associated with the closure of Bridgend Market and the recurring 300k per annum that was still being paid on the lease, as well as holding costs and covering the cost of the small market hall which was opened in the Rhiw centre where 5 traders currently operate. Members were informed that the future of Bridgend Market Hall itself was still being determined.</p> <p>Members expressed concern that with the hundred-year lease that was taken out initially in 1971; the authority could potentially be paying out 300k for the next 47 years which would accumulate into millions.</p>	Options are being assessed with regards to the future of the Bridgend Market Hall, to look at the long-term future and relinquishment of this budget pressure. This is being considered against the background of the substantial multi-million pound repairs to the market hall roof to remove the RAAC that is present. Once this appraisal is completed it will be discussed with Cabinet and could form part of a future Scrutiny session.	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	The Committee <b>recommended</b> that this agreement be explored further to find a long-term resolution and address this funding pressure. <b>(SOSC 3)</b>		
<b>Supplementary Recommendations and Requests for Information:</b> <u>Chief Executive's Directorate and Council Wide:</u>			
<b>29</b>	<u>Information Sharing</u> The Committee <b>recommended</b> consideration be given to how invest to save models and further collaborative working and sharing of best practice across local authorities regarding ICT and use of artificial intelligence could expedite savings. <b>(COSC)</b>	Work is now being done in this area.	Accepted
<b>Supplementary Recommendations and Requests for Information:</b> <u>Education, Early Years and Young People:</u>			
<b>30</b>	<u>Recovery Plans</u> Whilst noting that schools in a deficit budget position of over £50,000 must prepare a Deficit Recovery Plan that is carefully monitored, the Panel <b>recommended</b> that consideration be given to implementation of a similar plan to allow for schools who have a significant surplus to be similarly monitored. <b>(BREP)</b>	This recommendation will be considered (for example, through discussion with the School Budget Forum).  School Deficit Recovery Plans will be part of the financial review outlined above.	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
<b>31</b>	<u>Clear Direction on Efficiency Savings</u> The Panel <b>recommended</b> that there be clear direction to School Governing Bodies on how they may be able to make efficiency savings, e.g. shared senior leadership teams, federated arrangements, etc. and that such direction needed to demonstrate clear figures on the savings that could be achieved. <b>(BREP)</b>	The local authority can recommend options to governing bodies, but, in most situations, the local authority cannot direct governing bodies. Identifying best practice will be a key outcome of the financial review outlined above.	Partially accepted
<b>Schools Funding Formula</b>			
<b>32</b>	The Panel discussed the possibility of changing the schools funding formula in order to try and balance the schools' deficit and surplus positions and <b>recommended</b> that the Chair and Vice Chair of the School Budget Forum who are invited to the January meeting of SOSC 1 be asked for Headteacher views on the topic. <b>(BREP)</b>	School Budget Forum members attended the SOSC1 meeting in January 2025.  The School Budget Forum will be invited to contribute to the financial review outlined above.	Accepted
<b>33</b>	<u>Back Office Services</u> The Panel referred to the amalgamation of the Education Engagement Team and Educational Welfare Service which had resulted in significant savings being made and front loaded into this financial year and <b>recommended</b> that this be used for learning as an example of best practice, to ensure that back office services run efficiently and that the delegation of funding to schools is optimal. <b>(BREP)</b>	We will learn from effective practice to ensure back-office services run efficiently and that the delegation of funding to schools is optimal.	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
<b>Supplementary Recommendations and Requests for Information:</b>			
<u>Social Services and Wellbeing Directorate:</u>			
<b>34</b>	<p><u>Use of S106 Agreements</u> The Panel referred to potential future large scale housing developments being an opportunity to provide specialist housing in a different way via Section 106 agreement contributions. The Panel <b>recommended</b> that consideration be given to entering into S.106 agreements to provide an Extra Care style accommodation model or equivalent, recognising that the model is cost effective for the Authority and provides good outcomes for residents to live more independently for longer and those eligible can claim housing benefit. <b>(BREP)</b></p>	The Social Services and Wellbeing (SSWB) directorate has completed an in-depth accommodation-based service review to determine what housing with care developments are needed over the next 5 years. Each individual scheme will be subject to a Business Justification Case(s) where funding streams will be considered (inc. s106 funding), working with key relevant colleagues at that time. Planning colleagues also attend SSWB meetings, where the oversight and governance for such schemes takes place.	Accepted
<b>35</b>	<p><u>Additional Resource in Continuing Healthcare</u> The Panel referred to the specialist social worker with the relevant expertise that takes the lead in supporting the team in relation to the Continuing Healthcare (CHC) process. The Panel <b>recommended</b> that consideration be given to allocating additional resource to Adult Social Care to recruit an additional specialist social worker in order to accelerate savings associated with CHC. <b>(BREP)</b></p>	This has been highlighted at the Social Services Improvement Board and the directorate will work with finance colleagues to determine the best way to increase dedicated resources to take this forward.	Accepted
<b>36</b>	The Committee <b>recommended</b> that there be an all Member briefing on the use of artificial intelligence	The Head of Partnerships and the Corporate Director of Social Services and Wellbeing will work	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	within the Social Services and Wellbeing Directorate and how it is envisaged it could safely aid a reduction in staff numbers. <b>(SOSC 2)</b>	together to deliver a seminar for Members on how AI can be used in the SSWB directorate as part of the refreshed Corporate Digital Strategy.	
<b>Supplementary Recommendations and Requests for Information:</b>			
<u>Communities Directorate:</u>			
<b>37</b>	<p><u>Porthcawl Metrolink:</u> Members discussed the Porthcawl Metrolink Station and the justification behind having to pay ongoing revenue costs. They expressed their frustration that when first scrutinising the Metrolink Station they were not informed of the ongoing costs of £100,000 a year until the other redevelopment went ahead.</p> <p>The Committee <b>recommended</b> that any potential revenue liabilities associated with future capital programmes and projects be looked into and predicted as far as possible and fully disclosed when the decisions are made, especially in this time of austerity. <b>(SOSC 3)</b></p>	This recommendation is accepted and revenue costs resulting from capital costs will be estimated at the commencement of the scheme.	Accepted
<b>38</b>	<p><u>Highways</u> Members expressed concerns over the current conditions of highways within the County Borough and the time taken to action any reported issues. Members questioned whether the proposed approximate £1M increase for Capital funding was sufficient to cover the work needed in the</p>	Additional funding is to be made available by WG to support this work. Once the funding for BCBC is confirmed it will be allocated to the service.	Accepted

**SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2025-26 TO 2028-29**

	<b>Scrutiny Recommendation:</b>	<b>Cabinet Response:</b>	<b>Accepted/ Partially Accepted / Not Accepted:</b>
	forthcoming year. The Committee <b>recommended</b> that consideration be given to whether there is any additional funding that could be allocated to this budget to ensure Highways are maintained to an optimal standard. ( <b>SOSC 3</b> )		