

Agenda



Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Date: Thursday, 1 February 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

To: Councillors J Guy (Chair), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, P Hourahine, J Hughes, L Lacey and M Spencer

Item		Wards Affected
1	<u>Agenda in Welsh</u> (Pages 3 - 4)	
2	<u>Apologies for Absence</u>	
3	<u>Declarations of Interest</u>	
4	<u>Minutes of the Meeting held 14 December 2017 and 8 January 2018</u> (Pages 5 - 12)	
5	<u>Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2018-19: Draft proposals</u> (Pages 13 - 44)	
6	<u>Forward Work Programme</u> (Pages 45 - 48)	

Contact: Daniel Cooke, Overview and Scrutiny Officer.

Tel: 01633 656656

E-mail: Scrutiny@newport.gov.uk

Date of Issue: Date Not Specified

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda

Pwyllgor Rheoli Trosolwg a Chraffu

Dyddiad: Dydd Iau, 1 Chwefror 2018

Amser: 10 y.b.

Lleoliad: Ystafell Bwyllgora 1

Y Cynghorwyr: J Guy (Cadeirydd), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, P Hourahine, J Hughes, L Lacey and M Spencer

Eitem

Rhan 1

1. Agenda yn Gymraeg
2. Ymddiheuriadau am Absenoldeb
3. Datganiadau o Fuddiant
4. Cofnodion y Cyfarfod a 14 Rhagfyr 2017 ac 8 Ionawr 2018
5. 2018 – 19 Refeniw Gyllideb a'r Cynllun Ariannol Tymor Canolig: Cynigion Drafft
6. Y Diweddariad o'r Rhaglen Waith i'r Dyfodol

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes



Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Date: 14 December 2017

Time: 10.00 am

Present: Councillors J Guy (Chair), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, P Hourahine, J Hughes, L Lacey and M Spencer

In Attendance: Liz Blayney (Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer), Daniel Cooke (Overview and Scrutiny Officer); Paul Jones (Head of Streetscene and City Services), Steve Davies (Senior Strategy Manager); Inspector John Davies and Chief Inspector Mike Richards.

Apologies: None

1 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Phil Hourahine – Board Member of Newport Transport
Councillor Mark Spencer – Board Member of Newport Transport
Councillor Charles Ferris – Board Member of Newport Transport

2 Minutes of the Meeting held 16 November 2017

The minutes of the meeting were approved as a true and accurate record subject to the following amendments:

On Page 6 – ‘**Some** Members were disappointed that a representative from the Police could **not** be present to answer specific questions.’

‘**Some** Members were disappointed that alternative options, such as paying the police to employ more staff to undertake the parking enforcement in Newport, had not been explored within the report.’

3 Decriminalised Parking / Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE)

The Chair introduced Chief Inspector Mike Richards and Inspector Rob Jenkins to the Committee. The Chief Inspector advised that CPI Mark Button would be meeting Welsh Government Officers next week to discuss Civil Parking Enforcement in Gwent, and its aim to make the transition, if adopted by the Local Authorities, as seamless as possible.

The Chair gave a brief discussion of the history of the traffic wardens across Gwent and Newport.

The Chief Inspector advised the Committee that Newport is one of three forces in Wales that still did not enforce parking. The Police Community Support Officers (PCSO) are used primarily to enforce parking and advised the number of Officers had recently increased with another intake of staff. It was advised that the focus of the Police had changed and

developed over the last five years, with current Police main focus on being Threat, Harm and Risk.

The Committee were told that it had been reported in a news article that the number of tickets being issued having been reduced by 1000, and though the figures are not being disputed, it was explained that the demands of the Police force are changing. Examples were given of two large drug busts which took place recently, as well as the diverting of resources and Officers to teams to combat the sexual exploitation of children and cyber investigation to stop online grooming. It was noted that there was a need to balance, but the force prioritised deploying services to more vulnerable members of the public.

The Committee asked the following:

A Member queried the annual salary of a PCSO. In the additional information report it stated the cost to the Police to implement suitable traffic enforcement would be in excess of £50k per year, and would only cover the city centre with one Officer. It was also queried what the implications would be if the Council did not take over parking enforcement. Members were advised that the starting wage for a PCSO is £20k. Members were also advised that the Police expect the Local Authority to come in line with other authorities currently enforcing parking. The Police would not walk away from enforcement, however the Police were anticipating that the Council would be able to adopt Civil Parking Enforcement duties before December 2019. The Chief Inspector then explained that discussions by Senior Officers within the Police and Local Authorities be needed if the Local Authority were not in a position to enforce after this date.

Parking issues around schools was then discussed, in particular around the Rogerstone and Caerleon areas. Members also discussed the bollards in the city centre which had been lowered previously over the years. It was asked whether the parking enforcement would cover the school areas. Members were advised that when applying for the enforcement powers it would cover the whole city and resources would need to reflect this. The Officers explained that there are different levels of cover which would apply across the city. Modelling undertaken had anticipated an increase in resources needed in the city centre. It was also advised that part of the model included a mobile response element which would help alleviate congestion in school areas and areas other than the city centre. Members were also advised that use of the bollards in the city centre would be reviewed.

The Police were told of further parking issues in the Caerleon area, particularly in the afternoons as cars are parking on road markings and causing safety concerns for children coming out of school. Members sought reassurance that neighbourhood policing would not be cut similar to parking enforcement. The Police assured the Members that they were strongly committed to neighbourhood policing, and would take on board the idea of having a mobile unit around the Caerleon area depending on resources.. The Police stated the importance of multi-agency work, and the Police would continue to work alongside the Council before the potential implementation of CPE in December 2019, about the use of resources.

Members discussed an incident from earlier this year in which an illegally parked car by Friars Walk triggered a suspected terrorist attack. Members asked the Chief Inspector whether the Council Enforcement Officers would be able to contact the Police with instances of illegal and dangerous parking. Members were advised that there would be a strong relationship between the Council Enforcement Officers and the Police. There would be numerous Police Officers on foot patrolling the City Centre who would be able to respond to instances of dangerous parking. Members asked for written assurances of this in the future.

Concerns were raised about the cost of new signage and road markings, and Members queried if the decision to take over parking enforcement would improve the perception of the City. Members were advised that signs need to comply with Welsh

Government standards, although signs would be replaced over a longer period of time. Many of the existing signs would be compliant and the cost in the report is the worst case scenario of replacing all signage and road markings. The Police advised that if the Council take over parking enforcement it would allow the Police to get more involved with more serious criminal activity and more issues the public want them to deal with, which in turn would improve people's perception of the City.

Members queried how much work would need to be done in advance if Council decided to go ahead with enforcement, and concerns were raised if Welsh Government were to not agree that the Council was in a position to take on CPE.

Members were advised that Welsh Government were supportive of authorities wishing to apply for enforcement. It was explained that the scheme needs to be cost neutral for the Council..

A Committee Member moved that the Committee vote on whether or not to make the recommendation for Council to adopt Civil Parking Enforcement. It was suggested that this be amended to include confirmation of the hours for free parking are maintained where they currently are in the City as the Committee were concerned that they might be replaced with ticketed parking. The Head of Streetscene explained that should the Council proceed with Civil Parking Enforcement, under Welsh Assembly Government legislation all parking restrictions and charges remain the same while Welsh Assembly Government considers the application. After this process, the decision on parking restrictions and charges was a Members decision. The Committee took a vote on this amendment and it was lost with three Members voting for and four Members voting against.

Conclusion

The Committee **unanimously agreed** to recommend that the Council pursue the adoption of Civil Parking Enforcement powers.

The Chair thanked the Police and Officers for attending and for their direct responses to Members questions.

4 Forward Work Programme Update

The Committee discussed the forward work programme, in particular the items on the next two Committee meetings.

The City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order was scheduled to be discussed at the next meeting, and the Committee were advised that the Public Protection Manager along with a representative from the Police would be in attendance to discuss if amendments are needed for the order.

Actions

The Committee **agreed** to note the items scheduled for the next two meetings.

The meeting terminated at 11.00am.

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Date: 8 January 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Present: Councillors J Guy (Chair), M Al-Nuaimi, C Evans, M Evans, C Ferris, P Hourahine, J Hughes, L Lacey and M Spencer

In Attendance: Neil Barnett (Democratic Services Support Officer); Daniel Cooke (Overview and Scrutiny Officer); Helen Wilkie (Public Protection Manager); Inspector John Davies.

Apologies: None

1 **Declarations of Interest**

None

2 **City Centre PSPO (Public Spaces Protection Order)**

City Centre PSPO –

Invitees;

- Helen Wilkie – Public Protection Manager
- Inspector John Davies – Gwent Police

The Public Protection Manager introduced herself and Inspector John Davies to the Committee. The Officer provided an overview of the current Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) which was enacted on November 2015. It was advised that the Order will expire in November 2018 and would be considered timely to review it now with a view to enacting a revised City Centre PSPO, taking into account what has worked over the past two years, what restrictions need to be kept or revised, and whether new restrictions need to be introduced to tackle other forms of anti-social behaviour that are occurring in the city centre. Public consultation would take place in form of an online survey and information would be gathered ready for April's meeting for the Committee to make recommendations to Council regarding the revised PSPO.

Each restriction was then discussed:

Street drinking

It was advised that street drinking is still prevalent, and is the main restriction breached. Two camps of drinkers were mentioned, those who move around dependant on weather, and pub and club goers 'pre loading' who bring beer with them before going into clubs. It was explained that the Licensing Committee have tried to combat this by declining requests from off-licences to extend the time they can sell alcohol. It was then recommended that this restriction stays in the Order.

Touting for services / donations

The Public Protection Manager was pleased to inform the Committee that there has been a decrease from previous years in the amount of charity agents along Commercial Street, although complaints are still being received about Internet Services, Phone Sellers and Claim Handlers. The Inspector advised that even though the Police are not getting a lot of complaints relating to this, it is still happening. The Committee were advised that it would be possible to keep this restriction but amend the definition, as traders are not covered in the Street Trading legislation.

Aggressive Begging

It was advised that there is still a problem with aggressive begging, and the Committee were directed to the report which states that the Community Safety Wardens deal with a high number of complaints, as do the Police. The Police Inspector advised that a number of Fixed Penalty Notices had been issued, and the Police have also issued Community Protection warnings. The Inspector advised that the Police feel that this area is still vastly underreported to them, even though the complaints that are being received are high.

The Inspector then advised that over the last 18 months aggressive begging has gotten worse, especially around cash points, and explained that most cash points in the night time have a beggar near which people find intimidating. The Committee were informed that due to the definition of "aggressive", the Police need to secure witness statements to prove that the beggar had been aggressive for action to have been taken. The Police have been working with the Rough Sleepers Group and the Council's Homelessness department to help and assist those most vulnerable, but noted that not everyone wishes to engage, which then causes problems.

The Committee was advised that an alternation could be considered in the Order for begging, either a blanket ban of begging in the city centre, or an alternative which is currently favoured in other parts of the UK is to prohibit begging within the vicinity of cash machines, a 10 metre distance example was then given. The Committee was advised that the Business Improvement District are looking to introduce a Diverted Giving Scheme, which had been discussed could be launched later this month, to encourage the public not to give to beggars, but instead to donate through approved retailers in the city centre, where funds will be transferred to the Wallich who work with and help the rough sleepers in the city centre.

Flyposting

The Committee were informed that there have been no problems with flyposting as it is covered by legislation other than the City Centre PSPO. The Committee were advised to recommend this restriction is removed from the Order.

Dogs on leads

The Committee were informed that there had been a number of complaints about dogs walking loose in the City Centre, but the whole of Newport is covered by dog fouling legislation. The Committee were advised to recommend this restriction is removed from the Order.

A proposal was made to the Committee to keep Street Drinking in the Order, look to change the definition of the begging restriction and aggressive touting services. A new restriction was then suggested to the Committee, Gang Anti-Social Behaviour. The Police state that 29% of the calls they receive in the city centre relate to gang/youth anti-social behaviour occurring from 3pm and peaking at about 8pm daily. Youths loitering near fast food outlets/ bus stations are the subject of many complaints from members of the public and business owners, who are either confronted by gangs or feel intimidated by their presence when

walking past them. It was suggested that we replicate the restriction that is part of the recently enacted Pillgwenlly PSPO, namely;
“No person shall congregate in a group of 3 or more persons within the Restricted Area AFTER an authorised person has requested that the group disperse”,
or instead, a variant that is in use elsewhere. Exeter Council’s PSPO’s restriction was included in the Officers report and referred to.

The Committee then discussed the following:

The Committee commented on the survey which was included in the report, whilst praising the information given they felt that it was slightly long, and a 5 minute online survey should be enough. Members also enquired about the lack of information of the success rates of other authority’s schemes. The Public Protection Manager advised that she would get in contact with her counterparts in other authorities to get this information for the Members. The Inspector also advised he would do this with his Police counterparts in the same areas. Members praised the presentation and discussed including legal highs in the Order. It was also mentioned that cycling in the city centre was not included in the report, which is covered by the Road Traffic Act but is dangerous in pedestrian areas. Members were advised that cycling was not in the original Order as it was covered by traffic legislation, and was felt that there are current laws to control it, which the Police can currently enforce. The Inspector advised that something that could be looked into is an increase in Officers in the city centre and have restriction included in the Order. It was also advised that in regards to legal highs, it will be included in the public consultation to see if they have noticed this and if they’d like to have it included in the revised Order.

Members commented on people working within the city centre and their concerns of feeling less secure in the area from 7am – 9am. It was asked whether there would be an increase of officers or community officers in the city centre to give assurance. The Police explained to the Members that traditionally during these times there are a change of shifts, and officers are dealing with prisoners caught from the previous night so police visibility is quite poor during these times, although three new officers had started today.

Members spoke of previously attending a visit to the city centre with the Police to view derelict buildings and a query was made if there were links between rough sleepers and arson to derelict buildings, as the buildings they visited had been stripped of their metals to sell for scrap. The Inspector advised the Committee that though rough sleepers have been known to stay in derelict buildings but wanted to make clear that the Police cannot and will not make a link. The Inspector advised the Committee that prior to Christmas a couple of Members came along with the Police on a night out to see the issues that they are facing, and advised Members were invited to come in pairs or groups to also take witness if they wanted to in the future.

It was asked by Members if the more successful restrictions in the Order, dogs on leads and flyposting, would be able to stay on the Order. If they are taken off it may signify to people that you can do these again. It was also asked if the online consultation questionnaire could include views of people who use the city centre on a regular basis i.e Admiral staff. The Public Protection Manager advised that The Welsh Government had stated if a restriction is no longer facing any problems they should be removed from the Order. It was also advised that the Business Improvement District would advertise on social media and deliver flyers to retailers in the City Centre, as well as Newport Centre, Information Station and any other public building to encourage filling out the online questionnaire.

The Inspector then advised the Committee that success of the Order is the people fearing being dealt with in court. They will try to get views of his Police counterparts in other areas to bring back to the Committee.

It was advised that moving beggars to other areas is not the answer, as some Councils have banned beggars around cashpoints who then congregate around car parks. Suggestion was made that the Committee look at schemes taking place in other authorities that have had a positive effect. The Inspector advised that there is a holistic approach dealing with those who are most vulnerable, and advised of a group that are already proactively approaching rough sleepers and beggars to offer help.

It was hoped that there would be results from the Diverted Living Scheme from February to April to bring to April's meeting. Members were advised that it may be possible to invite Kevin Ward, the Manager of the scheme, to the meeting.

The Inspector advised the Members that the Diverted Living Scheme was one of many options, and that the goal was not to cleanse the city of beggars but to help the vulnerable. It was advised that there is a multi-agency approach towards looking at the problem.

Conclusions

The Committee **accepted** the evidence and opinions from the Officers and the Police. They **approved** the consultation strategy proposed and **agreed** to receive the outcomes of the consultation at its meeting in April.

The Members were advised that there could be opportunity to invite representatives from the Wallwich, Shelter Cymru and the Housing Needs Manager for Newport City Council to the meeting in April.

The meeting terminated at 11.38 am



Scrutiny Report

Performance Scrutiny Committee – People

Part 1

Date: 23 January 2018

Subject 2018/19 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan

Author Senior Overview and Scrutiny Officer

The following officers have been invited to attend for this item:

Role / Areas of responsibility	Lead Officer
Budget Overview and Process	Meirion Rushworth, Head of Finance
Budget Public Engagement	Rhys Cornwall, Head of People and Business Change
Comments from the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People	Cllr David Williams, Chair of Performance Scrutiny Committee – People
Comments from the Performance Scrutiny Committee – Place and Corporate	Cllr Chris Evans, Chair of Performance Scrutiny Committee – Place and Corporate

Section A – Committee Guidance and Recommendations

<p>1. Recommendations to the Committee</p> <p>(i) The Committee is asked to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the process undertaken for this year’s Draft budget proposals; • the public engagement undertaken for this year’s Draft budget proposals; <p>(ii) Determine if it wishes to make any comments on the budget process or the public engagement to the Cabinet;</p> <p>(iii) Endorse the comments made by the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People, and Performance Scrutiny Committee – Place and Corporate to be forwarded to the Cabinet.</p>

2. Context

- 2.1 In accordance with the constitution, the Cabinet is required to consult on the proposals before recommending an overall budget and required council tax to the Council for approval in March. Scrutiny Committees must be consulted as part of this process. The timetable for the consultation on the budget is as follows:

Cabinet agrees budget proposals as a basis for consultation	20 December 2017
Consultation period	21 December 2017 to 31 January 2018
Cabinet considers feedback from consultation and agrees final budget proposals for recommendation to Council	14 February 2018
Council approves the 2018/19 budget and council tax level	27 February 2018

Structure of Scrutiny of the Budget Proposals

- 2.2 Each Committee will meet to discuss the budget proposals in detail and formulate comments relating to their portfolio:

Committee	Date	Role
Performance Scrutiny Committee - Place and Corporate	22 January 2018	Savings proposals within the Place Directorate and Corporate.
Performance Scrutiny Committee - People	23 January 2018	Savings proposal within the People Directorate
Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	1 February 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coordination of comments from all Scrutiny Committees• Comments on the budget process• Comments on public engagement

- 2.3 Recommendations will be agreed verbally at the Committee meetings, the final wording will be approved by the Chairperson after the meeting. These recommendations will then be sent to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) at its meeting on 1 February 2018 to confirm the list of comments that will be submitted from Scrutiny to the Cabinet. The Chair of this Committee will be invited to attend the meeting of the OSMC where the Committees recommendations are discussed.
- 2.4 The role of the Overview and Scrutiny is to coordinate the comments from Scrutiny to ensure that there are no overlaps in what is being recommended and ensure that scrutiny as a whole provides a cohesive and consistent response to Cabinet. It also has overall responsibility for comments on the budget process, and public engagement, which it will be focusing on at its meeting.
- 2.5 The Committee may wish to draw out key themes from the two Scrutiny Committees to highlight overarching issues on the budget to the Cabinet Member.

- 2.5 At its meeting on 28 September 2017, the Committee received an [update](#) on the Budget Consultation and Engagement process for this year.

3. Information Submitted to the Committee

- 3.1 The following information is attached:

Appendix 1	Cabinet Report
Appendix 2	Comments from the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People
Appendix 3	Comments from the Performance Scrutiny Committee – Place and Corporate

- 3.2 The draft 2017-18 Budget proposals and Medium Term Financial Plan were confirmed by Cabinet at its meeting on 20 December 2017. The full cabinet report is available on the Council's Website ([Cabinet Report](#)):

- 3.3 At this meeting, the Cabinet agreed the following proposals for public consultation:
- The budget savings proposals in Appendix 2 (summary table) and Appendix 6 (detailed business cases).
 - The proposed increases to fees and charges in Appendix 7 of the Cabinet Report.
 - The position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in section 5.

These proposals have been considered in detail by the relevant Scrutiny Committee as per the schedule at paragraph 2.2 above.

- 3.4 Under the constitution and our scheme of delegation, some budget decisions have to be taken by the Cabinet collectively or individual Cabinet Members. These proposals, totalling £2,393k for 2018/19 and £2,919k over the life of the MTFP, will form the basis of the public consultation on the budget this year.

- 3.5 Some lower level, more operational and efficiency type budget proposals are delegated to senior officers for decision and implementation. These proposals, totalling £2,947k for 2018/19 and £3,049k over the life of the MTFP are listed for reference. There are also savings that have been agreed in the previous years or are due to be implemented in 2018/19.

Reference to these is contained within the [Cabinet papers](#) and will be implemented separately from the public consultation. As these do not form part of the consultation, they are not being considered by the Scrutiny Committees, and are referenced for information only.

- 3.6 The Cabinet report (**Appendix A**) contains background information in the budget setting process, financial planning assumptions as well as outlining the budget process and planned consultation. This is the focus of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's consideration of the budget this year.

Scrutiny Committees

- 3.7 The Performance Scrutiny Committee – Place and Corporate, met on 22 January to consider the proposals relevant to their directorates. At this meeting, the Committee questioned the Heads of Service,

4. Suggested Areas of Focus

Role of the Committee

<p>The role of the Committee in considering the report is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is there evidence of links to the Corporate Plan and a strategic long term approach to budget; ○ Fairness and Equalities Impact Assessments – have these been completed consistently and used to develop the proposals? ○ Has the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act been incorporated into the proposals in terms of the need for long term thinking and planning? ○ Approach to public engagement - is there a cohesive and consistent approach demonstrated to how the public have been involved and consulted on the proposals. • Conclusions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comments / recommendations to Cabinet on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget process; ○ Public Engagement; ○ FEIA's; ○ Wellbeing of Future Generations Act. ○ Any overarching issues emerging from the two Performance Scrutiny Committee meetings. ○ Agree to forward the comments of the two performance Scrutiny Committees to the Cabinet on the specific proposals.

Suggested Lines of Enquiry

- 4.1 Councillors have a fundamental democratic right to commission financial information and provide challenge to executives and officers about finances. Scrutiny councillors are not expected to be financial experts, but they have a key role in ensuring **accountability** and **value for money** are demonstrated to the public.
- 4.2 The following has been adapted from Section 3.1-3.4: Source: Grant Thornton – Local Government Financial Resilience Review 2012 (“Towards a tipping point?”) to provide examples of the questioning and lines of enquiry that the Committee may wish to consider:

Links to Strategic Planning	How does the proposal contribute to the achieving corporate priorities?
	How do these proposals fit into an overall budget strategy / what is the long term approach to budget at the Council?
Fairness and Equalities Impact Assessments	Have these been completed? Is there a consistent approach to completing FEIAs and have they been used to inform the proposals?
Public Consultation	Is it clear how the public have been consulted on the budget proposals? Has there been a consistent approach to public engagement and involvement within this year’s budget proposals?

4.4 All plans / decisions / policy changes now need to be made in line with the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act, and this should be considered in Scrutiny's consideration of budget proposals.

Wellbeing of Future Generations	How will this decision / policy / proposal impact upon future generations? What is the long term impact?
	What evidence is provided to demonstrate WFGA has been / is being considered?
	How are the Wellbeing goals reflected in the policy / proposal / action? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A prosperous Wales</i> • <i>A resilient Wales</i> • <i>A healthier Wales</i> • <i>A more equal Wales</i> • <i>A Wales of cohesive communities</i> • <i>A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language</i> • <i>A globally responsible Wales</i>
	Does the report / proposal demonstrate how as an authority we are working in accordance with the sustainable development principles from the act when planning services? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long Term <i>The importance of balancing short-term needs with the need to safeguard the ability to also meet long-term needs</i> • Prevention <i>How acting to prevent problems occurring or getting worse may help public bodies meet their objectives</i> • Integration <i>Considering how the public body's well-being objectives may impact upon each of the well-being goals, on their other objectives, or on the objectives of other public bodies</i> • Collaboration <i>Acting in collaboration with any other person (or different parts of the body itself) that could help the body to meet its well-being objectives</i> • Involvement <i>The importance of involving people with an interest in achieving the well-being goals, and ensuring that those people reflect the diversity of the area which the body serves.</i>

Section B – Supporting Information

5. Further Guidance on the Scrutiny Role

5.1 The information in the following section has been taken and adapted from the CfPS / Grant Thornton Finance Scrutiny Guide (pdf) published in June 2014. The extracts reproduced here focus predominantly on Councillors' role in the annual budget setting process.

- 5.2 For further information, Members are invited to read the original publication which includes more detail about scrutiny's role in financial planning and management, as well as case studies and best practice examples.

Understanding Roles and Responsibilities

- 5.4 Councillors and officers have a collective and individual responsibility for ensuring that a council's finances are effectively managed. Within the Annual Budget process:

Council	Agrees the policy and budget framework.
Cabinet/Executive	<p>Cabinet agrees a series of proposals for public consultation, which form the draft budget proposals. Scrutiny must be consulted as part of this process.</p> <p>Responsible for proposing the policy and budget framework and key strategies, including the MTFP and annual budget. It has power to take all executive decisions within the policy and budget framework agreed by the Council.</p>
Scrutiny Chairs	<p>The Chair should encourage all scrutiny councillors to take a full part in scrutiny, including taking part in any agreed work outside of the formal meetings.</p> <p>Focus the Committee on their role in providing constructive challenge as a consultee in the budget process.</p>
Scrutiny Councillors	<p>The role of scrutiny councillors is to review policy and challenge whether the executive is making the right decisions to deliver policy goals and achieve Council's agreed objectives. Their role comprises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing constructive challenge on the draft budget proposals and ensure that properly costed policy and budget proposals are implemented. ○ Monitoring the service and financial performance of the council and its partners and examining the impact and implementation of cabinet decisions and policies ○ Holding the council leader, cabinet and senior officers to account in how effectively they deliver a balanced budget.
Heads of Service	<p>Within the policy and budget framework and decisions taken by executives, Chief Executives, Chief Finance Officers and Monitoring Officers have key responsibilities for the way Councils are run in terms of compliance with legal duties.</p> <p>Section 151 of the Local Government Act sets out requirements to prepare a prudent and balanced annual budget including maintaining reasonable levels of reserves and the role of the Head of Finance (as the designated 151 Officer) within this. Other members of the corporate management team are responsible for administering annual service budgets.</p>
Finance Professionals	Such as auditors and accountants, should identify how financial planning and management processes can ensure time and space for scrutiny to add value and make a difference.

Fairness and Equalities Impact Assessment (FEIAs)

- 5.5 Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments (FEIA) are a systematic approach to ensure that the Council takes decisions that balances the needs of people, local culture, the economy and the environment over time. FEIAs assist the Council in ensuring that our decision-making process is inclusive. They are used to look at the effect of any change to Council services or employment from everybody's viewpoint, to make sure that changes are fair and do not discriminate.
- 5.6 Officers have a responsibility to inform decision makers of all the relevant implications of any proposal and provide evidence on which they will base their decisions. FEIAs help decision makers understand service users, employees and other stakeholders' perspectives, and provide evidence that citizens have shaped the council's work. There is legal requirement to publish FEIAs.
- 5.7 Within the Budget proposal Business Cases, there is an indication as to whether or not an assessment is necessary for a proposal. The Performance Scrutiny Committees were asked to consider these during their discussion on the proposals within their remit.
- 5.8 The FEIA's are published on the Council's Equalities page on the website ([link](#)).

Links to Council Policies and Priorities

6. The overall aim of the budget and MTFP is to ensure resource allocation is based on priorities, supports the delivery of the Council's change programme and saving proposals and protects the financial health of the Council. Scrutiny should seek to ensure that the MTFP and Draft budget proposals contribute to this aim.

Financial Implications

7. The financial implications are contained within the report to the Cabinet on the draft budget proposals 2017/18. Scrutiny is being asked to make recommendations and comments to the Cabinet for consideration on these proposals

8. Background Papers

Cabinet Report – Draft Budget Proposals (21 December 2017)

Grant Thornton – Local Government Financial Resilience Review 2012 (“Towards a tipping point?”)
[28 September 2017 – Agenda and minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee](#)

The full cabinet report is available on the Council's Website ([Cabinet Report](#)):

Report Appendices:

- Appendix 1 [Budget investments](#)
- Appendix 2 [New budget savings for consultation](#)
- Appendix 3 [New budget savings implemented under delegated authority \(Head of Service\)](#)
- Appendix 4 [Budget savings previously approved](#)
- Appendix 5 [Savings summary](#)
- Appendix 6 [Budget savings for consultation – Business Cases](#)
- Appendix 7 [Fees & Charges for consultation](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Report

Cabinet

Part 1

Date: 20 December 2017

Subject 2018/19 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)

Purpose To present the draft proposals for the 2018/19 budget. Cabinet are asked to agree the draft proposals to start the budget consultation process for this year. Consultation results and final proposals will be presented back to Cabinet in February, when Cabinet will be asked to recommend a final budget and council tax level to full Council.

Author Head of Finance

Ward All

Summary Further reductions in resources have been confirmed in the Council's indicative grant notification for 2018/19 which could, potentially, worsen again when the final grant settlement is known on 20th December 2017. Alongside pressures on the Council's budget which require new investment, these require savings to be considered to produce a balanced budget in 2018/19.

The draft 2018/19 budget proposals are explained and detailed in this report and its appendices.

Section:

- 1 Our financial challenge
- 2 Setting the budget
- 3 Financial planning assumptions
- 4 Budget savings
- 5 School budgets
- 6 Budget process and consultation
- 7 Report review and statutory comments

Appendix:

- | | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Appendix 1 | Budget investments |
| Appendix 2 | New budget savings for consultation |
| Appendix 3 | New budget savings implemented under delegated authority (HoS) |
| Appendix 4 | Budget savings previously approved |
| Appendix 5 | Savings summary |
| Appendix 6 | Budget savings for consultation – business cases |
| Appendix 7 | Fees & Charges for consultation |

Proposal

1. **Cabinet is asked to agree the following draft proposals for public consultation:**
 - i) Budget savings proposals in Appendix 2 (summary table) and Appendix 6 (detailed business cases).
 - ii) Proposed increases to fees and charges in Appendix 7
 - iii) The position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in paragraphs 5.1– 5.6
2. **Cabinet is asked to note:**
 - i) The position on developing a balanced budget for 2018/19, acknowledging that the position will be subject to ongoing review and updates,
 - ii) and agree that the Head of Service decisions in Appendix 3 will be implemented with immediate effect.
 - iii) That Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments have been completed for all proposals requiring one.

Action by Directors / Heads of Service

Timetable Immediate:

1. Head of Service decisions in Appendix 3 to be implemented with immediate effect.
2. Cabinet / Cabinet Members budget savings proposals, fees and charges, and schools funding position to form the basis of the budget consultation process.

This report was prepared after consultation with:

- Directors
- Head of Law and Regulation
- Head of People and Business Change

1 Our financial challenge

- 1.1 The Council provides over 800 services, for over 147,800 people, living in over 65,000 households. Newport's population is growing, with the largest growth for children under five, and people aged over 65. The Council also provides employment for over 6,000 people.
- 1.2 Financial pressures and demands on our services are increasing due to:
- Ageing population
 - Increases in demand led services
 - Care for the elderly and children
 - Schools funding
 - National Minimum Wage
 - Inflationary costs
- 1.3 Over the last five years, the council has made savings of £41m. To achieve this we have
- reduced the number of staff we employ by around one quarter
 - sold land, buildings and property we no longer use or need
 - set up a property services joint venture
 - set up a charitable trust for leisure services
 - reviewed our services to become more efficient
 - developed shared services such as IT
 - helped people to live independently

But ongoing public sector austerity measures, coupled with continuing financial pressures and demands mean that even more savings must still be found – at least £30m by 2022.

Implementing the new Corporate Plan

- 1.4 Following the elections in May 2017, the council has developed a new Corporate Plan which sets out a clear set of aspirations and plans for the future. This is the first budget setting period within this strategic plan. There is work ongoing to develop our new change programme and ensure that the necessary investment (revenue and capital) is available to achieve the priorities set out in the corporate plan.
- 1.5 The Council's future plans and its change programme will need to ensure a strategic approach is taken on the future direction of Council services. This means that it will need to meet the medium term financial sustainability challenge, meet key priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and our duties under the Well-Being of Future Generations Act in terms of sustainability and well-being objectives. The new Corporate Plan is rightly ambitious and whilst this presents significant financial challenges within the current climate of austerity, the Authority has made a commitment to address key priorities over the plan's lifespan.
- 1.6 Of particular importance is the need to bring forward plans to stabilise and manage the current areas of significant in year budget overspending – Community Care, Special Education Needs and Children's Placements, whilst managing the budget risks they represent in the shorter term before those plans can be implemented. The costs and investments in doing these will need to be factored into the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) when known.
- 1.7 Factoring in any cost implications of the new Corporate Plan over and above existing revenue and capital budgets, as well as any costs required to deal with stabilising the three areas of significant demand/cost overspending shown above, will need to be factored into the MTFP when there is more information available on these and this will need to be completed as soon as possible. Clearly, in the current financial climate, the Council will need to minimise the cost implications wherever possible.

2 Setting the budget

2.1 There are two main elements to the council's financial planning:

- strategic planning: the MTFP
- within that, the annual council budget.

2.2 The Council is required by law to set a balanced budget every year. At the same time, we review and update our MTFP, to help plan our savings and investments across the next four years. For a number of years now we have faced continued financial pressures together with reducing funding allocations from central government, so we have had to find savings to meet the funding gap between the income we receive through our grants and council tax collection, and our expenditure on the wide variety of services we provide.

2.3 To meet this gap, in putting together the budget proposals each year we review:

- i) budget commitments (both investments and savings) agreed in the MTFP last year
- ii) new areas in need of investment and growth
- iii) new proposals for savings and efficiencies
- iv) new proposals on our fees and charges

2.4 As in previous years, Cabinet will be asked to keep the medium term position in mind, and in February will agree the full package of new medium term savings and investments, to be added to what has already been approved within the MTFP.

National budget position

2.5 The Chancellor's Autumn UK budget in November continued the significant reductions to public services funding over a number of years, and local government in particular. Lower GDP growth and productivity means UK borrowing is now forecast to be considerably higher over the next few years than was the case in the March 2017 budget, and the fiscal target to eliminate the deficit by the middle of the next decade looks much more difficult to meet. Brexit, of course, provides another layer of uncertainty at this time.

2.6 In this context, the downward pressure on public services funding continues. Crucially, no new funding for Social Care was announced, an area which is very challenging, in particular Children's services. In addition, the Green Paper review of the future funding for Adult Social Care services has been delayed. It provided no prospects for change to the Council's indicative grant settlement for 2018/19, which was announced on 10 October and is discussed below.

2.7 The Chancellor's UK Autumn budget provided an additional c£1.2bn funding to the Welsh Government budget over the next 3 years, which is all capital funding apart from around £350m allocated for revenue funding. No decisions have been announced yet on how this additional funding will be used.

Welsh Government funding settlement

2.8 Welsh Government funding accounts for the largest part of the council's budget, equating to around 80 per cent of its total net revenue budget funding. This funding is provided through non-hypothecated grants – the Revenue Support Grant (RSG). In addition to this, other grants provide funding for specific purposes.

2.9 The council received its [provisional RSG settlement from Welsh Government](#) (weblink) on 10 October 2017. Overall, it confirmed that the council would receive £211,682k for 2018/19. After allowing for net specific grant transfers into the RSG, and new responsibilities being funded, this is a 'cash decrease' of £873k (-0.4%) from current funding. Our final settlement from Welsh

Government is due on 20 December 2017, and we are waiting for further information on the receipt of specific grant income.

- 2.10 In terms of the final settlement, the main cause of changes from the draft settlement is in relation to changes to a council's tax-base, i.e. its ability to raise its own council tax income. If a council's tax-base changes by more or less than the Welsh average, their final grant settlement will be increased or decreased accordingly. This 'equalisation' is a key feature of the Local Government grant settlement process, but provides some challenges to those Councils, like Newport, who have significant cost pressures resulting from housing and population growth.
- 2.11 The Head of Finance has set the tax-base for 2018/19 and it will increase by almost 1.5%, significantly higher than the all Wales average of 0.5%-0.8% over the last few years. We do not know what impact this will have until we receive the final budget settlement, but it is likely that the council could suffer a further decrease in its grant settlement, with the possibility of this being significant.
- 2.12 The current budget assumptions have not been adjusted for this increase in the tax-base in Newport and the increased council tax income it brings, on the assumption, at this point, that we'll lose at least the equivalent in Welsh Government grant. The Head of Finance will provide a verbal update on this in the Cabinet meeting, when the final settlement will be known.
- 2.13 The outcome of the draft settlement, along with extensive work by officers to develop robust savings proposals since July, has seen the budget gap in 2018/19 reduce to a position where the budget for 2018/19 is finely balanced. The position can only be confirmed with confidence after receipt of the final settlement, on 20 December.

3 Financial planning assumptions

Revenue Support Grant (RSG)

- 3.1 The draft grant settlement for 2018/19 is currently known at a -0.4% reduction, which may change at final settlement stage. An average -1.5% reduction has been indicated by WG for the following year 2019/20 but this may decrease slightly following the UK budget announcement in November. The MTFP will be updated for the February 2018 Cabinet when details are known with more certainty.

Inflation

- 3.2 Pay, contract and income inflation has been included within the MTFP based on specific inflationary factors:
- National pay award inflation is included at 1%, in line with the 'public sector pay cap', but the Cabinet will know that this pay cap is under intense scrutiny and pressure across the UK public sector and therefore represents a risk in terms of the budget.
 - Lower pay grades and external contracts affected by the Minimum and Living wage increases have been uplifted by increases in these rates, which in percentage terms, are significant and provide a relatively large, and unfunded, pressure on budgets.
 - Unavoidable inflation pressures equate to £2,273k in 2018/19 and £13,074k over the four year period to 2021/22.

Investments

- 3.3 In addition to the unavoidable inflationary increase, the Council has to also consider and fund unavoidable budget pressures from increasing demand, unfunded UK/ Welsh policy changes and

other issues resulting in significant savings being required from in the base budget in order to balance the budget.

3.4 For 2018/19 specifically, the Council is currently planning on investing around £11.3m in the draft budget over and above an allowance for inflation on pay and prices. Around £4m of these pressures relate to specific grants that have been transferred into RSG. More details on proposed investments are included in Appendix 1 and some of the key items include:

- £3,985k grants transferred into the RSG
- £1,313k costs associated with new schools
- £1,135k for pension deficit
- £1,100k permanent transfer of funds to schools
- £800k for increasing number of children in out of County placements
- £427k reduction in external funding in respect of Supporting People (Adult & Community Services) and Sustainable Waste grant (Streetscene & City Services)
- £350k of pressure from implementing national policy of increasing 'capital limit' before any contributing is payable for residential care charges.

Council tax

3.5 It is well documented that Newport's council tax is low compared to others in Wales, generating approximately 20 per cent of our income, compared to around 25 per cent for most Welsh councils. The Welsh Government uses the standard spending assessment (SSA) to calculate the level of spending required to deliver a 'standard level' of service in each council area. However, our actual spend is well below our SSA (around £8.3m in 2017-18), which is mainly due to our low level of council tax funding.

3.6 A base 4% increase is already included in our MTFP each year. This year, the budget proposals include an additional 1% increase to council tax in 2018/19 (Appendix 2) bringing the proposed increase to 5%. This is subject to consultation, and a final recommendation to Council on the council tax level will be confirmed in the Cabinet's February meeting.

4 Budget savings

4.1 The savings identified for 2018/19 total £7,408k. Table 1 below provides a summary of the savings for 2018/19.

4.2 Under the constitution and our scheme of delegation, some budget decisions have to be taken by the Cabinet collectively or individual Cabinet Members. These proposals, totalling £2,393k for 2018/19 and £2,919k over the life of the MTFP, will form the basis of the public consultation on the budget this year.

4.3 Some lower level, more operational and efficiency type budget proposals are delegated to senior officers for decision and implementation. These proposals, totalling £2,947k for 2018/19 and £3,049k over the life of the MTFP are listed in Appendix 3. These Head of Service decisions are listed for reference and will be implemented separately from the public consultation. Regardless of their categorisation, the normal protocols for staff, unions and any other required consultation are being adhered to in respect of all savings.

4.4 The savings already agreed last year are either in progress or due to be implemented in 2018/19. Links to their business cases are provided in the appendix. No further details are shown for these savings, as they have already been approved, although it should be noted that in some cases the timings or value of savings have been updated in light of experience gained in their implementation. The net impact of these adjustments for 2018/19 is £12k fewer savings.

Table 1: 2018/19 summary of savings

Savings Decision Type	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	Staff Impact FTE
Budget savings for full Cabinet decision (Appendix 2 & 6)	1,548	269	0	0	-11.5
Budget savings for Cabinet Member decision (Appendix 2 & 6)	845	257	0	0	-65.2
Budget savings delegated to officers (Appendix 3)	2,947	76	26	0	-7.1
Total new budget savings	5,340	602	26	0	-83.8
Previously agreed budget savings (Appendix 4)	2,068	1,580	20	0	-35.1
TOTAL BUDGET SAVINGS	7,408	2,182	46	0	-118.9

Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments (FEIAs)

4.5 All budget proposals have been reviewed, where needed, to ensure the Council understands and mitigates, where possible, fairness and equality issues. FEIAs seek to identify whether proposals will have a positive or negative impact in relation to the protected characteristics, as defined by the Equalities Act. Within Newport, they also include an assessment against the principles of fairness, as presented by Newport's Fairness Commission. Where required, proposals include mitigating measures needed to ensure we meet our equalities responsibilities. Officers have identified those specific proposals where an FEIA would be required and these have been completed. Compliance with the Equalities Impact Assessment and the Equalities Act 2010 is a legal obligation and is intended to result in better informed decision-making and policy development and services that are more effective for users.

5 School funding

- 5.1 The current position assumes there is no reduction to school's funding, unlike other parts of the Council's budget where significant savings are being made. Cabinet are asked to consider the level of funding that will be delegated to schools for 2018/19. The current draft budget proposals for schools include funding for the following items:

Table 2: School budget pressures 2018-22

School Pressures	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	Total (£'000)
Inflation	-	1,163	1,181	1,199	3,543
Demographic Growth	-	539	826	807	2,172
Schools Reorganisation	1,028	1,307	1,006	1,050	4,391
Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) school	285	200	-	-	485
Teaching Staff Increments	-	736	612	484	1,832
Continuation of one off funding	1,100	-	-	-	1,100
Total Pressures	2,413	3,945	3,625	3,540	13,523
Savings	(240)	0	0	0	(240)
Net Budget Pressure	2,173	3,945	3,625	3,540	13,283

- 5.2 This report proposes that the schools budget is kept at the current level for 2018/19, with the exception of:
- funding to cover the running costs of new schools; including a new Social, Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) school
 - continuation of the £1.1m one-off funding which was made available in 2016/17 from revenue budget underspends.
- 5.3 Overall, the total existing schools budget will be 'cash-flat' and schools will need to absorb cost pressures such as inflationary pay awards / pay increments etc. The existing budget will not be expected to absorb the cost of new schools as new, additional funding is included for this.
- 5.4 This is undoubtedly a challenging position for schools and is further compounded by reduced funding from their external grant. Although final allocations are yet to be determined across the Education Achievement Service (EAS) region, there is a headline cut to the Education Improvement Grant (EIG) of £3m (11.2%). We are yet to receive figures for the Post-16 grant, however projections of close to £0.5m reduction have been tentatively acknowledged by Welsh Government as being broadly accurate.
- 5.5 In recognising the challenges the draft budget assumptions give, school funding in overall terms is better than other parts of the Council, and has increased, on average, over the last few years. The table below sets out the proposed percentage change to cash limits in 2018/19 for both schools and other areas of the Council. This excludes the impact of specific grants that have transferred into the RSG (£3,985k) but includes new responsibilities (£321k).

Table 3: Budget changes for schools and other areas of the council

	2017/18 Base Budget (Apr '17)	Inflation	Other Pressures	Savings	2018/19 Est Cash Limit	Growth/ (Reduction) in Cash Limit	Growth/ (Reduction) as % of net budget
Schools	90,297	-	1,313	- 240	91,370	1,073	1%
Other	176,075	2,273	4,940	- 7,168	176,120	45	0%
	266,372	2,273	6,253	- 7,408	267,490	1,118	

5.6 The table below shows how the overall schools budget has increased by over 7% over the last 4 years.

Table 4: School budget changes 2013-18

Year	Nursery	Primary	Secondary	Special	Total
2013/14	656	50,193	46,152	2,959	99,960
2014/15	585	52,234	47,165	2,894	102,878
2015/16	519	52,924	47,480	3,724	104,647
2016/17	494	54,627	48,619	4,040	107,780
2017/18	512	54,959	47,505	4,247	107,223
Increase in funding over 5 year period (incl specific grants)					7.3%
Increase in funding (excl specific grants & delegations)					7.7%

6 Budget process and consultation

6.1 This report presents the draft proposals for the 2018/19 budget. The report asks Cabinet to note:

- The position on developing a balanced budget for 2018/19, acknowledging that the position will be subject to ongoing review and updates,
- and agree that the Head of Service decisions in Appendix 3 will be implemented with immediate effect.
- That Fairness and Equality Impact Assessments have been completed for all proposals requiring one.

6.2 The report also asks Cabinet to agree a series of proposals for public consultation. This includes

- The budget savings proposals in Appendix 2 (summary table) and Appendix 6 (detailed business cases).
- The proposed increases to fees and charges in Appendix 7
- The position regarding the proposed school funding for 2018/19 in section 5.

6.3 Seeking to capture and understand the opinions needs and suggestions of the public, specific service users and other stakeholders has been an important part of the Council's budget setting process in recent years. Each year the budget is informed by extensive consultation, which allows our knowledge and understanding to grow over time. Over the last three budget cycles we received more than 5,600 responses from the public with over 2,600 in the last financial year.

- 6.4 In addition to external public consultation, proposals will be reported to Scrutiny Committees, the Fairness Commission, Unions, School Forum and Third sector/Business community throughout December / January. As already noted, further work is required on the Council's Corporate Plan, Change programme and proposals to balance the overall MTFP both in total and over individual years.
- 6.5 A second budget report will be presented Cabinet on 14 February 2018. This will ask Cabinet to agree its final proposals for the 2018/19 budget and the resulting recommended level of council tax to fund that. The February report to Cabinet will include:
- The results of the public consultation process
 - Details and analysis of the final grant settlement from Welsh Government
 - Any updates from Welsh Government about future grant settlements
 - Any emerging details on specific grants which have financial implications.
- 6.6 Setting the Council Tax level and resulting total net revenue budget is the responsibility of full Council, so Cabinet's recommendations will be presented to the Council meeting on 27 February for approval and adoption.
- 6.7 Below is this year's timetable for consulting on and approving the 2018/19 budget:

Table 5: Budget consultation timetable 2018/19

Cabinet agrees budget proposals as a basis for consultation	20 December 2017
Consultation period	21 December 2017 to 31 January 2018
Cabinet considers feedback from consultation and agrees final budget proposals for recommendation to Council	14 February 2018
Council approves the 2018/19 budget and council tax level	27 February 2018

7 Report Review and Statutory Comments

7.1 Risks

Risk	Impact of Risk if it occurs* (H/M/L)	Probability of risk occurring (H/M/L)	What is the Council doing or what has it done to avoid the risk or reduce its effect	Who is responsible for dealing with the risk?
Planning parameters around inflation are incorrect	M	M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Use of contingency, where required 2 Use of reserves, where appropriate 	Head of Finance SLT
Planning parameters around Welsh Government	H	M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of contingency, where required 2. Keep the assumptions under constant review 	Head of Finance

revenue grant are incorrect over medium term			3. Use of conservative assumptions	
Increasing budget pressures over medium term	M	M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manage demand, where possible 2. Keep MTFP under constant review 3. SLT review of all budget pressures within MTFP 	SLT

* Taking account of proposed mitigation measures

7.2 Links to Council Policies and Priorities

The overall aim of the budget and MTFP is to ensure resource allocation is based on priorities, supports the delivery of the Council's change programme and saving proposals and protects the financial health of the Council.

7.3 Options Available and considered

There are few options available as the Council is required to consult on its budget where decisions do not fall under delegated authority and therefore needs to agree the basis of its consultation.

7.4 Preferred Option and Why

To consult on the new medium term package to ensure that savings are deliverable from the earliest opportunity.

7.5 Comments of Chief Financial Officer

The main financial issues are contained within the body of the report. Of particular importance is the need for the Council to develop a strategic approach to change the way services are delivered, within the context of a new, updated Corporate Plan. The on-going financial challenges will require significant changes in how services are delivered. In the meantime, the significant budget pressures in Social Care and SEN education will need to be managed before plans are brought forward to mitigate and stabilise.

In its February 2017 budget setting meeting, further details on financial resilience and capacity to meet performance targets and mitigate risk will be included. These issues were set out comprehensively when agreeing the main budget setting planning parameters in the September budget report to Cabinet and will be reviewed again as the final budget is agreed.

7.6 Comments of Monitoring Officer

There are no specific legal issues arising from the Report at this stage. Cabinet is being asked to approve draft savings proposals set out in the attached business cases in order to deliver a balanced budget for 18/19, as the basis for public consultation, where those business cases are not delegated to Heads of Service, in accordance with the Council's scheme of delegation. Cabinet and Cabinet Members (as appropriate) will then take the final decisions on those business cases in the light of the responses to the public consultation, prior to making a recommendation to Council regarding the budget for 18/19.

The implementation of all these business cases are executive matters, with the exception of any consequential staffing proposals which are non-executive matters delegated to Heads of Service. However, whichever decision-making process applies, all of the business cases have been the subject of equality and fairness impact assessments to ensure that the Council has regard to its public sector

equality duties under the Equality Act and is also acting fairly in terms of the impact of the proposed changes on service delivery. In addition, where specific proposals require more focussed consultation with staff and key stakeholders, this will be carried out prior to the implementation of any proposed changes.

The setting of the overall base budget and council tax rate for 18/19 is a matter for full Council as these are non-executive reserved matters under the Constitution.

7.7 Comments of Head of People and Business Change

The report presents a series of proposals to Cabinet and Cabinet Members for consideration, prior to consultation with the public, partners and staff. The staffing implications of each proposal, along with those decisions delegated to Head of Service, are highlighted within the report in terms of head count and full time equivalent (FTE). There are also other impacts on staff that are detailed within individual business cases, whether positive or negative. Whilst the Council continues to do all it can to limit the impacts of staff reduction it also has a binding duty to manage the delivery of services within ever tightening financial constraints.

Over the last four years extensive public engagement has been undertaken in relation to setting service delivery priorities and identifying which services matter most to people, and contribute to their wellbeing. Cabinet have considered the results of this engagement and this has been reflected in the budget programs taken forward in 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18.

The Wellbeing of Future Generations Act 2015, which came into force in April 2016 provides a framework for embedding sustainable development principles within the activities of Council and has major implications for the long-term planning of finances and service provision. A corporate training and development program was undertaken to ensure that senior management and elected members were aware of the implications of the Act and the part they should play in embedding its principles and ways of working. Key documents and processes have been revised so that they incorporate sustainable development and wellbeing principles. The Business Cases used to develop savings proposals now require the consideration of the “five ways of working”, and similar revisions have been made to report templates and the Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment format.

7.8 Comments of Cabinet Member

The Chair of Cabinet has approved the report for consideration by Cabinet.

7.9 Scrutiny Committees

The constitution requires that Scrutiny Committees are consulted on Cabinet’s draft budget proposals.

7.10 Equalities Impact Assessment and the Equalities Act 2010

This is referenced in paragraph 4.5 of the report.

7.11 Children and Families (Wales) Measure

All proposals will be consulted on widely, as required.

7.12 Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

The Act is referenced in the report.

7.13 Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes a duty on the Local Authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.

Dated: 13 December 2017

- Appendix 1 Budget investments
- Appendix 2 New budget savings for consultation
- Appendix 3 New budget savings implemented under delegated authority (Head of Service)
- Appendix 4 Budget savings previously approved
- Appendix 5 Savings summary
- Appendix 6 Budget savings for consultation – Business Cases
- Appendix 7 Fees & Charges for consultation

This page is intentionally left blank

Performance Scrutiny Committee People 23 Jan 2018 at 10am

Conclusions and Comments:

Comments to Cabinet on following Proposals:

EDU181902 - Consolidation of the Educational Psychology, Additional Learning Needs, and Specific Learning Needs Teams into a 'Inclusion Enrichment Team'

The Committee felt that there was insufficient evidence in this business case to fully understand how the savings would be achieved. The Committee received explanation from the Head of Service as to how this would work in practice; however this level of detail should have been included within the business case, so that the public have an understanding of the potential impact of the proposal.

Highlight the risk of this proposal:

- This proposal will increase the pressure placed on schools without any additional funding or resources, and will likely have a negative impact on the young people needing to use this support.
- Move to a cluster approach - unclear how the clusters will operate, and how the resources will be allocated to each cluster, which makes it difficult to fully understand the impact of the proposal.
- Indication from the officers was that the face to face contact with pupils will decrease and the proposal looks to empower the school based staff to take over this role. There is a risk that too much is being expected of the teaching staff to provide effective oversight of all of the potentially complex issues for that individual child, whilst managing the needs of the whole class.
- This presents a risk to young people who could potentially be missed if the impact of this proposal is a reduction in service. This would have an impact on their opportunity to engage within work and training.

The Committee acknowledges the mitigation outlined to provide training to support the teachers and schools to enable school based staff can support their pupils in their own learning environments. However, the Committee concerned that this mitigation may not fully address the risk for the following reasons:

- Concerned about the capacity of the remaining staff within the clusters to provide training for schools on a large scale;
- As its unclear how the cluster approach will operate – therefore it's also unclear whether there is capacity within these clusters to deliver this training.
- Unclear who within the new team will be responsible for training, and the timescale of when the training will be provided to the schools.
- The time that this will take to roll out the training could mean that there is a substantial gap in provision in the short term.

The Committee recommends that if this proposal is approved, that the implementation of this is carefully monitored, and that this is reported to the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People on a regular basis, with detailed information in the impact on these young people.

EDU181904 - Re-modelling of the Pupil Referral Unit

The Committee felt that this saving was not accurately set out in the business case. The Head of Service provided additional information, the Committee agreed that this should have been included in the business case to inform the public of the potential impact, risks and mitigations in place.

Highlighting the risks of this proposal:

Performance Scrutiny Committee People 23 Jan 2018 at 10am

Conclusions and Comments:

- The proposal will increase pressure on schools without any additional funding or resources and could have a negative impact on the young people accessing the PRU in its current state.
- The staff and teachers are being asked to undertake additional roles and responsibilities, which might impact on their health and wellbeing. As well as their ability to provide a continued high quality service to all the young people.
- The young people who would normally receive additional support from the PRU, are now at risk of losing this support, increasing the likelihood of them dropping out of education and becoming NEET (Not in Education Employment or Training).
- The detail about satellite provisions was missing from the business case, as was their impact on the communities where they are based.
- The impact on the young people in mainstream school when the young people from the PRU are placed in a mainstream environment.

The Committee welcomed the mitigations outlined in the proposal, but were concerned that the mitigations were not enough. They explained that there might be an accumulative affect from increasing the numbers of young people in need of support, and the transition period of the Educational Psychologists and ALN team training and upskilling the teachers and school staff.

The Members felt that the claim of a saving of £485k was misleading. The net saving claim of £485k is incorrect as this money is being moved into the Individual Schools Budget to fund the SEBD School. This proposal will make no financial saving.

CFS181901 - Review of Oakland Short Break Service

The Committee had concerns about the impact of this proposal on disabled children and their families, based on the information presented in the business case. The Head of Service provided context to the review and additional information on alternative provision that would be explored to ensure that the needs of the children and their families are met. Information on this alternative private and third sector provision should be included within the business case to enable the public to fully understand the impact of this proposal as it gives a context to the proposed review.

Within the 'Impact on Citizens' section of the business case, the impact on service users was not sufficiently stated, simply stating that '*support for families with disabled child will be reduced.*' This does not give a full picture of what the impact will be. Within the options considered section of the business case it stated '*for some children there would be a reduction in the offer within their package of care*'. This again does not give a full explanation of what this reduction would be and how the impact will be mitigated.

The Committee received assurances that the families and the children currently using these services would be consulted and their views used to shape the reformed service. This was to happen should the Cabinet adopt this proposal. It was noted that this could be misleading as the decision to reduce this service from 7 days to 5 days service would have already been taken, therefore limiting scope of the input from the families.

Performance Scrutiny Committee People 23 Jan 2018 at 10am
Conclusions and Comments:

CFS181904 - Restructuring of the Funding within Prevention Services

Preventative services is not an area that the Council should be reducing. It is fundamentally against the intention of the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act to act to prevent problems occurring or getting worse, and balancing the short term needs with the need to safeguard against the ability to meet long term needs. The Committee understands the rationale behind this proposal, in that it is not a statutory service and there are limited options to making the necessary savings whilst protecting statutory services.

However, the full impact of reducing this service should be fully understood if the proposal is to be adopted.

The Committee had specific concerns regarding the following:

- Unclear how the savings of £311,000 will be made, other than a direct reduction of staff by 4 FTE. As such, there are concerns about how achievable this proposal will be as there is insufficient information in the business case to assess this.
- Title of the proposal does not accurately cover the nature of the proposal, as the recommended option (option 3) directly reduces the services offered.
- The savings made here will directly increase the other costs in other parts of the Council, most acutely Education and Children's Services. The cost of this has not been factored into the potential savings.
- Although this is not a statutory service, making reductions in this service will impact upon the statutory services budgets, as it will increase the demand for statutory services in the longer term.
- The prevention service is a core element of working with families in such a way to prevent future problems. Concern that reducing this may increase the risk for Children who would previously accessed preventative services, in that they could miss out on early interventions before issues escalate to the level for a children's services referral. Some of the Committee felt that this presented a safeguarding risk.
- No mitigations were outlined for this proposal – the explanation for this was that there was nothing that could be done to mitigate as it was a direct reduction in service.
- Very concerned about the impact that has been outlined in the business case, in particular:
 - *'...a potential restructuring of the Families First Grant could lead to a reduction in opportunities for third sector organisations'* – direct impact on the alternative / complimentary provision from the third sector.
 - *'Preventions, CANs and young Carers all have waiting lists for service so any decrease in funding would increase the gap in provision'* – there is gap in provision already, this proposal would exacerbate this issue.
 - *'Greater number of referrals to children's services'* – direct impact on future budgets of statutory services within Children's Services.
 - *'Reduced capacity in schools for support'* – direct impact on pressures of schools staff.

The combined effect of these would significantly impact upon the lives of the children involved.

Performance Scrutiny Committee People 23 Jan 2018 at 10am

Conclusions and Comments:

Comments to Cabinet Members for following proposals

CFS181902 - Integrated Family Support Team Restructure

There had been significant changes to this proposal since it had been issued for consultation in December. The progress made had caused a dramatic decrease in the number of staff impacted on by the proposal and also the implementation costs that are required to carry out the proposal.

The Committee commented on how the business case was not fit for consultation in its current form and any recommendations made might not accurately represent reality.

It was noted by Members that that no linkage with the Well-being of Future Generations act were included in the business case and this might not be the case as it directly impacts on families and young people.

CFS181913 - Reduction in expenditure on placement for Looked After Children

The Committee felt that there was not enough information or detail in this business case including:

- Increase in pressure for out of Authority placements in Education. No further information on the extent of this impact.
- *'This proposal will need to link to an invest to save proposal to crease a small amount of capacity within Children's services to first undertake a concentrated review of the current provision'*. The investment required section is then left blank so no further details about the required investment.
- The Proposal states it will reduce the spend on placements – but it doesn't explain how this will be achieved other than through reviewing the service. It is unclear how a figure for savings can be estimated before the review has taken place.
- Proposed savings – how have these been calculated, what number of placements would this reduction represent, and how are you sure this specific number of placements can be reduced before the review has been undertaken.
- In the Risk information – states that *'The risk is simply that because of external demands and increasing complexity in the children being cared for that we will be unable to achieve this saving.'* – no mitigations to explain how this risk will be managed and what the likelihood of this happening.
- Insufficient evidence of the Well-being of Future Generations act being taken into consideration.

The Head of Service provided some explanation on how the savings would be made. To achieve meaningful consultation the additional information should have been included in the business case to give the public access to all of the information.

ACS181903 - Review of the Domiciliary Care Service

The Committees greatest concern was around the lack of mitigations for the contract failing and the impact that this would have on the people who are receiving care. They felt that other mitigations needed were not set out in the business case.

Not enough information and detail was provided in the business case, most importantly included the number of residents that the proposed saving would affect.

Performance Scrutiny Committee People 23 Jan 2018 at 10am
Conclusions and Comments:

Another risk the Members highlighted that was not adequately mitigated in the business case was the continuity to care of the service users and their families.

With all of the missing information the Members agreed that it would be hard for the public to be fairly consulted on this in a productive manner as their responses would not be fully informed and would lack the depth of understanding needed for such a delicate subject.

ACS181904 - Re-provision of Supported Living Service

The Committee supported his proposal but feels that the implementation needs to be sensitively managed to limit the impact on the service users and their families.

ACS181907 - Reduction in Adult Budget

The business case does not provide sufficient information on the impact it will have on service users or what mitigations have been established.

The Committee discussed the lack of Well-being of Future Generation act information in the business case simply stating '*...the Future Generations Act 2014 requires that the City Council makes the right services available at the right time*'. This does not state how this proposal fits in with this, or mention any of the other aspects of the act.

Fees and Charges – Social Services

The Committee commented that the issue of fees and charges not being reviewed or increased for a number of years appears to be an ongoing issue.

The Committee recommends that the Cabinet ensure that each year the service areas undertake a review of the charges to ensure they are accurate each year. This would ensure that the costs area accurate, that the authority is in line with other Authorities and to stop large increases in subsequent years.

Comments upon the Budget process or public engagement to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee:

The Committee wanted to raise the following overarching issues with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee for further exploration and discussion:

Business Case Template:

- Not consistent information within the business cases. Most of the business cases needed explanation and further information from officers to fully understanding of the impact of the proposal.
- Concern that this is what is being consulted with the public and the public will not have the benefit of discussing the proposals with lead officers to gain a full understanding. The Council needs to be more transparent and ensure all the relevant information is contained within the Business Cases to ensure robust and meaningful consultation.
- If the public are to be meaningfully engaged they must be provided with clear and understandable information which sets out budget proposals, what they aim to achieve, who and how many it will effect, what the main impacts are, financial implications, if there is a reduction in service – detail as to how that would work in

Performance Scrutiny Committee People 23 Jan 2018 at 10am
Conclusions and Comments:

practise, staffing implications and other figures, detailed mitigations for any risk, detail of alternative provision (such as third sector) to indicate how a reduction in service could be compensated for.

- Level of detail inconsistent between the proposals.
- Risk scores – unclear in the business cases how these are scored – need to be broken down further not just the number but an indication of that this number means.
- Wellbeing of Future Generations box in the Business Plan – not consistently completed. The linkages between the act and the proposals were not always clear.

Wellbeing of Future Generations Act

- It is not clear how these proposals fit into a long term plan – they seem to still be reactive.
- Unclear what the Long term budget strategic direction is for the Council.

Performance Scrutiny Committee Place and Corporate 22 Jan 2018

at 4pm

Conclusions and Comments:

Comments to Cabinet on following Proposals:

Note: The Head of Service was unable to attend the Scrutiny Committee due to an emergency. The Committee understood this, and wished to thank the Officers within Street Scene who had to cover the meeting at very short notice.

As these Officers were not the owners of the business cases, there were naturally some questions from Members that they were not able to answer. This is reflected in the comments as the Committee felt unable to draw conclusions on the achievability, impact and risk of some of the proposals, as the information within the business cases was not sufficient.

SS181902 - Closure of Public Conveniences

The Committee had concerns that the Business Case was not complete as:

- The impact of this proposal upon disabled people was not sufficiently mitigated in the Business Case.
- The Business Case did not contain information regarding usage or consultation with users, particularly those with access issues such as disabled or elderly users.
- How near and the location of alternative facilities needed to be identified and signposted and Members suggested this could be done via Maindee Unlimited /other businesses / Business Improvement District partners.
- There was no evidence in the Business Case of what potential solutions other Cities or neighbouring local authorities have used to address similar issues to those identified in the business case, and the rationalisation and identification of alternative provision in the community.
- With the recent City Summit in mind, this proposal was not conducive with the growth and development of Newport and attracting visitors, as it was the view of the Committee that this proposal would have a negative impact on the image of the city.
- Need to develop Business Cases to fully explain the impact on citizens, and what consultation has taken place. It would be beneficial to engage earlier in the development of proposals in future to ensure meaningful involvement when developing the proposals.

WS181904 - Reducing telephone and face to face services within Customer Services

The Committee had concerns about:

- The Loss of 0.88 FTE face to face contact and the impact on users as a result.
- Issues regarding moving people online from face to face or telephone contact including:
 - Computer literacy / those unable to access computers ;
 - The difficulty of navigating the Council website;
 - The City free WiFi is inconsistent and crashes a lot.

In order to mitigate the impact upon citizens, the Committee suggested the exploration of:

- Live chats and ring back service as offered by other call centres;
- Assistance in libraries for citizens to access computers, and;
- The potential for sharing call centre resources with a partner e.g. Newport City Homes.

Performance Scrutiny Committee Place and Corporate 22 Jan 2018
at 4pm

Conclusions and Comments:

SS181905 - Introduce parking charges within city parks

The Committee welcomed the investment in Belle Vue Car park, but had concerns that the Business Case was weak due to the lack of evidence of consultation with users particularly on the pricing structure. Furthermore, the current business operator located in the park had not received the correct information.

The Committee recommended that:

- More detailed consultation and communication with existing regular users be undertaken urgently before introduction and particularly on pricing strategy, eg. for event customers, Bowls Team tournaments, etc.
- The rollout of this proposal to other parks be removed from this proposal and when necessary, should be the subject of future separate fully costed and consulted upon business cases / proposals.
-

SS181901 - Composting at Docks Way

The Committee welcomed this proposal to make a saving and bring the service in house.

SS181903 - Review of Back Office Cemetery Operations and facilities in some parks

The Committee noted that there is information that is not included within the Business Case, namely:

- The impact on citizens is not accurately reflected - under the new arrangements an enquiry by a member of the public making about burial records for the City's cemeteries would be dealt with centrally via telephone or an appointment in the Civic Centre. This would present a change to the current provision, and as such would have an impact on citizens, not being able to access the burial records at the respective cemetery that the relevant grave is located.
- Within the summary in the Business Case, it is indicated that the proposal includes the closure of the toilet facilities in the Cemetery. However, this is not referenced in the 'Impact upon Citizens' nor the 'Risk / Mitigation' sections. Closure of the public toilets in the cemeteries would impact upon citizens and this impact should be explained within the Business case.
- There is no mention of the 36% increase in fees to £15 for 30 minutes for an administrative research of burial records which is included in Street Scene Fees and Charges schedule later in the report.

NS181901 - Council Tax - Increase Council Tax by a further 1% from current assumption of 4% to total of 5%

While the Committee realised the challenges faced by the Council and that the Council Tax had been frozen for a number of years, it was concerned about the impact on citizens to pay the increased Council Tax.

The Committee recognised the issues and noted that this proposal would be debated at Council.

Performance Scrutiny Committee Place and Corporate 22 Jan 2018
at 4pm

Conclusions and Comments:

Comments to Cabinet on any of following Fees and Charges:

Regeneration Investment and Housing:

The Committee stressed that proper communication and consultation with the service of facilities users / fee payers upon proposed fee and charges increases is necessary to feed into the annual review of fees and charges.

Streetscene and City Services:

The Committee welcomed:

- No charge for the interment of a child up to the age of eighteen (from sixteen previously) and recommended that this is publicised;
- the freeze on car parking charges to encourage visitors.

The Committee clarified that the 36 % increase of the charge for an administrative research of burial records to £15 is for 30 minutes. (This wasn't mentioned in the Business Case for the which includes the centralisation of burial records above.)

The Committee was surprised at the under occupancy of allotments, given their rise in popularity in other areas and suggested promotion to younger demographics via social media to increase uptake and revenue.

Corporate Services:

The Committee had concerns that between this year and last year, the pay award was 2% but costs were increasing an average of 4%.

The Committee suggested the promotion of the house naming in order to maximise the opportunity of the building boom, to increase this income stream.

Comments upon the Budget process or public engagement to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee:

Public Engagement

- Concerns about the levels of consultation with citizens / service users and poor evidence of this within business cases.
- Overall engagement and consultation for the 2018-19 Budget was poor with one Community Engagement Event planned in the Market in the daytime compared with a number of events in previous years. Members referred to past engagement when they had circulated hundreds of forms to constituents and respondents and Officers had attended Ward Meetings.
- The engagement was not as good as in previous years, but recognised it could be partly as a result of budget fatigue.
- It was difficult to find the budget consultation online and there was a long form to complete which wasn't easy to use and off-putting, while constituents would prefer a short form to comment on a single or few issues.
- A Member commented that sending a twitter link to constituents required searching back a number of days to find a budget # and that other social media could be used more to engage.

Performance Scrutiny Committee Place and Corporate 22 Jan 2018

at 4pm

Conclusions and Comments:

- The Council website wasn't easy to navigate for citizens wishing to engage and that it needed a redesign to provide easier access to engagement.

Budget Process

- A Member commented that the lack of information demonstrating the budget modelling process didn't provide a justifiable explanation of the 4% starting point for fees and charges and examples of how this was reviewed and adjusted for individual fees and charges.

Note: Due an emergency, the Head of Streetscene was not able to attend the Scrutiny Committee. The Strategic Director – Place was also not able to attend.

The Committee appreciated that emergencies happen and Officers had been asked to attend at short notice, however stressed the importance of the appropriate Strategic Director, Head of Service or relevant Officer(s) knowledgeable about each proposal / business case attending Scrutiny to answer Members questions about each, before the Committee can conclude.

This impacted upon the Committees ability to draw conclusions on these proposals. If the Business Cases were more complete and robust in particular regarding impacts, risk and mitigation and sufficient consultation activity included, this would be less of an issue. The information that is contained within the business cases should contain sufficient information to ensure meaningful engagement with the public.

Scrutiny Report

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Part 1

Date: 1 February 2018

Subject: Forward Work Programme Update

Author Overview and Scrutiny Officer

Section A – Committee Guidance and Recommendations

1. Recommendations to the Committee

The Committee is asked to:

- (i) Endorse the proposed schedule for the next two Committee meetings;
- (ii) Confirm the topics to be considered, the invitees for each item, and indicate whether any additional information or research is required; and
- (iii) Note the list of reports that have been sent to the Committee for information over the last month.

2. Context

- 2.1 The purpose of a forward work programme is to help ensure Councillors achieve organisation and focus in the undertaking of enquiries through the Overview and Scrutiny function. Effective work programming is essential to ensure that the work of Overview and Scrutiny makes a positive impact upon the Council's delivery of services.
- 2.2 The Centre for Public Scrutiny's 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 co-ordinated 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.
- 2.3 Further information about the work programming process, including the procedures for referring new business to the programme, can be found in our Scrutiny Handbook on the Council's Scrutiny webpages (www.newport.gov.uk/scrutiny).

3. Information Submitted to the Committee

3.2 The following information is attached:

Appendix 1: The current Committee forward work programme;

Appendix 2: List of information Reports sent to the Committee over the last month.

Section B – Supporting Information

4 Risk

- 4.1 If proper work programming procedures are not put in place, the organisation and prioritisation of the work programme is put at risk. The work of Overview and Scrutiny could become disjointed from the work of the rest of the Council, which could undermine the positive contribution Overview and Scrutiny makes to service improvement through policy development.
- 4.2 This report is presented to each Committee every month in order to mitigate that risk. The specific risks associated with individual topics on the work programme will need to be addressed as part of the Committee's investigations.

5 Links to Council Policies and Priorities

- 5.1 Having proper work programming procedures in place ensures that the work of Overview and Scrutiny makes a positive impact upon the Council's delivery of services, contributes to the delivery of corporate objectives, and ensures that work can be undertaken in a timely and well-planned manner.

6 Financial Implications

- 6.1 There will be financial consequences for some of the reviews undertaken. These will be commented upon by the Head of Finance as the reports are presented. The preparing and monitoring of the work programme is done by existing staff for which budget provision is available.

Background Papers

Scrutiny Handbook

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee
– Forward Work Programme**

Date	Topic	Objective	Reporting Pathway	Invitees	Information Required
Thursday 22 March 2018	Corporate Safeguarding	To consider Annual overview of Corporate Safeguarding arrangements in the Council	N/A	Sally Ann Jenkins, Head of Children's Service Mary Ryan, Corporate Safeguarding	<p>The annual review of safeguarding, which will include an update on the corporate safeguarding plan and an update of the safeguarding unit individual teams key priorities plans.</p> <p>The report will provide scrutiny with information on how well the council is achieving on its safeguarding arrangements.</p>
Thursday 26 April 2018	Adult Residential Care – Recommendations Monitoring	To consider how effectively the recommendations made in relation to Adult Residential Care have been implemented.	Approved by the Scrutiny Committee in April 2017. Cabinet Member Decision on (TBC)	Chris Humphreys – Head of Adult Social Services; Paul Cockram, Cabinet Member for Social Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update from the Service area on the implementation of the recommendations; - Summary of the background to the item and a list of the recommendations as approved and implemented by the Council.

**Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee
– Forward Work Programme**

	Community Centres Recommendations Monitoring	To consider how effectively the recommendations made in relation to Community Centres have been implemented.	Recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee were approved on 15 October 2014, and endorsed by the Cabinet on 9 February 2014.	Keir Duffin – Head of Regeneration, Investment and Housing Cllr David Mayer – Cabinet Member for Community and Resources	Update from the Service area and the Cabinet Member on the implementation of the recommendations, including an update on the action plan previously presented to the Committee.
--	----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Page 48

Information Reports

To be circulated to Members by email for comment and included in monthly Information Report section of Work Programme report.

None scheduled.		
-----------------	--	--