

# Minutes



## Performance Scrutiny Committee - Place and Corporate

---

Date: 15 January 2024

Time: 12.00 pm

Present: Councillors M Howells (Chair), J Cleverly, S Adan, J Harris, G Horton, A Pimm, C Reeks, J Reynolds and K Thomas

In Attendance: Paul Jones (Strategic Director – Environment and Sustainability), Rhys Cornwall (Strategic Director – Transformation and Corporate Centre), David Walton (Head of Housing and Communities), Silvia Gonzalez-Lopez (Head of Environment and Public Protection), Stephen Jarrett (Head of Infrastructure), Tracey Brooks (Head of Regeneration and Economic Development), Elizabeth Bryant (Head of Law and Standards), Tracy McKim (Head of People, Policy and Transformation), Meirion Rushworth (Head of Finance), Mark Howcroft (Senior Finance Business Partner (Place and Corporate)), Leanne Rowlands (Democratic and Electoral Services Manager), Neil Barnett (Scrutiny Adviser), Taylor Strange (Governance Officer) and Simon Richards (Governance Officer)

---

### 1 Apologies

Councillor Linton

### 2 Declaration of Interest

None.

### 3 Minutes of the previous meetings held on 27th November 2023 and 11th December 2023

The Minutes of the previous meetings held on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2023 and 11<sup>th</sup> December 2023 were held as a true and accurate record with the following amendment:

27<sup>th</sup> November 2023 – page 8, point 6 – ***“The Strategic Director noted that bringing all unadopted roads up to standard would cost £12 million, which is not viable considering the current financial position.”*** The Committee wished to include more detail from the discussion in the minutes so residents are aware of the road adoption process. The Scrutiny Adviser advised the Committee that this would be amended.

### 4 2024-25 Budget and Medium Term Financial Projections

Invitees:

- Paul Jones – Strategic Director – Environment and Sustainability
- Rhys Cornwall – Strategic Director – Transformation and Corporate Centre
- Meirion Rushworth – Head of Finance

*This document is available in welsh / Mae's ffurflen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg*

- David Walton – Head of Housing and Communities
- Silvia Gonzalez-Lopez – Head of Environment and Public Protection
- Stephen Jarrett – Head of Infrastructure
- Elizabeth Bryant – Head of Law and Standards
- Tracey Brooks – Head of Regeneration and Economic Development
- Tracy McKim – Head of People, Policy and Transformation

The Head of Finance introduced a brief overview of the budget process.

### **Budget Pressures and Investments**

The following was discussed:

#### **Housing and Communities**

##### **Shortfall in Housing Benefit subsidy arising from increasing demand for temporary accommodation**

- The Committee raised concerns about the reduction in the Communities for Work grants by the Welsh Government and its impact on homelessness services. They questioned if the proposed additional funding of £600,000 would be sufficient, considering the £1 million overspend from the previous year. They also enquired about strategic asset investment to address the reliance on bed and breakfast accommodations for temporary accommodation and homelessness. The Head of Housing and Communities advised ongoing work with Registered Social Landlord partners to develop more social and transitional accommodations and emphasised the focus on homelessness prevention. The Strategic Director acknowledged the increasing pressures and the need for a long-term plan to address homelessness, while also highlighting the need to monitor the impact of grant changes and refine the financial position accordingly.

#### **Environment and Public Protection**

##### **Costs associated with increasing requirement for tree maintenance**

- The Head of Environment and Public Protection explained that the ongoing costs associated with tree maintenance, including the need for intervention in various tree species, are separate from the specific project addressing ash dieback. The maintenance costs are attributed to the ongoing need to manage and maintain trees on public land, adopted highways, schools, and other areas due to issues causing structural damage and the need to increase tree cover. This ongoing maintenance proves to be quite costly in terms of resources.
- The Committee asked about the projected costs for tree maintenance in the next few years, and the Head of Finance confirmed the figures. The Committee expressed the need for clearer communication regarding such budget items. The Head of Finance acknowledged the suggestion of aligning budget reports for better clarity.
- The Committee asked about the Council's equipment and capabilities for tree maintenance in relation to ash dieback and whether any of the allocated £115,000 would go towards plant and equipment. The Strategic Director explained that the majority of tree maintenance work is outsourced to contractors due to the need for specialised machinery, such as cranes, which would not be cost-effective for the Council to own.
- The Committee questioned whether the allocated budget of £115,000 for tree maintenance in subsequent years could vary, and the Strategic Director confirmed

that it could fluctuate based on historic performance and the identification of tree defects.

#### Landfill site closure – associated loss of income.

- The Committee enquired about the £975,000 investment related to the closure of the landfill site and its associated loss of income. The Head of Environment and Public Protection explained that the landfill site at the Docks Way site is reaching the end of its life and will no longer be able to accept waste, leading to a loss of income. The Strategic Director clarified that there are no plans for a new landfill site, as the trend is towards reducing disposal and increasing recycling and incineration. The Committee also sought clarification on the impact of the landfill closure on commercial businesses in Newport. The Head of Environment and Public Protection advised on the upcoming workplace regulations that will require businesses to segregate recycling, leading to a decrease in residual waste. Additionally, the Committee sought assurance that the Council would continue to provide businesses with waste collection services. The response confirmed that the Council would continue waste collection services, and non-recyclable waste would be directed to Trident Park for disposal.
- The Strategic Director clarified that the closure of the landfill site would only affect the disposal of waste into the landfill, and that the site's commercial operations and public waste disposal facilities would remain the same. Additionally, the Strategic Director advised that medium-sized businesses may need to consider alternative waste disposal methods, such as incineration, due to cost-effectiveness and tax considerations.

#### Infrastructure

##### Bus station departure charges

- The Committee questioned the £225,000 pressure for bus station departure charges and the lack of a budget allocation for the following year. The Head of Infrastructure explained that public transport operators pay a departure charge to use the bus stations, but the bus industry is undergoing significant funding changes. The end of bus transition funding and the consideration of new funding contribute to the pressure. Increasing the departure charge to cover the gap could negatively impact bus routes and residents.
- The Committee enquired about the previous identification of the budget shortfall related to bus departure charges, which the Strategic Director confirmed would have been covered by subsidies in the past. They also discussed the historical context of the issue, highlighting that the shortfall was not a recent development due to the end of transitional funding. The Strategic Director explained that the costs have increased over the years, leading to the current gap in the budget. The Committee sought clarification on whether the figure represented actual costs or a loss of revenue, to which the Strategic Director confirmed it as a loss of revenue. They also discussed the contributions from bus companies and the impact of the departure charge on the budget shortfall. The Strategic Director emphasised the significant gap between the realistic expectation of bus departures and the budgeted revenue. Finally, the Committee enquired about addressing the issue in the future, to which the Strategic Director explained that once the pressure is addressed, the gap in the budget would be eliminated.
- The Committee expressed their concern about including the bus costs in the budget every year without finding a solution. The Strategic Director explained that one alternative would be to pass the costs fully to the bus companies, but this could result

in a significant reduction in bus services. The Committee mentioned the need to wait for the Burns report to assess the impact of any changes.

- The Strategic Director explained that the Council subsidises bus routes in various ways, but this budget investment specifically focused on departure charges. The Chair emphasised the need to understand the current payment before determining if there is a deficit. The Strategic Director clarified that the gap in the budget developed due to a decrease in the number of bus journeys, resulting in a shortfall. The Head of Finance provided additional context, advising that many councils charge bus operators for accessing and using bus facilities to cover the costs of infrastructure maintenance. They acknowledged that the current departure charge may not fully cover the costs but increasing it significantly would require careful consideration. The Committee expressed the need for the cost per trip to align with the actual maintenance costs. The Head of Finance acknowledged the comment and explained that the budget adjustments were necessary to ensure the budget is appropriately sized. The cost per trip could be a topic for discussion during the budget review.
- The Committee questioned why the bus charges were not recurring in the budget and why they were not being included. They expressed concerns about inflation and the potential impact on bus services, suggesting that the budget should reflect these ongoing costs. The Head of Finance clarified that there is an existing budget for departure charges, and the £225,000 mentioned is a reduction in that budget line. The bus companies will continue to be charged for using the bus station, and the adjustment is necessary to ensure the budget is appropriately sized. The Committee asked if there would be additional costs in the coming years, to which the Head of Finance explained that it would depend on factors such as bus patronage and service levels. They acknowledged the need to consider future developments, such as the Burns report and the city centre's housing and transportation provisions. The Head of Finance mentioned that if there is higher patronage and more bus services in the future, there could potentially be savings associated with the budget. The Committee emphasised the importance of considering these factors in the budget and showing indicators of future considerations. The Head of Finance clarified that the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) covers a three-year period and assumes a certain level of bus patronage for the next year and relatively flat levels for the following two years. Adjustments can be made if there are changes in bus services and patronage patterns.

#### Fleet maintenance – budget pressures in relation to tyres and other supplies.

- The Committee raised concerns about the ongoing budget pressure for tyres and other supplies, questioning whether it would be included in the budget for future years. The Head of Finance confirmed that once a figure appears in the budget, it is assumed to be a permanent and ongoing cost unless there is a negative adjustment in the following year.
- The Committee questioned why the maintenance contract did not include services such as tyre replacement to avoid repeated payments, and suggested renegotiating the contract to include all maintenance services. The Head of Infrastructure explained that they already secure services competitively and ensure appropriate purchasing through term or framework contracts. The Strategic Director advised that the contract is for a specific duration and parts prices tend to increase over time. The Chair asked if the Council leases vehicles, to which the Strategic Director clarified that the discussion pertained to the maintenance of Council-owned vehicles. The Chair suggested that tyre replacement could be included in the lease charge for full repairs. The Strategic Director acknowledged that such negotiations may have been

considered during procurement, but factors such as the number of vehicles and the rising costs of parts and staff wages need to be taken into account.

### **Regeneration and Economic Development**

#### **Staffing resource to fulfil the client role in relation to leisure services.**

- The Committee requested a broad outline of the new role and if a job description had been written for it. The Head of Regeneration and Economic Development explained that the funding management areas are complex, with a document of about 600 pages outlining the Council's expectations and the services to be delivered by Newport Live. They have monthly liaison meetings with Newport Live to discuss relevant issues, but there is room for improvement in understanding the finer details of the funding management agreement. The Committee expressed the need for a better mechanism to provide feedback from constituents regarding the services of Newport Live. They suggested following up on this matter when someone is in place to address it.
- The Head of Regeneration and Economic Development advised that they have client contracts but not one specifically for Newport Live, which is a significant multi-million pound contract. They believe that having additional resources would help them manage the contract more effectively, as it currently requires a significant amount of their time. While they cannot guarantee savings or efficiencies at the moment, they believe that having more focus and scrutiny on contract management would be beneficial, especially considering feedback from audit reviews. The Strategic Director emphasised that Newport Live is delivering services on behalf of the committee. The goal is to ensure that the Council has enough resources to effectively oversee these services. This is seen as an opportunity to address any deficiencies and improve the overall management of the contract.
- The Committee raised concerns about whether the proposed position is necessary for one person, considering that it hasn't been needed previously. They also highlighted the significant salary of £65,000, which they consider to be a reasonably senior position within the Council. They questioned the savings or benefits that would be delivered by this position, especially in a time of budget cuts. The Head of Regeneration and Economic Development emphasised the importance of maximising efficiency and return on the multi-million pound contract with Newport Live. They felt that having someone dedicated to scrutinising the contract and ensuring accurate reporting to the Council is necessary. While they acknowledged that additional efficiencies may be derived, they currently allocated a portion of their and the service manager's time to this task.

#### **Energy budget requirement for new leisure centre.**

- The Committee expressed doubts about the figures regarding the energy budget requirement for the new leisure centre, and commented that £500,000 has been allocated to subsidise the medium-term financial plan for this year and the next, but they believe that it doesn't cost £500,000 to run the leisure centre. They suggest that there may be a surplus from the centre that could potentially cover the £500,000 required in year three. The Strategic Director explained that the current budget associated with Newport Centre for energy is £500,000, which has been treated as a saving for the Council in the next two years. However, it was always understood that this money would need to be returned to the budget once the leisure centre was operational. They highlighted that the Council has benefited from this arrangement for the past two years, and the money would be allocated back into the budget in year three.

- The Committee questioned whether the energy costs would reduce significantly, considering the zero carbon nature of the building and the significant solar investment. They wondered if the costs would be much less than half a million pounds going forward. The Strategic Director responded, explaining that the original budget for energy costs was higher. Adjustments were made when energy prices increased, and some net savings were put forward last year. The challenge lies in the transition from gas to electricity. The savings from using electricity are currently marginal compared to gas, as the price of gas was cheaper. The long-term projection is that the price of gas will increase as necessary, and electricity costs will be lower. The Strategic Director noted that gas cannot be used past 2030, meaning that while there are some savings due to energy efficiency, the fact that gas cannot be used going forward offsets some of those savings.

### Law and Standards

#### Increased contribution to Coroner's Service, resulting from additional staffing resources and the running costs of the new building.

- The Committee enquired about the input of other councils in the increased costs of the Coroner's Service. The Head of Law and Standards confirmed that other councils are fully involved in the process and will contribute based on their population size.
- The Committee clarified that the minimum investment needed from Newport City Council's perspective is £85,000, which is the Council's share of the investment.

#### Resources (external and internal) required to support the Transformation Programme.

- The Committee asked if there are plans to take into account the Welsh Government's policy of taking profit out of children's care when looking at children's care transformation. The Strategic Director referred to the Eliminate agenda and the regional and Newport transmission teams associated with it, which are already looking at the transformation of children's care. The Performance Scrutiny Committee - People would be involved in the ongoing work related to the transformation. The Strategic Director highlighted the link between the Eliminate agenda and the assets work, with the goal of reducing the burden on the Council and ensuring the right assets are in place for children's services.
- The Committee expressed concern about the high percentage of children in care in the private sector and the need to address the lack of existing assets. The Strategic Director advised of the existence of an asset board and the involvement of the Head of Children's Services in that agenda.

### People, Policy and Transformation

#### Property budget pressures, including income shortfalls and additional maintenance costs

- When advised about the price pressures in estate management, the Committee queried an underspend of £115,000 in 2025-26 that was forecasted. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation agreed to look at these figures and confirm. ***(Following the meeting, it was clarified that the £115,000 was not referring to a future underspend, but the reversal of a temporary budget pressure introduced in 2023/24. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation confirmed that there was an overspending situation year on year.)***

### New Budget Savings for Consultation

#### 02 - To transform Malpas Court Mansion House into a new Community Learning Centre. To meet changing customer demand, develop Library community outreach whilst reducing the number of physical sites.

- The Committee expressed support for transforming Malpas Court due to its underutilisation, but opposed the closure of Pill Library, highlighting its importance to the BME community and its role in education and language learning. The Committee suggested relocating the Community at Work team to the library space in Bettws Library and utilising it for workshops and services for young people. The Head of Housing and Communities acknowledged the importance of libraries to communities and expressed willingness to consider the Committee's input during the consultation process.
- The Committee questioned the workload and responsibilities of the proposed Community Librarian position, which would replace two grade five posts. They expressed concern about one person covering the entire area of Newport and requested more details on the role's responsibilities. The Head of Housing and Communities explained that the workload would be manageable within the existing structure, with support from the community regeneration manager and library manager. The specific program of events and services would be shaped through consultation and tailored to meet the needs of the community.

### **03 - Charge for replacement (residual waste) bins**

- The Committee asked if there would be any dispensation for residents who are unable to control the safety of their bins, such as those living in areas prone to theft or without secure storage. The Head of Environment and Public Protection clarified that the charging only applies to refuse bins, while recycling boxes and garden waste bins would still be provided free of charge. The provision of bins incurs costs related to managing requests and delivery. The Head of Environment and Public Protection acknowledged that some locations may be more disadvantaged in terms of bin placement, but the measure would apply equally to all residents. The Committee enquired about whether residents were charged for replacement bins in the previous year and the revenue generated. The Head of Environment and Public Protection confirmed that the measure was not implemented in the previous year.
- The Head of Environment and Public Protection confirmed that the charge for a replacement residual waste bin would be £23.70, and this appears in the Fees and Charges section in Appendix 5 of the agenda.

### **04 - Highways fees and Charges - Increase of Fees by 8%**

- The Committee enquired about the allocation of funds for unexpected issues such as potholes and pipe repairs. The Head of Infrastructure explained that there is a revenue budget specifically designated for reactive maintenance, including pothole repairs. The budget is utilised on an annual basis to address these issues as they arise. Highway inspectors and customer contacts help identify areas that require action related to potholes. The Chair advised the Committee that the Highways Asset Management Plan will provide more detailed information on maintaining and repairing highways, which will be discussed in future committee meetings. The Strategic Director confirmed that the core revenue budget for highways maintenance has not changed as part of the budget proposals.

### **05 - Reduction in Newport Live Management Fee**

- The Committee enquired about whether the reduction in fee is in line with the agreement. The Head of Regeneration and Economic Development explained that the funding management agreement states that the funding will be set each year. However, the fee reduction has not been reviewed since the trust was established and the contract was awarded. Last year, they implemented a 10% reduction in light of the financial situation and the need for businesses to review their operations and

delivery. They propose another 10% reduction this year, acknowledging that it may not be necessary to come back every year with the same request. They expressed that, at this time, they consider a further 10% reduction to be reasonable.

#### **06- Closure of Civic Centre for two days a week, reducing spend on utilities**

- The Committee asked if the entire building would be closed or if there would still be some areas in use. They also expressed concern about the impact of temperature fluctuations on the building's fabric. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation confirmed that the proposal was to close almost all of the building, with only a few small pockets that required maintenance remaining open. For example, the CCTV staff still needed to work from the building due to the infrastructure involved. They explained that the heating system couldn't be fully compartmentalised due to the building's outdated design. As a result, the proposal aimed to close most of the building, except for the manageable small areas. The Committee acknowledged the challenge of temperature fluctuations and the need to heat the building when people entered, especially considering the fabric's vulnerability. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation agreed that it was a challenge. They mentioned that the proposed closure aimed to extend the weekend by shifting the heating problem from Monday to Tuesday, although there was already a heating challenge on Mondays. They further explained that finding arrangements to close the building for two additional days a week was a real challenge. However, they emphasised the need to explore all budget options and identify ways to achieve savings, with building closure being one of the potential approaches.
- The Committee asked if alternative models, such as closing the building for four days every two weeks, had been considered. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation acknowledged that alternate models could be fed back from scrutiny and explained that this proposal highlighted the cost implications of one day. They advised that different models and different days would result in slightly different savings, as they had calculated based on the varying footfall on different days. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation further discussed the practical considerations, such as handling mail and post, which often required physical scanning and posting, even if electronic methods were used. They noted that many staff did not have printers and relied on coming to the civic building for printing. They emphasised the importance of convenience and mentioned the possibility of exploring other locations.
- The Committee raised concerns about the practical implications of closing the Civic Centre for a few days and asked about provisions made to safeguard employee well-being and ensure the delivery of services, considering the loss of human interaction and collaborative work that occurs in an office setting. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation advised that the unions had been involved in changes to working from home policies. They explained that they would discuss the proposed savings in more detail with the Employee Partnership Forum. They clarified that most Newport City Council staff had contracts allowing them to work from home or come into the building, and some had applied to work full-time from home. They assured that agreements with the unions were in place, but they were also aware of staff who needed to come into the office due to unsuitable home environments or other reasons. The well-being of employees was a priority, and they had conducted staff engagement and well-being surveys to address concerns.
- The Strategic Director added that they had already experienced changes in work practices due to the pandemic and advised of a previous initiative called "The New



Normal," which involved extensive engagement with unions and staff. Many employees already had a hybrid work arrangement, coming into the office for 1 or 2 days a week and working from home for the rest. They acknowledged the complexity of maintaining services that required face-to-face interaction, particularly in departments like social services that had a front door in the Civic Centre. The Strategic Director emphasised the Council's track record of working closely with trade unions to ensure the well-being and welfare of employees. They advised of the ongoing efforts to address concerns and conduct well-being surveys. They also acknowledged the need to consider alternative locations for those unable to work from home full-time and the importance of maintaining engagement and teamwork.

- The Committee enquired whether there were any possibilities of redundancies with the proposal. The Committee were advised that the proposal does not include any staffing impacts because the savings are based on reduced energy consumption.
- The Committee asked if the footfall numbers noted earlier (250 to 300) included both staff and visitors. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation clarified that those numbers were likely only for staff and that they could double-check. They mentioned that the number of visitors to the Civic Centre was generally low, with most coming for specific requirements such as a Taxi Licensing review. They explained that the number of customers visiting would depend on the services located in the building. However, they acknowledged the need to gather more specific figures on visitor numbers. The Committee expressed concern about accommodating visitors who may not have online access or internet and rely on physically coming to the building. They emphasised the importance of informing such individuals that they should visit on Tuesday to Thursday instead of Monday to Friday and ensuring that alternative locations were available for them if needed.
- The Committee inquired about the number of people who visit the Civic Centre on a daily basis, specifically those who cannot work from home and come to the building five days a week. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation advised that the specific data on the number of daily visitors had not been collected yet. They advised that the system for logging in was relatively new, and the footfall numbers provided earlier were averages over a short period. They are currently reviewing the specific needs of departments and services within the Council in case the proposed changes were implemented.

## **07 - Fraud prevention initiative**

- The Committee asked about the process for investigations and potential challenges if someone disputes the accusations. They enquired whether there would be an appeal process, possibly involving Magistrates courts. The Head of Finance responded that they would need to establish their own framework for conducting investigations. They advised that the implementation of the policy would focus on cases where someone had claimed benefits for at least eight weeks when they should not have. They referred to their existing work on the National Fraud Initiative, which involves data matching and investigations resulting in actions being taken. They explained that if deliberate withholding of information was suspected, they would go the extra mile and pursue fines. The Committee then asked about the current appeal process for disputes. The Head of Finance advised they did not have that information but assured the Committee that they would obtain it from the Revenue department.

- The Committee asked about the estimated number of individuals with fraudulent intent per year. The Head of Finance responded that they had made a realistic assumption based on the background information, and the figure they used was 350.
- The Committee asked for background information on the draft budget's mention of legislation for increasing teacher pension costs by £3.4 million. The Head of Finance explained that all public sector pension schemes are valued and revalued every three years to ensure that the funds are sufficient to meet the liabilities. In the case of the teachers' pension scheme, it has been revalued, resulting in a 5% increase in the employer's pension contribution. The £3.4 million figure represents the impact of this increase on the Council's budget. The Head of Finance advised that the teachers' pension scheme is a UK national scheme that applies to all authorities across the country.
- The Committee questioned whether the shortfall in the pension scheme was due to mismanagement by those responsible for it. The Head of Finance clarified that the valuation of the scheme is conducted by the Government's Actuary service, and the cost increase is guaranteed. They explained that they were awaiting final confirmation that the Welsh Government would be funded by the UK government, and if so, the cost would be passed down to local authorities. They assured the Committee that the increase in pension costs would be funded nationally and would not affect Council Tax.

The Chair thanked the Officers for attending.

#### **Conclusions:**

#### **Comments to the Cabinet on the following proposals:**

- a) The Committee noted the budget proposals relevant to the Place and Corporate Directorates and agreed to forward the minutes to Cabinet as a summary of the issues raised.
- b) The Committee wished to make Cabinet aware that throughout the meeting and questioning of Officers, the Committee were concerned that the information presented for consultation is poorly presented and easily misunderstood. For example, in the appendices around budget savings over the Medium Term Financial Plan, the documents do not make clear that investments in Year 1 will continue in Years 2 and 3. Members were concerned that the same misunderstanding could be made by members of the public when responding to the consultation. The Committee also wished to recommend that more detailed budget training is provided to all members to help ensure that the documents are fully understood and to enable proper scrutiny to take place.
- c) The Committee wished to make the following comments to Cabinet on the Proposals within the Place and Corporate Directorate:

#### **02 - To transform Malpas Court Mansion House into a new Community Learning Centre. To meet changing customer demand, develop Library community outreach whilst reducing the number of physical sites.**

- The Committee recommended that Cabinet need to ensure that the impact on service users for this savings proposal is minimal. The Committee also suggested that there were other options which don't appear to have been explored, such as the Community at Work and the Youth Service move into Bettws Library to ensure services are not lost.

- In addition, concern was raised about the workload of the new Community Librarian post that would be created. The Committee felt that it may be too much work for one person and emphasised the need for realistic expectations and ensuring that residents who use the services would see a significant difference.

### **03 - Charge for replacement (residual waste) bins**

- The Committee were content for this proposal to go ahead. The Committee recommend to Cabinet that the policy is implemented with an element of discretion given to Officers on implementation, to protect the most vulnerable individuals across the city as well as discretion to protect individuals who may not be able to afford replacement bins or who may face difficulties in managing their bins due to their living situations.
- The Committee recommended to Cabinet that the Council should implement a coding/labelling system with a barcode on each bin with its address to prevent theft or misuse.
- The Committee also felt that the cost of the replacement bins should have been noted in the main commentary of the savings proposal and not just in the Fees and Charges section in Appendix 5, making it difficult for members responding to the consultation to locate the detail.

The Committee also wished to leave comments on the following Savings investments for the Environment and Public Protection service area:

#### **Costs associated with increasing requirement for tree maintenance.**

- The Committee felt that they did not get an adequate explanation on this saving investment, only that contractors were called in for tree maintenance. The Committee were also concerned that the documents did not make clear that the budget increase is £115k in Year 1, £230k in Year 2 and £345k in Year 3. The committee questioned the need for £345k investment in Year 3 and also questioned the need for investment of £690k over a 3-year period.

#### **Landfill site closure – associated loss of income.**

- The Committee were content with this savings investment, but wished to comment that consideration must be given to the impact on our net zero targets of having lorries transport waste to other locations to ensure that the net zero goals are not compromised.

The Committee were also concerned about the Stray Dogs Reclaiming Fees within the Fees and Charges in Appendix 5 – regarding dogs reclaimed within 4 hours being charged at £54.00 per dog. The Committee questioned the fairness of the implementation of this fee at the current level and recommended Cabinet gain an insight from the service area into its planned investment. The Committee also asked for further information from officers as to whether there has been an increase in the amount of XL Bully dogs being given up or abandoned since the new laws come into action.

### **04 - Highways fees and Charges - Increase of Fees by 8%**

- The Committee were content with this proposal.

The Committee also wished to leave comments on the following Savings investments for the Infrastructure service area:

#### Bus station departure charges.

- The Committee wished to recommend that the bus station departure charges should not be added as a permanent budget line. Instead, it should be treated as an annual subsidy or grant to the bus operators, subject to review each year based on the performance of the bus services and other factors. The Committee suggested that this addition to the budget is effectively the council subsidising fares for members of the public and should be credited as such. An additional reason for assessing it each year as a subsidy is the ongoing work by the Burns Transport Commission might have a significant impact on sustainable public transport and mean the subsidy may not be needed in future if user numbers increase. Also, the Council should consider the net zero impact of the bus station charge and explore ways to minimise its impact on bus fares and services.
- The Committee also commented that they would like to consider the bus service charges as a future agenda item to be added to the 2024-25 forward work programme. The Committee asked significant questions to officers around the budget, costs of running the service, rent to Friars Walk, infrastructure costs and were not entirely satisfied with the answers provided. The area is complex and a sustainable, affordable transport network is a vital service, so the Committee felt it would be appropriate to give the area focus and scrutiny.

#### Fleet maintenance – budget pressures in relation to tyres and other supplies.

- The Committee wished to ensure that the Council follow best value and procurement practices to obtain better value for fleet maintenance services, as well as considering renegotiating the contract for fleet maintenance services to include the cost of tyres and other supplies as part of lease charges.

#### **05 - Reduction in Newport Live Management Fee**

- It was acknowledged that the reduction in the management fee would result in cost savings for the Council, but concern was raised about the potential impact it may have on the facilities and services provided by Newport Live. The Committee would like to know what services, if any, may be cut by Newport Live as a result of the reduction in the management fee and at the time of the committee meeting, that information wasn't available to Officers.

The Committee also wished to leave comments on the following Savings investments for the Regeneration and Economic Development service area:

#### Staffing resource to fulfil the client role in relation to leisure services.

- The Committee questioned whether this resource was needed, as the role was not required in the past, and there was no indication what the extra resource would be made up of as a business case was not presented. The Committee felt that Officers were unable provide acceptable justification for the need for the additional post or whether it was required to be a full-time post. The Committee recommended to Cabinet that it satisfies itself that the post is needed given the budget pressures and the requirement to reduce resources elsewhere.

#### **06 - Closure of Civic Centre for two days a week, reducing spend on utilities**

- The Committee recommend that Cabinet put this savings proposal on hold until the proper analysis of the data is understood and the impact that this will have on our people and services. Concerns were raised that more contextual data was needed, such as details of length of time the quoted 250-300 staff were working in the Civic Centre. In addition, no information was available on the number of staff who work at the Civic Centre full-time and no account has been taken of the requirement to heat

the building from cold more regularly which could result in higher costs overall. The Committee recommended to Cabinet that whilst this budget line was attractive as a saving, the impact is considerable and should be considered in the wider context of our overall Asset review, as decisions now may affect the ability of that review to rationalise assets in the future. The Committee were also concerned that the timeframe was too short to consult with staff and understand the impact on well-being.

The Committee also wished to leave comments on the following Savings investments for the People, Policy and Transformation service area:

Property budget pressures, including income shortfalls and additional maintenance costs.

- The Committee queried the 2025/26 £'000 column which the service area will review with Finance. The Committee recommended that Cabinet be satisfied with the correct data given to them and that the consultation documents are amended. In general, the Committee were content with this savings investment.

**07 - Fraud prevention initiative**

- The Committee were content with this proposal but wished to recommend to Cabinet to ensure that the Council develop a robust set of policies and procedures for implementing the scheme to ensure fairness, such as presenting a clear set of parameters for appeals, how they are investigated and how the Council would mitigate the possibility of being fined if appeals are overturned against the local authority. The Committee also cautioned that the costs of the additional investment of resource in investigations and appeals may mean the £70 statutory fine for each case is not worth the effort required to manage the process.
- The Committee would like to receive information about the appeals process for this initiative once available.

The Committee also wished to leave comments on the following Savings investments for the Finance service area:

Resources (external and internal) required to support the Transformation Programme.

- The Committee recommended that Cabinet satisfies itself that these resources are required given the budget pressures and need for savings elsewhere

**5 Scrutiny Adviser Reports**

Invitees:

- Neil Barnett – Scrutiny Adviser

**a) Forward Work Programme Update**

The Scrutiny Adviser presented the Forward Work Programme, and informed the Committee of the topics due to be discussed at the committee meeting:

**Monday 19<sup>th</sup> February 2024**, the agenda item;

- Highways Asset Management Plan
- Flood Risk Management Strategy

**b) Action Sheet**

The Scrutiny Adviser presented the action sheet to the Committee and advised of the completed and the actions that are still outstanding.

The meeting terminated at 4.10 pm

# Minutes



## Performance Scrutiny Committee - People

---

Date: 16 January 2024

Time: 10.00 am

Present: Councillors W Routley (Chair), J Cleverly, P Bright, B Davies, D Jenkins, R Howells and D Mayer

In Attendance: Robert Green (Assistant Head of Finance), Sally Ann Jenkins (Strategic Director - Social Services), Sarah Morgan (Chief Education Officer), Natalie Poyner (Head of Children Services), Mary Ryan (Head of Adults Services), Mandy Shide (Service Manager), Samantha Schanzer (Scrutiny Adviser), Taylor Strange (Governance Officer) and Simon Richards (Governance Officer)

---

### 2 Apologies

Councillor Drewett and Councillor Townsend

### 3 Declarations of Interest

None.

### 4 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 12th December 2023 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

### 5 2024-25 Budget and Medium Term Financial Projections

#### Invitees:

- Meirion Rushworth – Head of Finance
- Robert Green – Assistant Head of Finance
- Sally Ann Jenkins – Strategic Director – Social Services
- Mary Ryan – Head of Adult Services
- Natalie Poyner – Head of Children Services
- Caroline Ryan-Phillips – Head of Prevention and Inclusion
- Mandy Shide – Service Manager
- Rhianydd Williams – Service Manager Integrated Family Support
- Sarah Morgan – Chief Education Officer
- Sarah Davies – Deputy Chief Education Officer

-

The Assistant Head of Finance introduced a brief overview of the budget process.

### **New Pressures and Investments**

The following was discussed:

- The Committee enquired about the SEN Out of County and Local Provision pupil demand and noted the increase of 4 places in both Sporting Chance and Catch 22 and asked for more information about this. The Chief Education Officer (CEO) informed Committee that Budget demand for Education is now being met by the Council and this looks at the need to support children that might have to go out of county due to complex needs. The CEO assured the Committee that work is being undertaken to establish local provision where possible and the contracts with current providers will be maintained as they provide around 30 places, but this will provide an additional 4 places if required. The CEO informed Committee that if they aren't used, it would be considered an underspend in the Budget, but the places are needed, and they are positive will be utilised. There is consistent monitoring taking place around who need places and what is available to us and when contracting additional places Quality Assurance checks are carried out to ensure pupils welfare and that the ratios of teacher to student are correct.
- The Committee enquired about the ALN Provision for schools and noted that last year funding was to be confirmed and we were unable to meeting ALN requirements and would like reassurance that this investment will meet requirements. The CEO informed the Committee that there has always been cost pressures around ALN pupils and this has been identified more than ever before. The CEO informed the Committee that due to more complexities with children and people, this investment amount doesn't mean it will necessarily meet all needs however schools have responsibility with wholistic budget to provide for all children, so this investment is in addition to an individual school budget. The CEO informed the Committee that they know the demand on schools, and this won't necessarily provide everything, but it is one additional step to support those recognised challenges. The Committee stated that it is a good thing that there is this additional investment to support ALN students.

-

### **Domiciliary care support to be enhanced with assistive technology to reduce the levels of care hours required.**

- The Committee enquired how assistive technology will be used to help reduce the levels of care. The Head of Adult Services informed Committee that they have already started to implement this and there is a smart HUB exhibition in Newport Market which demonstrates how this can be used for things like automatic curtains, and communication with family. They informed Committee that feedback from the public has been positive, but they are ensuring that it is tailored to meet individual needs.
- The Committee enquired that if domiciliary care is looking to be replaced in part by assistive technology that there is an assumption of family support to carry out these checks in place of the domiciliary care. The Head of Adult Services informed the Committee that during the Pandemic there were more family support which is not the case now but for unpaid carers this assistive technology has been a lifeline. They assured Committee that it will never replace the need for domiciliary care but is an addition to it.

## **Fees and Charges**

- The Committee enquired who pays fees and charges to the Council. The Assistant Head of Finance informed the Committee that the headings highlighted in green on the report show who pays these fees and charges, the first set is other Local Authorities and the second is Newport Residents. The charges are the same amounts, but they differentiate between who is paying. The Head of Adult Services informed the Committee that if there is a vacancy that a neighbouring authority wishes to use, they get charged at the same rate as Newport residents as it is means tested.
- The Committee queried the percentage increase of Appointeeships by 102% and wanted to know why it is such a large increase. The Assistant Head of Finance informed the Committee that this is now reflective following a thorough review and recosting exercise of the service area that has taken place and in cash terms it is not as significant an increase as other services even though the percentage is high. The Head of Adult Services informed the Committee that anyone who requires the Appointee services is subject to a full financial assessment of their circumstances.

The Chair thanked the Officers for attending.

## **6 Conclusions of Committee Reports**

### **Comments to the Cabinet on the following proposals:**

- a) The Committee noted the budget proposals relevant to the People Directorate and agreed to forward the minutes to the Cabinet as a summary of the issues raised.
- b) The Committee wished to make the following comments to the Cabinet on the Proposals within the People Directorate:

### **New Pressures and Investments**

- The Committee highlighted that the ALN investment is good for students with complex needs and the Committee are glad that it is now reflected in the Budget.

### **Domiciliary care support to be enhanced with assistive technology to reduce the levels of care hours required.**

- The Committee wanted to ensure that where domiciliary care is being replaced by assistive care that there is sufficient family support in place.
- The Committee wanted to ensure that the delivery of services of important and must not be impacted and highlighted the importance of the continuation of service delivery quality.
- The Committee noted that they are content for proposals to go ahead as they are.

## **6 Scrutiny Adviser Reports**

### **a) Actions Arising**



The Scrutiny Advisor provided an update to the Committee on the outstanding actions and the figure for the 1.2% of Education employees has been circulated to the Committee.

**b) Forward Work Programme**

The Scrutiny Advisor informed the Committee that the next Committee meeting date is the 20<sup>th</sup> February for the Regulated Service Reports and then the final meeting for this year is on the 26<sup>th</sup> March for the Recruitment and Retention Reports and an additional item of Key Stage 4 Outcomes.

The meeting terminated at 10:36am

# Minutes



## Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

---

Date: 30 January 2024

Time: 10.00 am

Present: Councillors P Hourahine (Chair), C Baker-Westhead, B Davies, S Cocks and M Evans

In Attendance: Rhys Cornwall (Strategic Director - Transformation and Corporate Centre), Tracy McKim (Head of People, Policy and Transformation), Robert Green (Assistant Head of Finance), Samantha Schanzer (Scrutiny Adviser), Taylor Strange (Governance Officer) and Simon Richards (Governance Officer)

Apologies: Councillors G Horton, P Bright and L James

---

### 3 Declarations of Interest

None.

### 4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- The Committee requested that the wording regarding the City Contact Centre response be reworded for clarity. The Head of People, Policy and Transformation (PPT) informed Committee that there was a customer engagement review currently underway, but would update the action.
- The Chair informed Committee that future mentions of the University of South Wales would be omitted from the minutes unless they were substantial.

The minutes of the previous meeting held **1st December 2023** were **accepted as a true and accurate record**.

### 5 2024-25 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan

Invitees:

- **Rhys Cornwall (Strategic Director for Transformation and Corporate)**
- **Tracy McKim (Head of People, Policy and Transformation)**
- **Robert Green (Assistant Head of Finance)**

The Assistant Head of Finance gave an overview.

The following was discussed:

- The Committee asked what school budgets being protected meant in real terms, for more detail on school's grants received after the budget had been set and the impact this had. The Assistant Head of Finance informed Committee that no budget savings were being requested from schools, but the budget must increase to cover increased costs and larger numbers of pupils. They informed Committee the formula for schools is prescribed by pupil numbers which was a key factor in allocating the overall budget. They informed Committee that individual school allocations such as grants are channelled through the regional consortium to local authorities (LA). They noted that Welsh Government (WG) have an 2024-25 agenda to reduced and consolidate grants and it would be difficult to determine the exact budget for schools until they received more information, which was likely to be after the budget was set.
- The Committee enquired how these grants were split between the LA and Educational Achievement Service (EAS). The Assistant Head of Finance informed the Committee that each consortium would top-slice each grant to manage their provision. They informed Committee that this could change in future following the new WG changes, but each LA had an input in these decisions taken by EAS as they are stakeholders.
- The Committee queried whether hardening grants into future budgets would provide greater clarity for schools when budgeting. The Assistant Head of Finance informed Committee that WG were not looking to change the temporary nature of grants and the risk of them being cut or removed in future would remain. They highlighted that WG were looking to streamline grants.
- The Committee enquired whether LAs were likely to benefit from the additional funding announced by UK Government to WG and when would WG inform LAs about this. The Assistant Head of Finance noted that there was unlikely to be an announcement from WG regarding this until certainty from UK Government was received. They informed Committee that they could not rely on this funding, but it may be seen in the next financial year.

The Head PPT gave a verbal update on the budget consultation process.

The following was discussed:

- The Committee asked for more information on the Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment (FEIA) process. The Head of PPT informed Committee that an FEIA is carried out on anything that has the potential to impact communities, residents, or staff. They informed Committee that the full list of FEIAs is available on the Newport City Council website, and these were produced early in the process and continuously updated. They noted that FEIAs are produced by people close to the proposal and signed off by Heads of Service.

### **Conclusion of Committee Reports:**

The Committee were content with the budget setting and consultation processes.

The Committee were content to acknowledge the minutes from the Performance Scrutiny Committee – People and the Performance Scrutiny Committee - Place and Corporate for forwarding to Cabinet.

## 6 **Scrutiny Adviser Reports**

### a. **Actions Arising**

The Scrutiny Advisor noted that there were no new actions.

### b. **Forward Work Programme**

The Scrutiny Advisor noted the date of next meeting to be 8<sup>th</sup> March 2024

## 7 **Scrutiny Topic Referral Feedback**

The Committee discussed the feedback. The Committee agreed with the content of the report and recommended that some reformatting be done within the report for clarity.

The meeting terminated at 10.32 am.

## **Extracts from minutes of the Employee Partnership Forum**

Meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### **2 Budget Update**

The Assistant Head of Finance presented the budget update as per the slides. The HR & OD Manager outlined the staff consultation process in addition. The chair agreed as the papers were not yet published for Cabinet we would defer to comments from trade union colleagues on the 18 January 2024.

Meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### **4 Budget Follow Up**

The Assistant Head of Finance (AHOF) presented the budget update as per the slides circulated.

As papers were not yet published for Cabinet at Budget EPF on 4 January, item deferred to 18 January for comments from trade union colleagues.

S Belcher thought the non-teaching pay inflation of £1,340 cash increase from April was optimistic and disliked support staff being named as 'non-teaching'.

AHOF stated that it is difficult to project when planning since the Autumn, but there are contingencies in place and a pay reserve.

The Cabinet Member for Organisational Transformation, Cllr Batrouni noted the use of the term 'non-teaching'.

# Minutes

## Newport Schools Forum

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2024

Time: 3:30pm

Venue: Microsoft Teams

### **7. 24/25 Budget Proposals – Assistant Head of Finance**

LAO provided an update on the budget proposals for 2024/25 for forum to discuss and make any suggestions, see attached.

FM asked if there was an increase of 1% to the NJC pension rate.

LAO confirmed there was a stepped increase in employers' rate and this would be included in the non-teachers' pay inflation figures.

FM stated that if the Post 16 funding remains at 2023/24 levels with no increase this in effect will be a real terms cut.

LAO advised that generally where grants are not cut or new policy, they tend to be flatlined which in effect are real terms cut.

LAO added that we haven't been made aware of the LA allocation yet but at an all-Wales level there had been no reduction to the overall level of funding. The LA are hoping to be able to provide an update shortly.

FM raised that in relation to the proposed reduction in the energy funding, this was not funded last year and asked whether this could be excluded in this years' proposals.

LAO stated its important to understand that last year whilst certain elements were identified as being funded/not funded, this provided a means of calculating the total cash investment to the ISB. Regardless of which elements were funded, the funding was directed via the funding formula to wherever it is needed in order of priority. Where the effect was seen, was across those areas that are based on an available budget ie capitation, resources examination fees etc.

FM acknowledged this but asked that if it possible to not include the energy reduction for schools that would be helpful although it was positive that inflationary cost pressures are included in future years.

## **Response from UNISON**

Newport City Branch welcome the Councils approach to funding to offset the shortfall in the current and historical shortfall of funding from Westminster and the impacts of increases in energy prices and the impacts of price increases across the board.

It is a pleasant surprise to not to have to sit in on so many consultations where staff are being given the news of potential compulsory redundancy or having to look for voluntary redundancies.

We also acknowledge that whilst the level of proposals and the impact is reduced there are still vacant posts and some potential redundancies which will impact on the workload of the remaining staff.

The Potential proposal around closure of the Civic Centre does concern us that it has not been fully considered and there may be impacts on staff services and the democracy of the council.

- How will staff in cctv continue in their role on the days the civic will be closed will they need building heating to be on do they have separate options for heating their work area aside from the civic?
- Are there enough agile working locations for staff who choose not to work from home?
- Will there be a priority of staff able to work from staff sites?
- Are there enough suitable locations for the many meetings to take place that cannot and shouldn't be held via Teams?
- Impact on staff working hours (NCC and Norse) any potential redundancies we appreciate that Norse staff are not an NCC concern, but some were previously NCC staff.
- The impact on local democracy must be given further consideration. The Civic Centre is a landmark building where the public who pay for it should be able to access it. Our fear is that this could lead to total closure in the future.

We ask that this proposal be given further review before implementation or if implemented it be reviewed in a timely manner with the option of returning to opening on a five-day basis.

We also note the amounts set aside for potential pay increase and would suggest that would fall short of where we as a trade union would expect to see potential staff pay increases especially at the same time, we are seeing the 8.5% increase in council tax and other rises in services a pay settlement of 4% is not keeping up with the cost of living but is actually a pay cut. Their standard of living will fall. This is after years of staff working to higher volumes of work. Doing more with less while trying to maintain the highest quality of work that is their standard.

We appreciate that councillors do not take up their roles with the aim to cut services and outsource council services and options available to present a balanced budget are finite but we ask them to consider how long staff good will can be relied on in schools, social services, housing, community safety wardens, flying start, highways and city services, waste site staff and all of the rest of services provided by this council staff group. They are working beyond their job descriptions whilst seeing their standards of living dropping.

## **Response from NASUWT**

### **BUDGET CONSULTATION AND POSITION STATEMENT ON NEWPORT'S FUNDING OF SCHOOLS**

NASUWT Newport is appalled by Newport City Council's funding of schools.

Children here are valued less than they are elsewhere in Wales. This is backed up by multiple statistical analyses. And the situation is getting worse year on year.

**Schools budgeted expenditure per pupil in Newport for 2023-24 was the lowest in Wales.**  
(Local Authority Budgeted Expenditure on Schools: 2023-24, Welsh Govt Statistical Bulletin)

**Schools budgeted expenditure per pupil in Newport for 2022-23 was one but lowest in Wales.**  
(Local Authority Budgeted Expenditure on Schools: 2022-23, Welsh Govt Statistical Bulletin)

When challenged about its lack of funding of schools, Newport points to complexities with the budget. Unfortunately, this is just hiding behind the fact that education is not a priority for Newport City Council.

The impact of years of underfunding at Newport schools is being felt by teachers and learners across the City:

- Class sizes are too high here and it is commonplace to see classes in excess of 30 students. Years of redundancy windows have left our schools with pupil-teacher ratios that are detrimental to progress.
- Learners are being taught by unqualified teachers or cover supervisors for part of their provision. These colleagues, however esteemed, are no substitute for a qualified teacher.
- Many teachers are having to teach subjects they are not qualified to teach in order to save money and absorb staffing cutbacks.
- School buildings are falling into disrepair.
- Damaging TLR restructures have been carried out in order to save money, with the Classroom Teacher picking up the work.

NASUWT Newport urges Newport City Council to do what is right. Put children here first. Not last.



## **Response from CONSH**

**February 2024**

### **Re – Response to Budget Consultation**

Annwyl Beverly Owen, Chief Executive, Cllr. Jane Mudd, Cabinet Member for Economic Growth & Strategic Investment and Cllr. Deb Davies, Cabinet Member for Early Years & Education

I firstly wanted to thank you, on behalf of CONSH for facilitating a very purposeful discussion prior to the Christmas break; we are most grateful for the opportunity to continue to engage in dialogue with you about matters impacting our schools so significantly. To this end, in receipt of your kind invitation to return to the Civic for discussion, we hoped we could schedule a date sometime in March when each of us are in a far better position to be able to speak with greater detail about our own budgets and collectively how this has impacted on Newport schools. I would be very grateful if you could provide us with suitable dates perhaps towards the end of March.

In regard to eliciting views as part of the overall budget consultation, although we welcome the proposed cash increase of £9,454,000 and acknowledge the very challenging financial position in which the council finds itself, the proposed increase only seems to cover new pay related pressures and as such will not alleviate the significant budget pressures we have raised over the past twelve months.

We know that you will be fully aware through our ongoing correspondence, that many Secondary Schools have needed to restructure, not appoint into substantive vacancies, end fixed term contracts and increase class sizes to align with the funding distributed via the ISB, as well as making use of historic school budget reserves. The lack of additional funds into the Education budget will result in these trends continuing; as raised at the meeting, we are particularly concerned about the lack of investment to ALN in Secondary Schools with so many of the pupils coming from LRBs and one to one support in the Primary Sector having to manage the challenge of no support within a much bigger mainstream setting.

Another major concern is that without additional funding; we are not able to manage requirements of the curriculum; a pertinent issue which was raised in our most recent dialogue in regard to not being able to run Engineering and Construction courses because of not being able to maintain the cost of the equipment and general environment. With a suite of new VCSEs on the way, pathways that we wholly advocate as being integral to best support the needs of our learners; our concern is that we simply will not have funding capacity to even consider offering them.

We are currently in consultation with Finance colleagues at the LA in respect of funding for Examinations. We raised this as an issue in April 2023 and whilst we welcome the consultation that has since taken place, the proposal which basically moves funding from one area of the ISB to another, does not really solve the underlying issue. You will be aware that Secondary School funding in Newport is over £1,000 per pupil under the Welsh average which continues to significantly impact on school development and pupil progress, especially for example when being compared to the performance of each of our families of schools.

We acknowledge that further details in regard to the proposed £9,454,000 cash increase will be shared at the relevant forums and communicated to all schools in due course; we hope that indicative budgets will then provide clarity on how the high level pay assumptions/funding, distribute through the ISB and impact individual schools, hence our

request to perhaps meet later in March. It would be useful to have clarification on the Teachers' Pension amount. It is currently included in the £9,454,000 but if separate WG funding is received the actual amount allocated to schools from the Welsh Government Revenue Support Grant would be £6,035,000 so further clarity on this would be helpful.

In summary, we look forward to working together over both the short and medium term to address the significant challenges we continue to face. We look forward to continuing this dialogue in the coming months.

Cofion cynnes

Victoria Lambe

Headteacher, Bassaleg

Chairperson, CONSH

Lucy Purcell – Headteacher, Caerleon

Julia Fitzgerald – Headteacher, Lliswerry

Mark Tucker – Headteacher, The John Frost

Jackie Jarrett – Headteacher, St Josephs

Dean Curtis – Headteacher, St Julian's

Gill Lee – Headteacher, Newport High

Damian Lawlor – Headteacher, Llanwern

Eirian Jones – Headteacher, Gwent Is Coed