

Public Document Pack

Penallta House,
Tredomen Park,
Ystrad Mynach,
Hengoed CF82 7PG

Ty Penallta,
Parc Tredomen,
Ystrad Mynach,
Hengoed CF82 7PG



www.caerphilly.gov.uk
www.caerffili.gov.uk

For all enquiries relating to this agenda please contact Rebecca Barrett
(Tel: 01443 864245 Email: barrerm@caerphilly.gov.uk)

Date: 10th September 2014

Dear Sir/Madam,

A meeting of the **Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee** will be held in the **Sirhowy Room, Penallta House, Tredomen, Ystrad Mynach** on **Tuesday, 16th September, 2014** at **5.30 pm** to consider the matters contained in the following agenda.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Chris Burns'.

Chris Burns
INTERIM CHIEF EXECUTIVE

A G E N D A

- 1 To receive apologies for absence.
 - 2 Declarations of Interest
Councillors and Officers are reminded of their personal responsibility to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interest(s) in respect of any item of business on this agenda in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000, the Council's Constitution and the Code of Conduct for both Councillors and Officers.
- To approve and sign the following minutes: -
- 3 Special Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee held on 12th June 2014 (minute nos. 1-3).
 - 4 Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee held on 1st July 2014 (minute nos. 1-11).
 - 5 Special Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee held on 30th July 2014 (minute nos. 1-11).

A greener place Man gwyrddach



6 Consideration of any matter referred to this Committee in accordance with the call-in procedure.

To receive and consider the following Cabinet reports*:-

- 7 Bulky Household Collections - Proposals to Charge for Failure to Notify of Cancellation - 2nd July 2014.
- 8 Introduction of Car Parking Charges at Country Parks - 16th July 2014.
- 9 Extension of Bedlinog Line/Dowlais Park and Ride - 16th July 2014.
- 10 Strategic Facility for Waste Transfer and Bulking of Recyclables - 16th July 2014.
- 11 Medium Term Financial Plan Savings - Vans and Trailers at Civic Amenity Sites - 30th July 2014.
- 12 Urdd Eisteddfod 2015 - 3rd September 2014.

** If a member of the Scrutiny Committee wishes for any of the above Cabinet reports to be brought forward for review at the meeting please contact Rebecca Barrett, 01443 864245, by 10.00 a.m. on Monday, 15th September 2014.*

13 To receive a verbal report by the Cabinet Member(s).

To receive and consider the following Scrutiny reports:-

- 14 Medium Term Financial Plan: Maintenance of Community Schemes Funding.
- 15 Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (First Review) up to 2031: Population and Household Growth Options.
- 16 Local Development Plan - Annual Monitoring Report 2014.
- 17 To record any requests for an item to be included on the next available agenda.

To receive and note the following information items*:-

- 18 Various Waste Management Issues.
- 19 Bryn Compost Liaison Group Minutes - 3rd June 2014.
- 20 Grants to the Voluntary Sector Panel Minutes - 16th July 2014.
- 21 Voluntary Sector Liaison Committee Minutes - 18th June 2014.
- 22 Bargoed Town Centre Management Group Minutes - 21st May 2014.
- 23 Blackwood Town Centre Management Group Minutes - 16th May 2014.
- 24 Caerphilly Town Centre Management Group Minutes - 3rd June 2014.
- 25 Risca Town Centre Management Group Minutes - 24th June 2014.
- 26 Ystrad Mynach Town Centre Management Group Minutes - 15th July 2014.
- 27 Summary of Members' Attendance - Quarter 1 - 8th May 2014 to 30th June 2014.

28 Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme.

** If a member of the Scrutiny Committee wishes for any of the above Information Items to be brought forward for review at the meeting please contact Rebecca Barrett, 01443 864245, by 10.00 a.m. on Monday, 15th September 2014.*

Circulation:

Councillors Mrs E.M. Aldworth (Vice Chair), J. Bevan, Mrs A. Blackman, C.J. Cuss, D.T. Davies (Chair), R.T. Davies, N. Dix, C. Elsbury, R.W. Gough, Ms J.G. Jones, S. Kent, Ms P. Leonard, M.J. Prew, Mrs D. Price, A. Rees and Mrs E. Stenner,

And Appropriate Officers

This page is intentionally left blank



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, YSTRAD MYNACH ON THURSDAY, 12TH JUNE 2014 AT 5.30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillor D.T. Davies - Chair
Councillor Mrs E.M. Aldworth - Vice-Chair

Councillors:

J. Bevan, C.J. Cuss, R.T. Davies, N. Dix, C. Elsbury, R.W. Gough, Ms J.G. Jones, S. Kent, Mrs P. Leonard, Mrs E. Stenner.

Cabinet Members:

K. James (Regeneration, Planning and Sustainable Development) and T.J. Williams (Highways, Transportation and Engineering).

Together with:

S. Aspinall (Acting Deputy Chief Executive), T. Shaw (Head of Engineering Services), C. Campbell (Transportation Engineering Manager), M. Lloyd (Highway Operations Group Manager), C. Forbes-Thompson (Scrutiny Research Officer) and R. Barrett (Committee Services Officer).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs A. Blackman, M.J. Prew and Mrs D. Price, together with Cabinet Member D.V. Poole (Community and Leisure Services).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors J. Bevan, Mrs J. Jones, Mrs E.M. Aldworth, R. Gough and R.T. Davies declared an interest in Agenda Item 3(1) - Section 4.4.4 – Concessionary Pass Replacements. Details are minuted with the respective item.

Councillor C. Elsbury declared an interest in Agenda Item 3(1) - Appendix 2 – 16/17 Options for Savings (Festive Lighting). Details are minuted with the respective item.

Councillor Mrs E. Aldworth declared an interest in item 3(1) - Section 4.4.6 – Events in Pay and Display Car Parks. Details are minuted with the respective item.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Consideration was given to the following reports.

3. **ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION MEDIUM FINANCIAL PLAN 2015/16 AND 2016/17 – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

The Chair welcomed those present to the first of four special Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee meetings, which marked the start of a wider comprehensive timetable of meetings within the Authority relating to the budget planning process for 2015/16 and 2016/17. The other three special Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee meetings were scheduled for the coming months, with each meeting focusing on a specific division within the Directorate of the Environment. A further special Scrutiny meeting would take place in the autumn to discuss savings and efficiencies for the four areas and the views of the Committee at each individual scrutiny meeting.

Sandra Aspinall, Acting Deputy Chief Executive, introduced the report, which sought Members' comments on the suggested Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) from the Engineering Services division, containing a range of proposed savings and efficiencies for the period 2015/16 to 2016/17. These comments would subsequently be forwarded, together with other feedback, to Cabinet for their consideration. It was emphasised to Members that the aim of the first round of special Scrutiny meetings was to seek initial views on the savings and efficiencies proposed for the next two financial years, further to definitive proposals emerging at a later point in 2014 for consideration at that time.

Terry Shaw, Head of Engineering Services, presented the report detailing the suggested savings and efficiencies for his area and reminded Members that required savings for the Authority totalled £6.5m for 2015/16 and £6.9m for 2016/17. Members were advised that the budget strategy identified two main strands in order to achieve this estimated savings requirement of £13.4m, these being the review of discretionary services and the delivery of further efficiencies of up to 3% on statutory or essential services.

With regard to Engineering Services, 3 discretionary areas for review had been identified, namely Street Lighting, School Crossing Patrols and Public Transport Subsidy, and these were included in the report, together with proposals for 3% efficiency savings and a summary of proposed savings and efficiencies for 2016/17.

Members were advised that no firm budget targets were set as yet and that the aim of the meeting was for Members to consider and comment on the proposals and for further information to be requested if it was felt necessary. These views would assist in providing an overview of the budget targets, savings and efficiencies required. It was advised that the financial situation facing the Authority was worse than what had been originally predicted.

The first element of suggested savings for the Engineering Services division related to Street Lighting Energy Reductions. The report contained a large number of options to reduce street lighting, together with costs relating to the measure and technical arrangements relating to permanent disconnection.

Detailed discussion of this proposal ensued and Members queried the details of a number of options contained within the report. Concerns were raised as to whether all the associated costs for each option had been fully reflected in the report. Officers confirmed that the costs within the report were accurate and had been calculated in accordance with recommendations from Street Lighting management staff.

Members discussed LED lighting detailed in Option 12 of the report, and Officers replied to a number of queries surrounding the uses and advantages of this technology. Members also discussed the potential for a Central Management System (CMS) detailed in Option 11 of the

report. This technology would allow the dimming of street lights from a centralised location, and Officers confirmed that a full consultation process with the public would be undertaken should such an option be pursued. It was also arranged for Members to be provided with a list of the location of LED lights and dimmed lights currently in operation.

Following discussion on the content of the report, Members requested further information in regards to Option 11 (the introduction of a Central Management System) and Option 12 (convert all residential lighting to LED luminaires, except the existing cosmopolis). Members also requested that an additional option be included (to convert residential lighting to cosmopolis lighting) and that a report be prepared in regards to this.

Members felt unable to support the remaining options and recommended that they be removed from the list of suggested savings

The next element of suggested savings related to School Crossing Patrols and proposed the withdrawal of this service following a period of consultation. There are currently 63 permanent members of staff employed within the service, together with 3 relief staff, serving 42 primary schools across the county borough. The implication note within the report considered this option in more detail. The report advised Members that this was not a statutory service and that this measure had already been proposed by a number of other local authorities. Withdrawing the service would bring about a projected saving of £360,000.

The assessment criteria relating to crossing points was discussed and Officers queried that at present, each location was reviewed upon retirement or resignation of the post holder, and then the service was removed if it did not meet such criteria. Officers suggested that an assessment review of each site could be undertaken as an alternative option to withdrawing the service altogether, should Members wished to pursue such an option.

A number of concerns were raised by Members in regards to the impact that withdrawing the service would have on the safety of children within the borough. Members were unable to support the proposal in its current form and recommended that the proposal to withdraw the SCP service be removed from the list of suggested savings and that the status quo be maintained in the meantime.

Members requested that a review of the service be undertaken in regard to assessments for each crossing location against the current national guidance and that a breakdown of the costs of the School Crossing Patrols be provided. It was advised that this review would take approximately 12 months and the Committee requested that the proposal be brought to them for reconsideration upon completion of the review.

The final element of suggested savings related to the Public Transport Subsidy and proposals regarding the withdrawal of financial support for certain bus journeys. The report informed Members that whilst many bus journeys within the borough operate commercially without subsidy, all evening and Sunday services are subsidised by the Council, along with many daytime routes that serve more isolated communities. The Council spends £700,000 per annum maintaining these services, supplemented by £380,000 grant funding from the Welsh Government.

Five options were detailed within the report for Members' comments - withdrawal of Sunday and bank holiday services, withdrawal of evening services, the targeting of contracts with subsidies in excess of £1.50 or £3 per passenger, and withdrawal of support for daytime services. Members were advised that cuts to journey subsidies had previously been implemented in September 2013 as part of budget savings, and that the proposals would require extensive consultation with appropriate timescales. The report advised Members that bus services are operating in an ever-changing financial environment which could be compounded should the Welsh Government implement further funding cuts.

Each of the report options was discussed in detail and a number of concerns were raised regarding the proposals. Members stated that the proposals could have a significant impact on those who rely on buses as their only means of transport, such as travelling to work, shopping and hospital appointments, and that it could lead to remote estates becoming even more isolated. It was explained that daytime services on commercial routes were not included in these proposals as revenue was derived from fare-paying passengers, and that the report was looking at subsidised journeys with a lower passenger rate. It was confirmed that the information relating to passenger numbers was derived from bus ticket sales.

Following detailed consideration of the report, Members felt unable to support the options listed without detailed analysis of the proposals. Further information was requested in regards to each of these options, including details of the routes affected, the number of passengers using these routes, the impact of withdrawal, peak-time options, and alternatives in regards to each of the options listed in the report.

The next section of the report proposed efficiency savings of up to 3% on a number of statutory or essential services, namely carriageway resurfacing, footway resurfacing, concessionary pass replacements, highway adoption and agreement fees, events in pay and display car parks and car park tariffs. The report suggested efficiencies that could be made within each of these services, with the proposed savings totalled £352,000.

Members discussed each of these proposed efficiencies in turn, raising a number of queries and concerns in regards to these options.

Regarding the resurfacing of carriageways and footways, the report proposed a budget reduction to the planned maintenance aspect of the service, which equated to a saving of £200,000 for carriageway resurfacing and £50,000 for footway resurfacing. Concerns were raised regarding the impact that this reduction could have on insurance liability and public safety, with Members requesting further information regarding these proposals.

The next element of efficiency savings related to the proposal to increase the replacement costs for concessionary travel passes.

Councillors J. Bevan, Mrs J. Jones, Mrs E. Aldworth, R. Gough and R.T. Davies had earlier declared an interest in this item, in that they are concessionary bus pass holders. Councillors J. Bevan and R.T. Davies had left the meeting by this point, and as there were no recommendations being made at this meeting, the remaining Members who declared an interest were not required to leave the room during discussion of this item.

The report advised that the first replacement is currently free of charge with subsequent replacements costing £5 each. The proposal suggested an increase to £5 for the first replacement and £10 for subsequent replacements, raising an additional £7000 per annum. It was confirmed that this charge would apply to all concessionary holders, and Members supported the proposal to increase the replacement costs for concessionary travel passes.

The next element of efficiency savings proposed the review of fees currently charged to developers to administer highway agreements and complete highway adoptions. This was last reviewed in 2012 with it proposed that the fees and charges be reviewed again and increased to 10%, achieving a saving of £15,000 per annum. Members asked for information and comparison with other local authorities for additional increases above 10%, and supported the proposal to review and increase highway adoptions and agreements.

The next element of efficiency savings proposed to cease the holding of Council events in the Council's off-street pay and display car parks. Councillor Mrs E. Aldworth declared an interest in this item in that she has relatives with businesses within Caerphilly Town Centre. As there were no recommendations being made at this meeting, Councillor Aldworth was not required to leave the room during discussion of this item.

Members were informed that these events result in a loss of income to the Authority as the car parks are out of use for the duration of the event, which can be up to two weeks in some cases. This efficiency would achieve a saving of £20,000 per annum. Officers clarified the details contained within the report and Members supported the proposal to cease the use of pay and display car parks for Council events, subject to further liaison with the Planning and Regeneration division.

The final element of efficiency savings proposed to increase car park tariffs by 10p an hour, which were last increased in Summer 2010. Members were informed that there would be implementation costs totalling £15,000 and that this efficiency would achieve a saving of £60,000 per annum. Members requested further information regarding this savings option and for additional options to be explored, including charging in all car parks and park and ride car parks, the parity of charges across areas and the impact of such charges.

Appendix 1 formed the basis of the final section of the report and listed all other statutory and discretionary service areas previously identified as possible savings. As they were over and above the requirements of the budget strategy for 2015/16, they were not subject to the level of detail contained elsewhere in the report. However, it was possible that they could form the basis of future consideration for savings options for the year 2016/17.

Officers encouraged Members to examine the service areas listed within Appendix 1, and welcomed their views and suggestions in regards to bringing these areas forward for future consideration within the budget planning process.

Members firstly discussed the statutory service areas listed within Appendix 1, raising a number of concerns and queries regarding several of the options, and also requested further information in relation to some of the items listed.

Two options within the statutory service areas related to reducing planned and reactive maintenance budgets for highways and land drainage were proposed, with estimated savings totalling £50,000. Members highlighted instances of flooding across the Authority and subsequently felt unable to support these options.

Further information was requested regarding the savings proposal to cut the highway reactive maintenance budget, with suggested cuts of between 4% and 8% and with savings of £50,000 to £100,000.

Discussion took place regarding winter maintenance in regards to the proposal to reduce the amount of salt bins and amount of roads salted, with savings estimated at £60,000. Officers responded to queries regarding the issuing of salt bins, and concerns were raised regarding the impact of any reduction to the salting regime on public safety, with Members requesting further information regarding this proposal.

The list of options included a proposal for further budget reductions to the planned maintenance aspect of resurfacing carriageways and footway maintenance, with savings ranging from £350,000 to £1,000,000, dependent on the level of reduction. Members queried the impact of varying percentages of any cuts and what level of cuts could be effectively borne by the Council. Further information was requested regarding these savings options.

An option to consider maintenance savings to structures and retaining walls was listed, with savings varying from £50,000 to £100,000. There was also an option regarding Consultancy Structures SLA, with savings ranging from £14,000 to £28,000, and it was advised that options regarding this saving were dependant on changes to the budget to structures and retaining walls. Members requested further information regarding these savings options.

The list included an option to reduce the budget for aids to movement markers (road markings/signs/crossing points) by 10%, which would bring about a saving of £10,000.

Officers confirmed they were becoming more proactive and efficient in their methods of maintaining such markers, and Members subsequently supported this option.

Members then discussed the discretionary service areas listed within Appendix 1, and again highlighted a number of concerns and queries regarding some of the items listed and requested further information regarding several of the options

A number of options relating to the operation and maintenance of bus stations and shelters were proposed and discussed, including the introduction of public bus operator departure charges, reductions to bus shelter cleansing, repairs and maintenance, and reductions to the cleansing schedule at Blackwood and Bargoed bus stations. Savings would range from £120,100 to £126,200 depending on the level of reductions. Members commented that the cleansing programme had already been reduced and were subsequently unable to support these options.

The school crossing patrol lunchtime service was listed as a potential option with a saving of £40,000. Members discussed this option and requested further information regarding this proposal. The option regarding the review of the service that provides school travel plans and road safety education was also discussed, with possible savings of £50,000. Members requested further information regarding this savings option, including an option to reduce or remove some elements of the service.

The Community Assets Community Response Team was included in the list of options with a potential saving of £100,000. The role of the Team was clarified, and Members requested further information regarding this savings option, which would be detailed at a further special Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting in September 2014 relating to savings in the Public Protection division.

An option to further increase off-street parking charges additional to those already addressed in the main report was discussed by Members. Savings would range from £60,000 to £100,000. It was agreed that clarification in the form of further information would be required on the matter and was requested from Officers.

An option to review the management of off-street car parks was also listed and the potential scenarios within were outlined by Officers, including the introduction of pay and display into various locations, charges for Sunday parking, and another option for fixed penalty charges. Potential savings would total between £15,000 and £40,000. It was arranged for further information relating to the introduction of pay and display and Sunday parking charges to be included in the earlier report requested relating to the review of car park tariffs. Members supported the third option to increase the excess charge notice penalty.

The reduction of street lighting innovative technology trials were listed as a potential saving of between £50,000 and £90,000. It was agreed that this option would be put on hold pending further information being provided on the discretionary areas for street lighting agreed earlier in the evening (Options 11, 12 and the additional option relating to cosmopolis lighting). Once this information had been received and reviewed, a decision would then be made on the innovative technology trials.

The promotion of the gully reed bed recycling facility, with a view to increasing income by up to £10,000 was discussed, and Members supported this option.

The removal of local authority financial support to Christmas lighting in towns and villages was discussed. Councillor C. Elsbury declared an interest in this proposal as he advises a company that could potentially pick up the contract for festive lighting, and left the meeting at this point. Members supported this option but asked for a list of affected areas to be provided.

At the close of the meeting, the number of Member requests for further information were

reviewed by Officers. It was agreed by Members that wherever possible, rather than new reports being produced, the additional options and information requested could be added to existing reports, subject to the new information being clearly indicated within the reports.

The meeting closed at 7.46 p.m.

Approved as a correct record and subject to any amendments or corrections agreed and recorded in the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd September 2014 they were signed by the Chair.

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, YSTRAD MYNACH ON
TUESDAY, 1ST JULY 2014 AT 5.30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillor D.T. Davies - Chair
Councillor Mrs E.M. Aldworth - Vice-Chair

Councillors:

J. Bevan, Mrs A. Blackman, C.J. Cuss, Ms J.G. Jones, Mrs P. Leonard, M.J. Prew,
Mrs D. Price, A. Rees, Mrs E. Stenner

Cabinet Members:

K. James (Regeneration, Planning and Sustainable Development), D.V. Poole (Community
and Leisure Services) and T.J. Williams (Highways, Transportation and Engineering).

Together with:

S. Aspinall (Acting Deputy Chief Executive), N. Scammell (Acting Director of Corporate
Services and Section 151 Officer), M.S. Williams (Head of Community and Leisure Services),
C. Campbell (Transportation Engineering Manager), D. Phenis (Sport and Leisure Services
Manager), C. Forbes-Thompson (Scrutiny Research Officer) and R. Barrett (Committee
Services Officer)

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R.T. Davies, N. Dix, C. Elsbury,
R.W. Gough and S. Kent.

The Chair also welcomed Councillor A. Rees to his first meeting of the Regeneration and
Environment Scrutiny Committee.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received at the commencement or during the course of
the meeting.

3. MINUTES – 20TH MAY 2014

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 20th May 2014 (minute nos. 1 - 15, on page nos. 1 - 8) be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. CALL-IN PROCEDURE

There had been no matters referred to the Scrutiny Committee in accordance with the call-in procedure.

5. CABINET REPORTS

None of the Cabinet reports listed on the agenda had been called forward for discussion at the meeting.

6. REPORT OF THE CABINET MEMBERS

Councillor T.J. Williams, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transportation and Engineering, informed Members that a programme of carriageway and footway works had recently commenced within the county borough to further improve the condition of the Authority's road networks. These works would continue throughout the remainder of the year, with a large proportion taking place over the summer. The Cabinet Member also referred to the resurfacing of the re-opened A469 road between New Tredegar and Pontlottyn following the recent landslide and thanked local ward members for their support during this time.

Major relining works on the Pontywaun section of the Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal were nearing completion, with a total of 230m of canal channel relined to address an issue with a long-standing major leak. Plans were ongoing to re-fill this section of canal and re-open the towpath by the end of July. Members were also informed that the last scheme in the rail park and ride project was completed last month in Rhymney, doubling the number of car parking spaces in operation. An official opening ceremony with local dignitaries would follow shortly.

Members raised concerns in relation to road resurfacing works and loose road chippings and were advised to email the Cabinet Member directly with further details so that the matter could be investigated. The Committee also thanked Council staff involved in the reopening of the A469.

Councillor K. James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning and Sustainable Development, informed those present of the intended closure of Cwmcarn Forest Drive from November 2014. This was in order for a tree felling exercise to take place following an outbreak of larch disease. Members were advised that whilst the Forest Drive would be closed, the Visitor Centre and Café, together with all walks, bike trails, the lake and campsite would be open for business as usual. The Cabinet Member responded to questions relating to larch disease and clarified that a date for the reopening of the Forest Drive had not yet been confirmed by the Forestry Commission.

The Cabinet Member also informed those present of the new First World War exhibition 'Our Duty To Bear' which was currently being prepared by Winding House staff for display in the main gallery.

Councillor D.V. Poole, Community and Leisure Services informed Members that a number of events recently took place to mark National School Sport Week, including a version of the Commonwealth Games with over 600 pupils involved. Members were reminded that Caerphilly were the only authority in Wales to have 100% of schools registered and engaging with the event, and that pupils were benefitting from improved wellbeing and learning through cross-curricular activities

The 2nd annual Caerphilly 10K race took place on Sunday 22nd June 2014, with an increase of 39% in registration compared to last year. This year also saw the introduction of a junior race, and Members extended their thanks to all staff, participants and spectators for continuing to make this one of the most successful events in Caerphilly Council's events calendar.

Members were informed that the Gwent Trading Standards Project is progressing and that views were currently being sought from staff, residents and other stakeholders on the proposal for a regional service. A website had been developed reflecting the work of Trading Standards in Gwent and it was anticipated that the full business case would be presented to the Committee for their consideration in September 2014.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Consideration was given to the following reports.

7. EXTENSION OF BEDLINOG LINE / DOWLAI PARK AND RIDE

Clive Campbell, Transportation Engineering Manager, presented the report, which informed Members of the potential to extend the current freight line between Ystrad Mynach and Cwmbargoed to Dowlais Top to facilitate the potential future reinstatement of a passenger service, and sought the comments of Members prior to the report being considered by Cabinet.

The report highlighted the findings of the Sewta Rail Strategy Review 2013, which proposed extending the passenger rail network to Bedlinog via Nelson and Trelewis along the existing freight line. Further details of the review were appended to the report. Following this review, Merthyr Tydfil Council and Caerphilly County Borough Council jointly commissioned a further study to examine the practicality of extending the proposed service further north to Dowlais Top, to the north-east of Merthyr Tydfil.

A number of key recommendations arose from the study and a number of advantages and practicalities in extending the line were highlighted, including the opportunity for a new station at Nelson and enhanced connectivity between Merthyr Tydfil and Ystrad Mynach/Caerphilly. It was envisaged that Merthyr Tydfil Council would take the lead in developing the scheme further, supported by Caerphilly Council, including thorough discussion with Network Rail and Arriva Trains.

A number of queries were raised by Members in relation to funding, public consultation and the frequency of such a rail service, and Officers confirmed that these matters would become clearer during the next stage of the process, which addressed the feasibility of the project. Members were advised that the project was currently at stage 1 of the Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) process.

Following discussion on the content of the report, it was moved and seconded that the recommendation contained therein be adopted. By a show of hands, this was agreed by the majority present.

RECOMMENDED that the report be submitted to Cabinet for approval, thereby facilitating Officers and Members to make formal representations to the Welsh Government to ensure the scheme is recognised and considered as rail priorities are developed.

8. REVIEW OF IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVE NO. 4 FOR 2013/14

David Phenis, Sport and Leisure Services Manager, presented the end of year progress report against the Improvement Objective relating to improving awareness, access, variety and use of leisure, community and sporting facilities.

The report summarised the progress made during 2013/14 and also identified areas that require further focus. Indications were that significant progress had been made in improving sports and leisure facilities and increasing levels of participation, but that more work was required to improve the quality of life for residents, in encouraging them to lead healthier active lives. Appended to the report were a set of key performance indicators which monitor progress against targets and compare performance against other local authorities.

A number of positive outcomes within the Improvement Objective were highlighted, including the development and implementation of the Smart Rewards Scheme, which was introduced in conjunction with the Youth Forum, and which aids the retention of leisure centre customers by rewarding them for their loyalty. Members were advised of the success of the new Aqua Passport programme, which has been introduced in all the county borough's swimming pools and promotes positive engagement with schools and parents to ensure children are provided with the opportunity to learn how to swim by the age of 11. The success and benefits of the exercise referral scheme were also referenced, with a large number of patients now remaining active following completion of the scheme.

Reference was made to the hard work and commitment of all Sports and Leisure Service staff, including the support of volunteers in delivering Community Sport. It was explained that volunteer retention needed to remain a priority if further increases in participation were to be realised. It was also advised that Improvement Objective 4 would be carried forward to 2014/15 and reported on again next year.

Members discussed the report and made a number of suggestions as to the recruitment of volunteers in delivering Community Sport. Reference was made to the performance indicators that related to swimming, with Members querying the target level of 91% for children aged 11 years to be able to swim 25 metres. It was explained that whilst this was an ambitious target, it was hoped that the actual 58% result would be improved upon once a number of improvements to the Aqua Passport had been implemented. Officers also clarified the enrolment process in regards to the Aqua Passport scheme.

Members were pleased to note the performance indicators which demonstrated that the number of children aged 3-6 and 7-11 participating in sport 3 times a week were over and above the target levels of 30% and 35% respectively. Members placed on record their appreciation to staff with regards to this achievement, and noted the progress made against the Improvement Objective to date.

9. STRATEGIC FACILITY FOR WASTE TRANSFER AND BULKING OF RECYCLABLES

Mark S. Williams, Head of Community and Leisure Services, presented the report, which advised of the need for a strategic facility for waste transfer and bulking of recyclables, detailed the business case for such a facility at the Duffryn House Site, and sought Members' views on this proposed development prior to the matter being considered by Cabinet.

The report outlined the background to discussions over waste transfer infrastructure during the last 5 years and Members were referred to the appended business case which highlighted the need for a modern waste transfer facility. Members were informed that the Authority currently utilised the Waste Transfer Station at Full Moon, Crosskeys to bulk its residual and recycling waste prior to onward transportation for disposal/treatment. However, the capacity of waste was frequently exceeded, especially during sustained inclement weather or holiday

periods and there was subsequently an urgent demand for a modern, fit for purpose Waste Transfer Infrastructure.

It was explained that a number of possible locations had been assessed and examined in further detail within the business case, with the Duffryn House site identified as the most suitable location for a new waste transfer facility.

Members raised a number of queries and concerns regarding the proposal to locate the waste transfer facility within the Duffryn House site, including the locality of the facility to adjacent offices and neighbouring houses. Officers confirmed the layout of the proposed facility and advised Members that assessments had been carried out in relation to environmental impact and planning regulations. The consultation process was also queried by Members, with Officers confirming that this was an ongoing process.

Reference was made to the other locations detailed in the business case and whether these could be considered as alternative locations for a waste transfer facility. It was explained to Members that there were a number of reasons why these locations were unsuitable, including access issues, relocation costs and site issues, which were detailed further in the business case, and that of the five sites listed, the Duffryn House location was the most viable.

An amendment was moved and seconded in that the matter to determine the location of a waste transfer facility be deferred for the time being. Following a show of hands, and by the majority present, the motion was declared lost.

Members were reminded of the pressing need for a strategic waste transfer facility, particularly in regards to uncertainty surrounding the future arrangements for the recycling of food and green waste.

Following discussion on the content of the report, it was moved and seconded that the recommendation contained therein be adopted. By a show of hands, this was agreed by the majority present.

RECOMMENDED that for the reasons contained therein, the Business Case for the development of a Waste Transfer Station at the Dyffryn House Site be supported, and that this recommendation be submitted to Cabinet for approval.

10. REQUESTS FOR REPORTS TO BE INCLUDED ON THE NEXT AVAILABLE AGENDA

1. Councillor C. Cuss requested an update in regards to Caerphilly County Borough Council's Communities First programme.

11. INFORMATION ITEMS

The Committee noted the following items for information, full details of which were included within the Officers reports. There were no items brought forward for review.

- (1) Public Protection Enforcement – 2013/14;
- (2) Annual Report On The Consumer Advice Service Provided By Trading Standards;
- (3) Trading Standards Enforcement of Age Restricted Products Legislation 2013-14;
- (4) Apportionment of Highway Maintenance Budget 2014/2015;
- (5) Revenue Budget 2014/2015 Environment Directorate;
- (6) Summary of Members' Attendance – Quarter 4 – 1st January 2014 to 7th May 2014;
- (7) Bryn Compost Liaison Group Minutes – 10th February 2014.

The meeting closed at 6.44 p.m.

Approved as a correct record and subject to any amendments or corrections agreed and recorded in the minutes of the meeting held on 16th September 2014 they were signed by the Chair.

CHAIR



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, YSTRAD MYNACH ON
WEDNESDAY, 30TH JULY 2014 AT 5.30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillor D.T. Davies - Chair
Councillor Mrs E.M. Aldworth - Vice-Chair

Councillors:

J. Bevan, Mrs A. Blackman, C.J. Cuss, R.T. Davies, N. Dix, C. Elsbury, R.W. Gough, Ms J.G. Jones, S. Kent, M. Prew, Mrs D. Price, A. Rees and Mrs E. Stenner.

Cabinet Members:

K. James (Regeneration, Planning and Sustainable Development), D. Poole (Community and Leisure Service) and T.J. Williams (Highways, Transportation and Engineering).

Together with:

S. Aspinall (Acting Deputy Chief Executive), M.S. Williams (Head of Community & Leisure Services), D. Phenis (Sport and Leisure Services Manager), D. Price (Parks and outdoor facilities manager), C. Forbes-Thompson (Scrutiny Research Officer) and C. Evans (Committee Services Officer)

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P. Leonard.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor E. Stenner declared an Interest in Agenda Item 3(1) Appendix 1, Waste Strategy Operations as a family member is employed in this area.

Councillors Mrs E. Aldworth, J. Bevan, R. Gough and Mrs J. Jones declared an interest in Agenda Item 3(1) Appendix 1, Waste Strategy Operations due to their use of Civic Amenity Sites within the Borough.

Councillors Mrs E. Aldworth, D.T. Davies, S. Kent, M. Prew and Mrs D. Price declared an interest in Agenda Item 3(1) Appendix 2, Sport and Leisure due to their use of Leisure Centres/ Facilities within the Borough.

Councillors J. Bevan, Mrs A. Blackman, D.T. Davies, R. Gough, M. Prew, Mrs D. Price and Mrs E. Stenner declared an interest in Agenda Item 3(1), Appendix 3, Parks, Bereavements and Outdoor Facilities due to owning Cemetery plots within the Borough.

Councillors Mrs E. Aldworth, J. Bevan, Mrs A. Blackman, D.T. Davies, R.T. Davies, C. Elsbury, S. Kent, Mrs D. Price and Mrs E. Stenner declared an interest as Community Councillors.

Councillor D.T Davies declared an interest declared an interest in Agenda Item 3(1) Appendix 1, Bowling Clubs as President of Bargoed Bowls Club.

Members were advised that as no decision was being made there was no requirement for Member to leave the meeting room and were able to fully take part in the debate.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Consideration was given to the following reports.

3. COMMUNITY AND LEISURE SERVICES DIVISION MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2015/16 AND 2016/17- ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

M.S. Williams, Head of Community & Leisure Services, provided Members with considerations for the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) contributions from the Community and Leisure Services Division in accordance with the Cabinet Report of 16th April 2014 (“Next Stages of the MTFP – 2015/16 & 2016/17”).

Members were asked to consider the Community and Leisure Services Division’s contribution to assisting the Authority to meet its obligations in respect of the 2014-17 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP), taking due note that:-

- i) The Council’s MTFP requires estimated savings of £6.5m for the 2015/16 financial year and £6.9m for 2016/17.
- ii) Discretionary Services are reviewed in full, including those areas of statutory provision where delivery exceeds the minimum required levels, with a view to identifying savings proposals totalling over £8m across the Authority
- iii) Further proposals for Members to consider in respect of up to 3% efficiency savings. These efficiency savings targets to be applied to those statutory and essential services that the Authority has to deliver, either directly or via a third party organisation.

The division operates a mix of statutory (e.g. waste services) and discretionary services (e.g. Sport and Leisure, Parks) with some other services (e.g. street cleansing) having a statutory basis with discretion over service delivery.

The Chair thanked the Officer for the introduction and the Committee agreed that, as per the report, which subdivided the 5 distinct services and identified suggested savings for each, the Scrutiny Committee would consider each area and proposal in turn.

5.2.1 Waste Strategy and Operations Service (Appendix 1)

Waste Strategy and Operations Service provides a mix of statutory and discretionary services including collection, treatment and disposal of wastes and recyclables, street cleaning, civic amenity sites and public conveniences

Closure of Civic Amenity Sites- Various options from closing 1 site to closing 5 sites

The report demonstrated the various savings options available through the closure of each site. Members noted that the Civic Amenity Sites are mainly discretionary Services, as statutory requirement provides for only 1 site within the Borough.

Members raised concerns about the possible increase in Fly Tipping, demonstrating a considerable increase noticed on the day of the strike. Members queried whether private skips could be provided in villages or towns, if a site were to be closed. Officers confirmed that the Authority, by law, has a Duty of Care, which would not be met. It was added that there would also be risks in the disposal of hazardous waste.

Members requested further information on the tonnage and number of cars disposing of waste at each of the sites and queried the impact to other sites and on Fly Tipping if a site were to be closed. The Officer confirmed that data could be provided, and highlighted that it is not an intention at this stage to close all or any sites, purely to offer Members a variety of options for consideration.

Members queried the progress of the Ty Dyffryn site. Members noted the closure of Trehir and Penallta and the replacement of a new facility at Ty Dyffryn is the subject of a business case, and potential savings of circa £110,000.

Members queried the policy on charging the public for the disposal of waste. It was noted that Cabinet had earlier endorsed a recommendation from a report, which provided for vans and trailers to be charged for the disposal of domestic waste.

Members raised concerns about the impact on performance and targets if any recommendation or closure were to come into force. Officers stated that Caerphilly is currently one of the top performers in Wales, however there is room for improvement. Targets are becoming more difficult to meet and there would be more costs involved in order to meet the requirements. Prosiect Gwyrdd could provide additional recycling options, however it was identified that further work is needed to find a solution to separating street litter in order to recycle, but a solution is not currently available.

Members felt unable to support this option in its current form and asked for options to be explored which involved reducing opening hours or closing for specific days across all sites. Concerns were raised that there would be an increase in Fly Tipping and Members requested further information on the cost implications of fly tipping and the number of incidents per annum.

Closure of Public Conveniences- Various options from closing 1 facility to closing all 6.

The report demonstrated the various savings options available through the closure of each site within the borough. Members noted that the Public Conveniences are discretionary Services.

Members sought further information on the funding provided by Welsh Government (WG) to local businesses in areas in which public conveniences had been removed. Officers confirmed that the WG funding was withdrawn in March 2014 and provided to CCBC as part of the Revenue Support Grant (RSG), however, clarification is pending on the amount received. Members noted that Cabinet considered a report in May to pay the grant to those properties in receipt of payment last year; however, no decision has been made to consider further payments in the future.

A Member queried those Public conveniences closed, whether they had been sold and if there was a payment of NNDR. Officers confirmed that the majority of properties had been demolished and were not paying NNDR.

Members felt that the options could not be supported without first consulting with Community Council's, Trade Unions and local companies in order to explore all avenues and funding options.

Councillor C. Cuss requested further information on the Public Conveniences that have been part of/ subject to Regeneration Funding.

Councillor A. Rees requested a detailed report on the breakdown of costs to run a public convenience.

Street Cleansing

(i) Reduced Cleansing on bank holidays

The report demonstrated the savings available through the reduction of street cleansing and the options to reduce cleansing on bank holidays. Members noted that street cleansing is part statutory and part discretionary service.

Members felt that there would be a minimal impact to the service delivery and cleanliness of the Borough and as a result supported the proposal.

(ii) Reduction in number of pedestrian sweepers operated (reducing by 1)

The report demonstrated the savings available through the reduction of cleaning on a year-by-year basis. Members noted that the street cleansing is a statutory service.

Members highlighted that cleansing within the Borough is better than in other areas and were unhappy to see a change in this.

The report suggested an early morning presence in Villages and Town Centres, (as opposed to an all day presence) with the result that each would only receive an early morning clean and not cleansing throughout the day.

A Member suggested that consideration be given to a seasonal cleaning regime. It was noted however, that this would reduce the saving by 50% if this were to be implemented on a seasonal basis.

Members supported the proposal within the report.

(iii) Reduction in weed removal budget and service.

The report highlighted the potential saving of £100k if the weed removal budget were reduced. Members noted that this reduction would provide an annual visit to each ward in the Borough, as opposed to 2 visits per year for weed treatment and removal.

Members discussed this proposal and raised concerns that weeds have been a significant issue in recent months due to the weather. It was observed that residents are not as proactive in the removal of weeds and debris from around their properties and as a result, Members raised concerns about the damage caused to highway and property infrastructure.

A Member queried the cost of the Weed Killer used and its effectiveness. Officers stated that the products used cost circa £70Kk to supply and spray onto the highway network. Members were asked to note that there are strict requirements placed on Local Authorities in terms of products, which are enforced by Natural Resources Wales.

Members considered and discussed the proposal in detail and supported this proposal.

Waste Collection

(i) Charging for all replacement containers

The report demonstrated the savings amounts if the Authority were to charge to replace all waste containers. Currently, only general waste containers incur a charge for replacing, unless they are stolen.

Members noted that refuse and recycling collection services are a statutory duty, however the supply of the containers is not. Local Authorities have the legal powers to specify the type of containers the waste is collected from.

Members discussed the proposal in depth and raised concerns about the proposal and the possible impact this could have on the Performance Data.

Members queried the cost to the public for each container. Officers explained that they are currently £25 for a new wheeled bin, which includes delivery but that there would obviously be lower charges for bags and food caddies.

Members suggested that Cabinet consider the proposal further.

(ii) Integration of Farm/ Rural collections onto One Vehicle

The report demonstrated the savings proposed if Farm/ Rural collections were integrated into one vehicle. Members noted that the proposal would require a split cage vehicle.

Members sought further information on the staffing implications to the proposal. Officers stated that they would be redeployed or cross-matched into alternative posts where possible.

Members supported this proposal

Waste Treatment and Disposal- Project Gwyrdd

The report provided details of the £1,200,000 saving, which was originally considered to be part of the savings that would arise once the full Prosiect Gwyrdd Service had commenced in 2016/17. However, due to interim contract provisions, can be brought forward to 2015/16.

Members were asked to note that if this saving can not be considered as part of the Community and Leisure Services MTFP then there are no further savings that can be made from this budget heading.

Members noted that Prosiect Gwyrdd is currently under development and due to open shortly. Members supported this proposal

5.2.2 Sport and Leisure

The Sport and Leisure Service is entirely discretionary although the service makes a significant contribution to the healthy lifestyle agenda and addressing obesity and inactivity across the County Borough in accordance with one of the Authority's improvement objectives.

Year 2 Saving from Caerphilly Leisure Centre Cafeteria

Members noted that Cabinet supported this proposal in 2013/14 and noted the Year 2 savings from Caerphilly Leisure Centre cafeteria closure.

Closure Cwmcarn as a Leisure Centre

Members noted that the Leisure Centre had not opened to the public since the issues were identified and supported the option not to reopen it as a leisure centre.

Reduction Cleaning Contract

The proposal to reduce the cleaning hours at all Leisure Centres would alter Terms and Conditions of contracts and there would be a potential redundancy in order to meet the £30,000 savings amount in 2015/16.

Members supported the proposal and suggested consultation with the Building Cleaning Service staff and Trade Unions.

Leisure Centre Closures

The Report detailed individual costs to the closure of each of the Leisure Centres in the Borough. Leisure Centres are a discretionary Service and Members noted that the closure of any Leisure Centre would result in up-front costs, therefore savings cannot be realised until 2016/17.

Members were asked to consider the Leisure Strategy, which had been sent to all Members for consideration and consultation. Members were urged to consider the proposals outlined within the report, alongside the Leisure Strategy, which would be considered at the next Scrutiny Committee in September.

Members expressed concerns that there was a conflict between the proposals and Improvement Objective 4, which was considered at the last meeting. Members noted that a Leisure Centre Strategy has been sent to all members of the Committee for their consultation, which outlined proposals to combat some of the concerns raised and look to make savings in Leisure Centres.

Members felt unable to support the proposals at the present time and suggested waiting until September for a more detailed report on the options, following the consultation on the Leisure Strategy and Business Plan.

5.2.3- Parks, Bereavements and Outdoor Facilities

The Parks, Bereavements and Outdoor Facilities Services is mainly discretionary although there are statutory elements such as grass cutting to maintain highway safety, play provision and maintenance of existing cemeteries.

Phase 2 of removal of flowerbeds in Parks and Open locations (Phase 1 was completed in 2014/15)

The report highlighted the potential savings of £40,000 for 2015/16. Members noted that phase 1 was completed in 2014/15 and Local Ward Members and Town and Community Councils would be consulted prior to works being conducted.

Following discussion and consideration, Members supported this proposal.

Removal of hanging baskets from town centres

The report highlighted that the provision of hanging baskets in town centres was a discretionary service and the removal of the service would provide a saving amount of £34,000 in 2015/16.

Members discussed this service and raised concerns about future entry into Britain in Bloom and the impact to the bee population. Members noted that the significant costs comes from the upkeep of the baskets, in particular the watering.

Members felt that the options could not be supported without first consulting with Town and Community Council's in order to explore all avenues and funding options. The Head of Service outlined the decision deadline for ordering plants as the end of October 2014.

Reduction in playing field maintenance to remove 2 fertilizer applications and cease end of season renovation works.

The report highlighted that there was a potential £30,000 saving amount to be made by reducing the discretionary service.

Members sought clarification on the reductions and it was highlighted that the renovations at the end of the season to maintain pitches would cease, as would all maintenance works at the end of the sports season.

Members felt that the options could not be supported without first consulting with Local Clubs and Town and Community Council's in order to explore all avenues and funding options

Increasing Outdoor Sports Facilities Charges by 20%

The report presented Members with a potential saving amount of £20,000 in 2015/16 and £20,000 in 2016/17 by increasing the Outdoor Sports Facilities charges by 20%.

Members discussed this proposal and raised significant concerns about the impact this would have on the users of the facilities and in particular on the young people of the Borough. Officers highlighted that Caerphilly are charging some of the lower prices for the use of these facilities.

Members suggested amending the proposal to further increase fees for adult activities beyond the percentage suggested and consider further options for freezing charges for junior users.

Review of Park Ranger Service to reduce from 18 to 6 Rangers over a 2 year period.

Members noted that the reduction in the discretionary Park Ranger Services would provide a savings of £40,000 in 2015/16 and an additional £40,000 in 2016/17.

Members discussed the proposal and sought further information on the staffing. Officers highlighted that 6 of the staff would not be subject to redundancy as they are employed through agency, however 6 are employed by the Authority and would be subject to redundancy or redeployment.

Further clarification was sought on the role of Park Rangers, in particular in relation to those responsible for sports pitches. Officers explained that Park Rangers are seasonal appointments that would deal with season tickets, management of outdoor sports facilities and general tidiness of the park. Members also noted that a Policy is in place and enforced that specifies that pitch cleanliness is the responsibility of the Clubs using the facilities.

Subject to consultation with staff, Trade Unions and Town and Community Councils, Members were happy to support this proposal.

Closure of 6 of the Authority's 21 Bowling Greens at Penyrheol, Oakdale and New Tredegar (in 2015/16) followed by Machen, Senghenydd and Ynysddu (in 2016/17)

Councillor D.T. Davies declared an interest as President of Bargoed Bowls Club, however, as this was not a proposal within the report, he remained and fully participated in the discussion.

The report referred to a proposal to close 3 of the Authority's Bowling Green in 2015/16, and a further 3 in 2016/17, which would provide a £50,000 saving amount in these 2 financial years.

Members queried the selection process for the proposed closures. Officers confirmed that the Bowling Greens were selected due to the number of season tickets purchased, the Greens with the lowest number of season tickets purchased were considered for efficiency savings.

Following detailed consideration and debate, Members felt that they were unable to support this proposal and suggested that all bowls clubs in the Borough be contacted and offered the management of the green and bring back to Committee for consideration.

Retirement of Principal Parks Operations Officer

The report referred to the retirement of the Principal Parks Operations Officer, which would provide a savings amount of £50,000 in 2016/17. Members noted that there would be a requirement to conduct a restructure of the service to ensure that service delivery is still effective and staff and Trade Unions are consulted with.

Members supported the proposal on the pretence that a restructure be conducted to ensure sufficient staffing in areas.

Reduction in Playground budget

The Report referred to the statutory service to provide playgrounds throughout the Borough. Members noted that the proposed saving for £8,000 in 2015/16 had been allocated from the repairs and maintenance budget.

Members discussed the proposal and raised concerns around maintaining safety of the parks and playgrounds. Members were assured that there would be no compromise on playground safety and that the playgrounds are subjected to annual inspections, the Authority has a responsibility to record and maintain records of the inspections for a 20 year period.

Members supported this proposal

5.2.4- Building Cleaning

The Building Cleaning Service provides a range of “soft” facilities management services (such as internal cleaning, window and canopy cleaning, PAT testing, etc) to schools and other public buildings as well as a small number of external customers. The Service is discretionary although the Authority has a legal duty to keep its buildings in a clean and safe condition.

Retirement of Service Manager

The report referred to the retirement of the Service Manager of Building Cleaning Service, which would provide a savings amount of £50,000 in 2016/17. Members noted that there would be a requirement to conduct a restructure of the service to ensure that service delivery is still effective and staff and Trade Unions are consulted with.

Members supported the proposal on the pretence that a restructure be conducted to ensure sufficient staffing in areas.

5.2.5- Fleet Management and Maintenance

The Fleet Management and Maintenance Service has 2 main elements- ensuring legal compliance with road traffic law and maintenance of the Council’s fleet of vehicles in a safe and roadworthy condition. These elements are essentially statutory. In addition the Authority’s fuel stocks and vehicle hires are managed by the service. These are discretionary elements of the service.

Retirement of Service Manager

The report referred to the retirement of the Service Manager of Fleet Management and Maintenance Service, which would provide a savings amount of £50,000 in 2016/17. Members noted that there would be a requirement to conduct a restructure of the service to ensure that service delivery is still effective and staff and Trade Unions are consulted with.

Members supported the proposal on the pretence that a restructure be conducted to ensure sufficient staffing in areas.

Councillor S. Kent requested further information on staff levels within Community and Leisure Services from 2008 to date. It was agreed that Officers would email the Committee with the information.

The meeting closed at 20.27 p.m.

Approved as a correct record and subject to any amendments or corrections agreed and recorded in the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd September 2014 they were signed by the Chair.

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

SUBJECT: MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN: MAINTENANCE OF COMMUNITY SCHEMES FUNDING

REPORT BY: ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) contributions from the Community Schemes budget in accordance with the Cabinet report – next stages of MTFP – 2015/16 and 2016/17 dated 16 April 2014. This report is seeking the views of Members prior to its presentation to Cabinet.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report is put before Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee to consider the Maintenance of Community Schemes funding in assisting the Local Authority to meet its obligations in respect of the 2014/17 Medium Term Financial Plan.
- 2.2 The Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) agreed by Council on the 26th February 2014 identified an estimated savings requirement of £6.5m for 2015/16 and £6.9m for 2016/17. This was based on an indicative reduction in Welsh Government (WG) funding of 1.34% for 2015/16 and, in the absence of further guidance from WG, an assumed reduction of a further 1.34% for 2016/17.
- 2.3 The budget strategy agreed by Council for 2015/16 and 2016/17 is currently being taken forward via two main strands. The first of these is further savings proposals for Members to consider in respect of up to 3% efficiency savings. These efficiency targets require savings of circa £5m and will be applied to those statutory and essential services that the Authority has to deliver. The second stand of the agreed budget strategy is a review of discretionary services, including those areas of statutory provision where delivery exceeds the minimum required levels, with a view to identifying savings proposals totalling over £8m.
- 2.4 Members of the Scrutiny Committee will be aware of the letter from the Minister for Local Government on the 24th June 2014 informing Local Authorities that due to a range of emerging cost pressures, particularly in the NHS, further significant reductions in the Local Government financial settlement are now anticipated for 2015/16 and beyond. This has serious consequences, as WG is now asking Local Authorities to consider how they would respond to funding reductions of up to 4.5%. A report was presented to Cabinet in the 16th July 2014, which identified that a cut in WG funding of 3% would increase the required savings for 2015/16 and 2016/17 from the current planning figure of £13.4m to £22.2m. A cut of 4.5% will increase the savings target to £30.1m. A further report will be presented to Cabinet early in the autumn when the position has been examined in more detail.

3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

3.1 The report links directly to the efficient use of funding provided for the Maintenance of Community Assets, prioritised towards Communities First Wards, as reported to Cabinet and Council in 2006/2007 Revenue Budget reports in February 2006.

3.2 Contributing to the Healthier Caerphilly, Safer Caerphilly, Learning Caerphilly, Prosperous Caerphilly, and Greener Caerphilly priorities within the Single Integrated Plan, Caerphilly Delivers.

3.2 Corporate Aspirations:

Our communities must be a safe, green and clean place to live to improve resident's quality of life

Our goal is that every child should have the best start in life, and the opportunity to achieve success as a young person and as an adult.

We want to enable our communities to make healthy lifestyle choices to improve citizen's quality of life.

4. THE REPORT

4.1 The Council's policy of maintaining community assets was funded in previous years from part of the Deprivation Grant, which the Authority received from Welsh Government. In 2010/2011 Deprivation Grant funding was transferred into the Council's Revenue Support Grant, but the Council has continued to support and fund community asset initiatives.

The Maintenance of Community Schemes budget for the 2014/2015 financial year is £252,000 this was reduced from £400,000 in 2013/2014 to address an unavoidable additional cost pressure in respect of care home fees in the Directorate of Social Services.

A report to Cabinet on 2nd April 2014 sought and gained approval to allocate this budget to fund a range of Community Schemes. The schemes approved are summarised in table 1 below.

TABLE 1	PROPOSAL	ALLOCATION £000
	Community Response Team (NCS) plus materials	100
	Urban Renewal (town centre areas of Caerphilly, Bargoed, Risca, Blackwood, Ystrad Mynach)	20
	Community Partnerships (items identified by Community Regeneration Officers)	35
	Litter bins - improvement or replacement	7
	Invasive Plant Species Officer - contribution to salary	15
	Parks to be allocated to cemeteries, parks east and parks west	40
	Living Environment Local Environmental Quality Partnership	10
	Community Payback (graffiti removal, community clean-ups)	10
	Allotment Strategy Implementation	5
	Maintenance budget for community schemes	10
	TOTAL	252

4.2 Options for Savings In Relation To the Community Schemes Budget

Options are considered in this report, including deleting the full Community Schemes budget of £252,000 (appendix 1). Individual schemes could be retained or deleted and appendix 2 provides detailed implications notes for each scheme listed in table 1 above.

4.2.1 Delete the Community Schemes Budget

Deleting the Community Schemes budget would generate a saving of £252,000 to help achieve MTFP (Medium Term Financial Plan) savings in 2015/2016. However this would result in the removal of funding for all the schemes noted in table 1 above, the implications of which are noted in appendix 2.

Many of the initiatives presently funded from the Community Schemes budget, would, if they were to continue, need to be funded from other core service maintenance budgets in relation to street scene, town centres, vandalism and graffiti, parks, playgrounds, cemeteries and allotments and street cleaning. Other Community Scheme funded initiatives involving Community Partnership projects, Living Environment Local Environmental Quality projects and Community payback via the Probation service would all be curtailed.

4.2.2 Reduce the Community Scheme Budget

A further reduction in the Community Scheme budget from £252,000 could be considered by deleting some of the schemes listed in table 1 of this report and detailed in appendix 2. A saving could also be made by reducing the Community Schemes funding in 2015/2016 and reprioritising the schemes to be funded, taking into account the impact of deleting schemes in terms of employment, impact on the community and existence of alternative options for funding from other core budgets.

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The empowerment aspect of the community partnership allocation is especially important for minority groups in the community as they often feel less empowered due to their particular circumstances. Further, the work undertaken in improving seating, pathways and reducing anti-social behaviour has a greater positive impact on elderly and disabled people in the community. Finally, the Community Payback involvement in dealing with graffiti supports the swift removal of graffiti that may contain discriminatory, extremist or hate crime phrases.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Deletion of the full Community Schemes budget would generate a budget saving of £252,000
- 6.2 Deletion of the Community Schemes budget would place added pressure on core maintenance, replacement and enhancement budgets in relation to street scene, town centres, street cleaning, parks, playgrounds and allotments, which may require a need to reprioritise some core budgets.
- 6.3 Deleting some of the initiatives funded from the Community Schemes budget and/or reducing the overall funding and reprioritising schemes to be funded, would generate a budget saving, the value of which will depend on which schemes are retained and at what funding value.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 As detailed in appendix 2, some of the schemes funded including the Community Response Team and the part funding of the Invasive Plant species officer have direct employment implications. The Invasive Species Officer brings in an income- and this was included in the 14/15 MTFP. If the 15k for his salary has to be funded by the income he raises then we do not make the saving we have already offered - and which is expected to come in every year.
- 7.2 The personnel implications of agreed savings proposals will need to be carefully managed and staff will need to be fully supported to identify redeployment opportunities wherever

possible. Consultation with staff and their representatives will need to be undertaken as appropriate.

8. CONSULTATIONS

- 8.1 This report has been sent to the Consultees listed below and all comments received are reflected in this report prior to further discussion by Cabinet.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 That Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Members consider and comment upon the contents of this report.

10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 To ensure that the views of the Scrutiny Committee are considered prior to any proposals being presented to Cabinet.

11. STATUTORY POWER

- 11.1 Local Government Acts 1972 and 2000

Author: Mike Eedy, Finance Manager
Consultees: Cllr. Dave Poole, Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services
Cllr. Ken James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning & Sustainable Development
Cllr. Tom Williams, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transportation & Engineering
Cllr. D.T. Davies, Chair Regeneration & Environment Scrutiny Committee
Cllr. E.M. Aldworth, Vice-Chair Regeneration & Environment Scrutiny Committee
Sandra Aspinall, Acting Deputy Chief Executive
Nicole Scammell, Acting Director of Corporate Services
Tony Maher, Assistant Director Planning and Strategy
Stephen Harris, Acting Head of Corporate Finance
Robert Hartshorn, Head of Public Protection
Terry Shaw, Head of Engineering Services
Mark S Williams, Head of Community & Leisure Services
Pauline Elliott, Head of Regeneration & Planning
Gail Williams, Monitoring Officer/Principal Solicitor
David A. Thomas, Senior Policy Officer (Equalities and Welsh Language)
Sian Phillips, HR Manager

Background Papers: Cabinet Report of 16th April 2014 entitled "Next stages of the MTFP – 2015/16 & 2016/17"

Appendices:
Appendix 1 Community Schemes Funding: Option 1 Full Deletion of Community Schemes
Appendix 2 Community Scheme Funding: Implications Notes for each Scheme Initiative

Medium Term Financial Plan – 2015 – 2016
Community Schemes Savings Option 1 deletion of the budget: Implications Notes

Budget Title / Ref:	Maintenance of Community Schemes
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£252,000 2015/16 Full deletion of the budget would result in the Community Schemes being curtailed.
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	
Staff Costs:	Redeployment/redundancy of 2 staff employed in the Community Response Team and possible redeployment/redundancy of the Invasive Plant Species Officer. In cases of redeployment should the employee be redeployed to a lower grade than that of their substantive role protection of salary applies for an 18 month period, up to a maximum of 2 grades. Full redundancy costs would be approximately £. There would be some additional costs relating to release of pension for some staff
Resource Costs: Additional Costs:	None None
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	No statutory consultation. Seek views of key Community Partnerships and Probation service. Staff and Union consultation required Not applicable
<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	
Not Achieving - Savings:	Savings could be partly offset by redundancy costs and pension release costs if suitable alternative employment cannot be secured for individual members of staff. In cases of redeployment should the employee be redeployed to a lower grade than that of their substantive role protection of salary applies for an 18 month period, up to a maximum of 2 grades. Increased pressure on core maintenance, replacement and enhancement budgets in relation to street scene and cleaning, town centres, parks, playgrounds and allotments especially where the requirement to replace or repair damaged assets may have a health & safety implication.

Timeframe:	The timing of any savings will need to be considered in the light of any funding requirement associated with redeployment and redundancy processes.
<u>HR Implications:</u>	
Redundancy:	Savings could be partly offset by redundancy costs and pension release costs if suitable alternative employment cannot be secured for individual members of staff.
Redeployment:	Possible 1, 2 or 3 FTEs
Redirected Resource:	Possible 1, 2, Or 3 FTEs
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	

Detailed Implications Notes for each Scheme funded from Community Scheme Budget

Budget Title / Ref:	Community Response Team
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	100,000 2014/15 The allocation of this budget provides funding for the Community Response Team (CRT). This team consists of two NCS workforce operatives. The type of work is generally tidying areas, painting, minor repairs, etc. The majority of their work is within the Town Centres, Caerphilly, Bargoed, Newbridge, Risca and Ystrad Mynach although there are other works carried out within the community as and when required. Should this budget be removed the town centre enhancement works would be removed and alternate suitable work would need to be found for these staff. The work the Team undertakes also adds value to the town centre management team, based in Regeneration and Planning.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Nil Nil There is a likely increase in longer term maintenance costs for the town centres and other area's of the community. There is also the public perception element of the attractiveness of the town centres, which could give a decline in visitor numbers and impact on the retailers.
Timeframe to Implement	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Not applicable. Not applicable.
Risks of Implementation	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Nil as budget under authority control Nil as budget under authority control
HR Implications	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Savings could be partly offset by redundancy costs and pension release costs if suitable alternative employment cannot be secured for individual members of staff. Consultation will be carried out with staff and their representatives as appropriate. Any alternate suitable employment. There are currently no opportunities within the Engineering Division.
Other Options/Issues:	.
If this budget is removed and maintenance within the town centres declines there could be a knock on effect to tourism and visitor numbers, which would have a wider impact on the authority and local business.	

Budget Title / Ref:	Cease contribution to Urban Renewal for town centre improvement works
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	<p>£20,000 2015/16</p> <p>A small allocation from the Community Assets budget is currently made by the Council to the Urban Renewal team to help maintain the Council's principal town centres.</p> <p>The resource is used to carry out work items identified on the regular environmental audits as part of the Town Centre Improvement Group process. This is done in an accountable and transparent way to issues raised by Members, the public, businesses, and members of the Town Centre Management Groups.</p> <p>The resource is also used to help match fund small to medium improvement projects in the town centre, which add value to the street scene by improving their attractiveness for visitors, residents and potential investors.</p> <p>Town centres are vitally important to the overall economic well being of the county borough and they are particularly vulnerable in this current economic climate. They are in a process of transition as the change in consumer spending patterns change the way they are used. The expectation of retailers and shoppers is for clean well maintained and managed town centres. Any reduction in the resources available to maintain and enhance them will have a detrimental impact on the centres and as a consequence also on the wider economy</p>
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs:	<p>None None The attractiveness of the town centres would be impacted upon.</p>
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	<p>N/A N/A</p>
<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	
Not Achieving -	<p>Non-allocation of this funding would jeopardise the ability of the Town Centre Management function to deliver well maintained and managed town centres as it relies on this budget to implement small improvement schemes in town centres and react to issues identified in the regular audits conducted in each town centre. Without the £20,000 there would be no capital budget available to the Town Centre Management Team. This budget has already been cut in half from an allocation of £40,000 in previous years</p> <p>This has a direct effect on Members ability to respond to queries and complaints in town centres. At present they utilise the town centre</p>

	<p>management function to take up and fix the issues raised on their behalf through the audit process.</p> <p>Town centres are employment centres bringing with them a economic vibrancy to an area. The Unique Places model of Town Centre Management is recognised and envied throughout SE Wales due to the attention to detail that the town centre management function brings. This is borne out by lower than average vacancy rates in our retail and commercial sectors in these towns.</p>
Savings: Timeframe:	Low Low
<u>HR Implications:</u>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	<p>None – although loss of budget would have direct impact on the effectiveness of the Town Centre Management Team</p> <p>None</p> <p>The Town Centre Management team understand where the need for intervention is through town centre visit and dialogue with businesses and local Members Through the audit process they are able to co-ordinate and prioritise the budget to action necessary works. Without this focus it would fall on the key bodies, namely owners of properties, Council services, town councils and retailers. With regard to the Council’s responsibilities it would fall on individual service areas to respond to issues (at a cost to the council). It is more effective to focus the resource with Town Centre Management who can react quickly to these demands in a co-ordinated manner before they escalate and become more expensive to resolve.</p>
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	
	<p>Reduce the allocation further. This would have a direct impact on the level of responsiveness to audit requests and a reduced ability to action small improvement schemes.</p> <p>It would have a direct correlation on the attractiveness of the town centres</p>

Budget Title / Ref:	Cease Community Assets budget - Community Partnerships
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	<p>£35,000 2015/16</p> <p>The budget was identified as an incentive for engagement of community partnerships in the maintenance and improvement of their local environment, over and above normal council work. The Budget has traditionally been used to deliver small schemes identified by Community Partnerships and has also been utilised as match funding for externally funded activities such as play parks, skateboard parks, MUGAs etc</p> <p>All requests for future schemes will need to be refused. With both Members and Partnerships informed as part of the process.</p>
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	

Staff Costs:	None
Resource Costs:	None
Additional Costs:	None
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation:	N/A
Statutory Process:	N/A
<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	
Not Achieving -	
Savings:	Low
Timeframe:	Low
<u>HR Implications:</u>	
Redundancy:	None
Redeployment:	None
Redirected Resource:	N/A
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	

Budget Title / Ref:	Litter bins – improvements or replacements
Savings (£):	£7,000
Financial Year:	
Comment:	This budget is normally used by colleagues in Economic Development to improve/enhance town centre bin provision or replacement although if there is no pressing need in this area it is used to satisfy public and member requests for replacement or additional bins
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	
Staff Costs:	Nil
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs:	
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation:	It would be appropriate to discuss with Town Councils as we would not in future be able to work with them to enhance town centres
Statutory Process:	
<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	

Not Achieving -	Nil
Savings: Timeframe:	2015/16
<u>HR Implications:</u>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Nil
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	It projects a much better image of the authority and makes it much easier for crews to collect rubbish that has been deposited in a bin. It also helps keep the borough looking cleaner and a more attractive place to live and visit

Budget Title / Ref:	Community Assets – Invasive Plant Species Officer – contribution to salary
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£15,000 15/16 This provides part funding of an Invasive Plant Species Officer post @ 40%. This post operates throughout the County Borough and generates some direct income from works undertaken. The main financial benefit is however related to reduced development costs and limiting potential claims from invasive spreading from Council land and seeking external funding to support the project. The post holder is on track to generate income for the authority of £15,000 for this financial year.
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	
Staff Costs:	Savings could be partly offset by redundancy costs and pension release costs if suitable alternative employment cannot be secured for individual members of staff. Possible redundancy cost
Resource Costs: Additional Costs:	Works to secure reduced delivery costs, possibly 10'000's Long term project, difficult to estimate. Contractual obligations.
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Possibly Possibly
<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	
Not Achieving -	N/A
Savings: Timeframe:	N/A N/A

<u>HR Implications:</u>	
	Savings could be partly offset by redundancy costs and pension release costs if suitable alternative employment cannot be secured for individual members of staff.
	Consultation will be carried out with staff and their representatives as appropriate.
Redundancy:	Possible £10,800
Redeployment:	Possible
Redirected Resource:	Possible
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	
	CCBC are currently seeking to lead on a 3 year Invasive Plant project for the South Wales Valleys from 15/16 for a period of 3 years. This would assist in funding the post CCBC have some contractual obligations to fulfil through this post e.g Bargoed Development plateau and the authority would need to outsource these works at considerable cost.

Budget Title/Ref:	Parks Allocation to Cemeteries & Parks (East & West)
Savings (£):	40,000
Financial Years:	2014/15
Comment:	Funding is used on various small schemes. In 2013/14 these included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pengam Play Area, provision of new highball fencing - £1,350 • Replacement of paving to footpaths around bowls green, Oakdale Welfare - £900 • New anti-social barriers and fencing renewal at Fochriw football ground - £2,200 • Provision of stolen entrance barriers to 3 pitches at Abertyswg playing fields £1,700 • New drainage to surrounds to former Bedwellty Comp. School fields to enable new public use - £2,200 • New drainage ditch to Brithdir playing field to pick up A469 surface water gullies - £1,500 • New Engineering scheme to stream wall at Abertridwr Library/Park - £15,000 + fees of £2,500 • New access gates & barriers permitting disabled access/entry, sports fields Bargoed Park £3,500 • Fencing and access provision at Deri playing fields - £1,100 • New bye-laws sign provision, all play areas and parks & open areas - £8,500 • Renewal of walls and entrance gates Coed y moeth , Aberbargoed - £900
Cost to Implement	
Staff Cost:	Nil
Resource Costs	Nil
Additional costs as a consequence:	There is likely to be an impact on use and access to many different areas of parks and open spaces. There is no revenue budget available to cover any future requests from users and members outside core maintenance items. The former Parks footpaths and fencing revenue budget of £120,000 was removed several years ago for general Directorate savings.

	The public's perception of such facilities may become an area of concern.
HR Implications	The sum is often used to generate work for staff for winter work within the service to ensure year round employment for staff.
Redundancy: Re- deployment	See above

Budget Title / Ref:	Cease contribution to the Living Environment Partnership, Local Environmental Quality Small Grants Fund
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	<p>£10,000 2015/16</p> <p>The Council currently makes a fund available to the Greener Caerphilly Theme Partnership of the Single Integrated Plan (formerly the Living Environment Partnership of the Community Strategy). The fund is operated as a small grants fund and partners can bid to undertake projects in the county borough. Projects must involve at least 2 partner organisations, must enhance or improve the local environmental quality and provide at least £1 for £1 match funding. The scheme acts as a catalyst for partnership working on environmental issues in the county borough.</p> <p>In 2014/15 the programme is supporting 8 projects including Healthy Rivers, a partnership between Groundwork, the South East Wales Rivers Trust, NRW and CCBC. Work is being undertaken to improve local river quality including litter picking and removing barriers to fish migration. Salmon eggs are being reared in classrooms and released into the river Sirhowy as part of an education programme. As a direct result of this work salmon have spawned upstream of Blackwood for the first time in over 100 years. Partners are contributing a total of £25,000 to this project in 2014/15.</p> <p>Other projects include training for local landowners and volunteers to build and maintain drystone walling and to carry out hedge laying. A further project is providing support to teachers to allow them to link practical environmental projects in their communities to the national curriculum, therefore allowing them to engage pupils in this work as part of their school activities.</p> <p>Many of these projects are low cost, innovative solutions to issues of local environmental problems. It is a very valuable tool in engaging local organisations in practical environmental projects and delivering the outcomes of the Greener Caerphilly Theme of the Single Integrated Plan.</p>
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	
Staff Costs:	None, although Council departments bid in and secure funding through this programme each year
Resource Costs:	None
Additional Costs:	None
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation:	N/A
Statutory Process:	N/A

<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	
Not Achieving -	
Savings:	Low
Timeframe:	Low
This work is an important element of the Greener Caerphilly Theme of the Single Integrated Plan. Ceasing this work will mean that elements of the Greener Caerphilly programme will not be achieved.	
<u>HR Implications:</u>	
Redundancy:	
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	

Budget Title / Ref:	Cease contribution to Probation Service for Community Payback (graffiti removal, illicit tipping removal, etc. etc.).
Savings (£):	£10,000
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	<p>The Council currently makes a contribution to the Probation Service to secure additional Community Payback hours within the county borough for all graffiti removal and some other community clean-ups and improvements etc. A vehicle was purchased for this purpose in 2012 at a cost of £34,000. If this arrangement is withdrawn there will be no graffiti removal service. The responsibility for graffiti removal will fall back to building owners, including Council services.</p> <p>The Welsh Government's National Survey for Wales published in May 2014 found that whether an individual is likely to be dissatisfied with local authority services primarily related to other attitudes and views about the local authority and the local area including whether the local authority is well maintained and the absence of graffiti. That is, the absence of graffiti was found to be one of the drivers of satisfaction with local authority services.</p>
<u>Cost to Implement</u>	
Staff Costs:	None
Resource Costs:	The authority will need to identify budgets for Building owners to clear graffiti from their properties and will not have the ability to clear graffiti from other public places or private buildings
Additional Costs:	None
<u>Timeframe to Implement</u>	
Consultation:	N/A
Statutory Process:	N/A

<u>Risks of Implementation</u>	
Not Achieving -	There are equalities implications associated with not being able to remove certain types of abusive (racial etc) graffiti. The loss of the team would remove this ability to remove such graffiti quickly.
Savings: Timeframe:	Low Low
<u>HR Implications:</u>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None None The responsibility for graffiti removal will fall back to building owners, including Council services.
<u>Other Options/Issues:</u>	

Budget Title/Ref:	Allotment Strategy Implementation
Savings (£): Financial Years: Comment:	£5,000 2014/15 The allocation is used each year as a method of absorbing the increasing demand on allotment provision by the public. Healthy living and Grow your Own promotions generated by government and TV have resulted in high areas of request particularly by young families and individuals especially in the southern areas of the County. Waiting lists are high in a number of towns and villages, with little opportunity of turnover of plots as a result of no vacancies. The funding is used to clear major overgrowth areas and re-introduce new plots for take up by the community. Security to the recently established areas is also included via use of this funding.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Cost: Resource Costs Additional costs as a consequence:	Nil Nil There will be an impact on the public on the allotments waiting lists. This is likely to lead to the public's frustration as a result of the time periods currently being experienced getting longer in the future, especially when space is available but not in a physical state to be brought into use.
HR Implications	
Redundancy: Re- deployment	No in-house implications

Budget Title/Ref:	Maintenance of Community Schemes (New Playground equipment/areas)
Savings (£): Financial Years:	10,000 2014/15

Comment:	The allocation of £10,000 is used to cover essential inspection, general maintenance and small scale replacement of playground equipment in areas originally funded by external bodies to local community groups and partnership teams. Without this funding there is a danger the small number of existing community schemes may have to close and any current planned community schemes (4 at planning/consultation stage) may either not progress or the maintenance/inspection funding will have to be generated privately before any applications for external capital funding is made.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Cost: Resource Costs Additional costs as a consequence:	Nil Nil Any removal of funding may lead to disappointment in local community groups and partnerships in their attempts to combat local anti-social behaviour and the general rise in young people's activity levels in deprived communities. Any future capital grant applications are likely to be more difficult to secure if this is withdrawn as there would be no maintenance/ inspection regime by the Authority to satisfy insurers etc.
HR Implications	
Redundancy: Re- deployment	No in-house implications



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

**SUBJECT: CAERPHILLY COUNTY BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(FIRST REVIEW) UP TO 2031: POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD
GROWTH OPTIONS**

REPORT BY: ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide elected members with an understanding of the key assumptions that determine the future level of population and housing growth to be accommodated in the county borough through the first review of the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2031.
- 1.2 To obtain the views of elected members on the level of population and household growth that should be included in the Preferred Strategy in order to inform the amount of housing land that will need to be released up to 2031 through the review process.
- 1.3 To inform elected members of the stakeholder engagement undertaken to date for the review of the LDP and outline how this work has influenced the population and household growth scenarios presented for consideration in this report.
- 1.4 To seek the Scrutiny Committee's views of the use of population and household growth scenario M as a basis for the preparation of the Preferred Strategy which will be considered by Council in early 2015.
- 1.5 To make recommendations to Cabinet and thereafter Council in respect of 1.1 to 1.4 above.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The Council has a statutory duty to prepare and review a Local Development Plan for its area to provide the policy framework for the development and use of land within the County Borough. On 23 November 2010, the Council formally adopted the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2031(LDP) and has since been monitoring the progress of the plan through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
- 2.2 Following the recommendations of the 2013 AMR, the Council resolved on 8 October 2013, to roll forward the LDP to cover the plan period up to 2031 and to commence work on the review of the plan.
- 2.3 Participation and public consultation is essential for effective community and stakeholder engagement in this process. Early discussion on the updated evidence base, alternative strategic options, preferred strategy and related proposals is critical for building consensus in respect of how the plan should be reviewed to meet the county boroughs future development needs.

- 2.4 Fundamental to the review of the LDP for the County Borough is the amount of new development that needs to be planned for up to 2031.
- 2.5 National planning policy states that the starting point for considering how much housing should be accommodated within Local Development Plans should be the Welsh Government household projections. However local authorities are able to deviate from these projections if they have the evidence to support this.
- 2.6 Concerns are raised however regarding the appropriateness of the assumptions used in the WG projections in respect of migration. There nine different scenarios were initially tested to examine the potential impact of different migration assumptions on household growth, however further to early stakeholder involvement a further 4 scenarios have also been tested. On balance it is considered that Population and Household Growth Scenarios E, H and M are the more desirable, realistic and robust options to inform the level of Population and Household Growth up to 2031 and should be used to inform the Preferred Strategy to be considered by the Council in October 2014 and thereafter to be subject of public consultation in the new year.
- 2.7 If members accept the recommendation contained in this report, the revised LDP will need to make provision for the development of 450 to 600 dwellings per annum.

3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 The Single Integrated Plan **Caerphilly Delivers** has been prepared by the LSB and represents a determined commitment by all partners to accelerate change, strengthen partnership working, multi-agency collaboration, and accountability for delivery.
- 3.2 **Caerphilly Delivers** has been developed based on 4 key principles of:
- **Sustainable development** where we promote social justice and equality of opportunity and enhance the natural and cultural environment and respect its limits
 - **Equalities and Welsh language** where we all promote and mainstream equalities and the Welsh language in accordance with our legislative requirements and strategic equality objectives.
 - **Early intervention and prevention goals** with the aim of either preventing matters from getting worse or occurring in the first place, by identifying those in greatest need from their vulnerability, their risk of becoming vulnerable or from otherwise becoming disadvantaged.
 - **Community cohesion** where people from different backgrounds enjoy similar life opportunities, understand their rights and responsibilities and trust one another and are trusting of local institutions to act fairly.
- 3.2 The Local Development Plan is the statutory framework for the development and use of land within the County Borough. It provides the policy framework for the development and conservation needs of the County Borough and is used by the Council to guide and control development. In order to realise the long term Strategic Vision for the county borough the LDP (1st Review) will facilitate the delivery of the land use elements of the five key outputs of Caerphilly Delivers, as follows:
- **Prosperous Caerphilly** - The LDP (1st Review) will seek to increase the economic prosperity of the people and communities of the county borough through the provision of land for employment opportunities, supported by appropriate housing and ancillary facilities and services (including community and health facilities, recreation, leisure etc). Further it will seek to facilitate the provision of a modern, integrated and sustainable transport system that increases opportunity, promotes prosperity and protects the environment; where public transport, walking and cycling provide real travel alternatives.
 - **Safer Caerphilly** - The LDP (1st Review) will seek to make Caerphilly County Borough a clean, green, safe and pleasant place to live and work with decent public services. It should enhance the vibrancy and diversity of local communities, in order to ensure good

health and social cohesion. It will facilitate the creation of new developments, which help to enhance social cohesion so that people feel safe and secure and it should deliver high quality design that deters opportunities for crime and anti social behaviour.

- **Learning Caerphilly** - The LDP (1st Review) will recognise the importance of modern education facilities and the role that they play in up skilling the population. It will therefore need to protect existing facilities and make adequate provision for sufficient land to be released to enable the improvement of education facilities throughout the county borough.
- **Healthier Caerphilly** - The LDP (1st Review) will contribute to improving public health, by promoting land use developments that contribute to healthy lifestyles and well-being. The plan will therefore make provision for a transportation network that increases the opportunities for walking and cycling and provide a policy framework for the protection and enhancement of recreation and leisure facilities to ensure that they are accessible for all.
- **Greener Caerphilly** - The LDP (1st Review) will protect the environment as a whole whilst balancing the need for new development with the need to conserve valuable resources. Further it will underpin all development with the principle of good design, that meets a diversity of needs; which uses resources efficiently; and which makes adequate provision for recycling and waste management and ensure that new development minimises emissions of greenhouse gases as far as is practically possible in order to mitigate the effects of climate change. Finally it will seek to ensure that resources are used efficiently making the best use of our valuable assets.

4. THE REPORT

- 4.1 The Council has a statutory duty to prepare and review a Local Development Plan for its area to provide the policy framework for the development and use of land within the County Borough. On 23 November 2010, the Council formally adopted the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2021(LDP) and has since been monitoring the progress of the plan through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
- 4.2 Following the recommendations of the 2013 AMR, the Council resolved on 8 October 2013, to roll forward the LDP to cover the plan period up to 2031 and to commence work on the review of the plan.
- 4.3 An important feature of the development plan review process is the emphasis on identifying and testing realistic strategy options to deliver the Vision and Objectives of the plan over the plan period.
- 4.4 As the Council already has an adopted plan, there is a need to assess whether the existing Development Strategy for the county borough remains appropriate within the context of the revised plan period up to 2031, and also remains robust within the changing regional context.
- 4.5 Participation and public consultation is essential for effective community and stakeholder engagement in this process. Early discussion on the updated evidence base, alternative strategic options, preferred strategy and related proposals is critical for building consensus in respect of how the plan should be reviewed to meet the county boroughs future development needs.
- 4.6 The Delivery Agreement, Agreed February 2014 (DA) outlines how the Council intends to engage with stakeholders throughout the review of the plan. In line with the DA, a series of targeted stakeholder events took place throughout the spring of 2014, as follows:

29 April 2014
9 May 2014
9 June 2014
23 June 2014

LDP Focus Group
Event with Members of Standing Conference
Stakeholder Event - Developer Workshop
General Consultation Bodies - Workshop

4.7 The purpose of this work was to:

1. Test the existing Adopted LDP development strategy against alternative scenarios to determine if it remains appropriate moving forward;
2. Obtain targeted stakeholder views in respect of the alternative scenarios for population and household growth;
3. Obtain targeted stakeholder views in respect of the development of alternative strategic options; and
4. Inform the Preferred Strategy that will be subject of a further report to Council in January 2015.

The summary of the stakeholder feedback obtained to date through these mechanisms is outlined in Appendix 1 to 3. The Draft Notes of the LDP Focus Group are attached at Appendix 4.

4.8 The comments and observations made, has helped to inform this report in terms of presenting options in respect of the scale of future population and household growth to be accommodated in the county borough up to 2031, for consideration by elected members. Further, this work has provided an indication of the stakeholders' initial views regarding the appropriateness, or otherwise, of alternative spatial options to deliver this growth.

4.9 This report provides an overview of the Population and Household Growth Scenarios that have been considered through this early engagement process. Five preferred growth options are presented for the consideration of members, one of which is highlighted as being the most robust to take forward as part of the consultation on the Preferred Strategy, namely Scenario M the Moderate average household size change and SE Wales migration (10 years), which equates to a need for 600 dwellings per annum up to 2031.

POPULATION & HOUSEHOLD GROWTH OPTIONS

4.10 Fundamental to the review of the LDP for the County Borough is the amount of new development that needs to be planned for up to 2031. Of critical importance is the future number of households that the plan will need to make provision for. This clearly influences the number of dwellings that will need to be provided over the plan period and the level of new jobs that will need to be created. Appendix 5 outlines a set of frequently asked questions and answers, concerning the need for new housing in the county borough.

4.11 National planning policy states that the starting point for considering how much housing should be accommodated within Local Development Plans should be the Welsh Government household projections. However local authorities are able to deviate from these projections if they have the evidence to support this.

4.12 The latest Welsh Government Population and Household Projections have a 2011 base date and are based on short-term trends for the five years preceding 2011. Whilst this is an appropriate timeframe to inform the projections, the plan period for the review of the LDP runs up to 2031, and therefore some caution needs to be exercised in determining the likely level of growth anticipated for Caerphilly County Borough over a 20 year period based on 5 year trends.

4.13 Population growth is determined by the number of births and deaths in an area, referred to as natural change, and the number of people moving in to, and out of an area, both from elsewhere in the UK and from overseas, referred to as migration.

4.14 The assumptions used to inform the 2011-based projections for both births and deaths are considered realistic. The number of births is expected to decline over the plan period, and although people are living longer, the number of deaths is expected to increase due to the

post war baby boom. Therefore whilst the assumptions are based on short-term trends, they also accord with long-term trends.

- 4.15 Concerns are raised however regarding the appropriateness of the assumptions used in the WG projections in respect of migration. Since the late 1990s migration in the County Borough has been positive and the population decline that had been experienced in earlier decades has been halted. The last 5-years migration rates have however been affected by the recession, and Caerphilly County Borough has experienced a short-term trend of out-migration that is not reflective of longer-term trends. It is therefore considered appropriate to examine alternative assumptions in respect of longer term trends for migration, in order to examine what impact this could have on the future number of people and households in the County Borough.
- 4.16 Nine different scenarios were initially tested to examine the potential impact of different migration assumptions as follows:
- Scenario A : WG 2011 based Principal Projection
 - Scenario B - Ten-Year Average Migration Projection
 - Scenario C - Zero Net Migration Projection
 - Scenario D - Average Migration for SE Wales - 5 year average
 - Scenario E - Average Migration for SE Wales - 10 year average
 - Scenario F - Moderate Migration - 5 year average
 - Scenario G - Moderate Migration - 10 year average
 - Scenario H - Dwelling led - 10 year average completions
 - Scenario I - Dwelling led, continuation of adopted LDP housing requirement
- 4.17 However as a consequence of stakeholder input to the process a further four scenarios have subsequently been tested in response to important issues raised, specifically: 1) the impact of the reducing average household size up to 2031, 2) the need to test a jobs led scenario where people migrate into the area for jobs and the population increases as a result; and 3) the change in household membership rates which would increase the number of single person households in the county borough. Consequently the following scenarios have also been tested:
- Scenario J - Jobs-led
 - Scenario K - Household membership type change and SE Wales migration (10 years)
 - Scenario L - Long term average household size change and SE Wales migration (10 years)
 - Scenario M - Moderate average household size change and SE Wales migration (10 years)
- 4.18 BR3: Population and Housing Growth Options Background Paper (July 2014) discusses each of these options in considerable detail, and concludes that growth options A, B, E, H and M should be subject to further consideration by stakeholders as part of the pre-deposit public consultation stage of the review process.
- 4.19 These five alternative growth options provide clearly different growth scenarios for Caerphilly County Borough up to 2031, and these are summarised below.
- 4.20 By way of context, it is important to note that the 2011 Census indicated that the population of Caerphilly County Borough was 178,800 equating to 74,500 households. To further aid understanding, it is also helpful to note that the Adopted LDP required a minimum of 8,625 dwellings to be developed up to 2021, requiring the development of 575 dwellings a year, but actually made provision for 10,269 new dwellings to allow for flexibility and choice.
- 4.21 Scenario A: WG 2011 based Principal Projection assumes the re-establishment of the long-term trend of loss of population toward the end of the plan period through out-migration and a significant decline in the working age population. This would increase the population of the county borough by 4,500 people by 2031 to 183,300 (79,908 households) and require an

annual house-building rate of 280 dwellings per annum. This would equate to 6,160 new dwellings over the plan period.

- 4.22 Scenario B - Ten-Year Average Migration Projection assumes the main driver for population change is natural change (births and deaths) , although migration makes a small contribution to the overall population growth. This assumes no increase in population from 2028 onward and a decline in the working age population. This would increase the population by 5,850 people by 2031 to 184,650 (80,478 households) and require an annual house-building rate of 310 dwellings per annum. The dwelling requirements associated with this option would be low when compared to historic housebuilding rates. This would equate to 6,820 new dwellings over the plan period.
- 4.23 Scenario E - Average Migration for SE Wales - 10 year average assumes population growth would be due to a combination of natural change and in-migration leading to a sustained increase in population throughout the plan period. This scenario results in a slight decrease in the working age population. This would increase the population by 13,450 people by 2031 to 192,250 (83,093 households) and require an annual house-building rate of 450 dwellings per annum. This would equate to 9,845 new dwellings over the plan period.
- 4.24 Scenario H - Dwelling led - 10 year average completions assumes population growth would be due to a combination of natural change and in-migration leading to a sustained increase in population throughout the plan period. This scenario results in a slight decrease in the working age population. This scenario would increase the population by 14,200 people by 2031 to 193,000 (83,637 households) and require an annual house-building rate of 475 dwellings per annum. This would equate to 10,450 new dwellings over the plan period.
- 4.25 Scenario M – Moderate Average Household Size Change and SE Wales Migration (10 Yr Average). As the 2001-2011 change in average household size declined at a much slower rate than had occurred in the previous decade (1991-2001), it is appropriate to consider the impact on households if a long term AHS rate of decline is used rather than assuming a rate based on the trends of the last 10 years. In this scenario a moderate AHS has been applied to the Scenario E (*Average Migration for SE Wales – 10yr average*) projection. This would result in the AHS reducing from 2.39 in 2011 to 2.21 by 2031. This reduction has a direct impact on the number of houses to be provided. This scenario would increase the population by 13,450 people by 2031 to 192,250 and require an annual house-building rate of 600 dwellings per annum. This would equate to 12,000 new dwellings over the plan period.
- 4.26 On balance it is considered that Scenario M is the most desirable, realistic and robust option to inform the level of Population and Household Growth up to 2031, for the following reasons:
- The assumptions in respect of births and deaths are realistic having regard for both long and short-term trends;
 - The migration rates that informs this options are realistic and achievable having regard for long-term trends;
 - The Average Household Size reducing to 2.21 over the plan period is realistic when long term trends are take into account;
 - The house building rates of 600 dwellings per annum are realistic having regard to the long-term trends in the county borough;
 - The level of house building proposed is achievable over the plan period having regard for economic cycles within the plan period;
 - This option recognise the need to retain and attract younger working age people in the county borough in order to ensure the future economic prosperity of the area; and
 - This level of growth would help retain and sustain services and facilities. In particular, Scenario H will help sustain school provision over the plan period.
- 4.27 Early stakeholder engagement indicated that
- It would not be desirable to plan on the basis of short-term trends that reflect a period of economic recession; and

- It would not be acceptable to plan for a declining, ageing population as this would adversely impact on the ability of the area to sustain services, facilities and economic growth.
- There was a broad consensus that growth (housing and employment) needs to occur in the county Borough.
- Growth needs to be supported by appropriate infrastructure, including improvements to the road network between New Tredegar and Pontlottyn, consideration of a bypass for Maesycwmmmer and South East Caerphilly. Further consideration is required in respect of the railway network and in particular Machen to Newport, Risca to Newport, Nelson to Dowlais Top and the impact of the electrification of the railways to improve connectivity.
- Flexibility, is key to deliverability.
- New housing needs to cater for all sections of society but in particular affordable housing and housing for an ageing population needs to be prioritised.
- There is the need and desire to improve prospects for the young, providing employment and training so that they remain in the County Borough.
- The Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area requires additional assistance to help boost home building.
- Any significant growth in the Southern Connections Corridor will result in the release of greenfield sites. The development of such sites needs to be undertaken sensitively to mitigate any landscape and ecological impacts.
- Improvements to the centre of Caerphilly through the creation of the South East By-pass are required to help alleviate the air quality issues in the centre of town.
- Development should be targeted at both the Southern Connections Corridor and Northern Connections Corridor.
- Transport links in all three strategy areas are in need of improvement if the Heads of the Valleys Area is to attract employment and housing growth.

4.28 The potential land use implications of meeting Scenario **M** now needs to be considered.

4.29 BR3: Population and Housing Growth Options Background Paper (April 2014) provides the methodology for determining the existing housing land supply at 2011 i.e. the base date for the plan. In summary, an allowance is made for sites with planning permission that had not been started, housing completions, units under construction, demolitions, windfalls and contributions from small sites and empty homes brought back into beneficial use.

4.30 Taking this existing land supply into account, there is already provision for approximately 5079 new dwellings as at 2011.

4.31 The additional land that would need to be identified to meet scenario M is thus calculated by subtracting the total housing land supply figure i.e. 5079 from the dwelling requirement (which includes 10% over-allocation to allow for flexibility and choice) to give a dwelling requirement figure for each scenario.

4.32 This dwelling requirement is then translated into land, based on an average density for housing development of 35 dwellings per hectare.

4.33 The land use implications of Scenarios M is therefore as follows:

- Scenario M would require the release of approximately 231 ha of additional land for housing development up to 2031 to accommodate an additional 8100 dwellings. This would make provision for a total of 12,000 dwellings over the plan period.

4.34 In order to help visualise how much land this is on the ground, it is useful to note that the Cwm Calon development in Ystrad Mynach is approximately 27 ha, Ty Du in Nelson is approximately 19 ha, Oakdale Plateau 1 is approximately 30 ha, whilst Bedwas Colliery is approximately 36 ha.

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Stakeholder engagement has been undertaken in line with the Agreed DA, which has full regard for the Citizens Engagement Strategy and the Equalities Strategy of the Council.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no new financial implications.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 None

8. CONSULTATIONS

- 8.1 All comments received have been incorporated in the report.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 Members are asked to provide their comments on the proposal that Population and Household Growth Scenarios A, B, E, H and M should be subject to further consideration by stakeholders as part of the pre-deposit public consultation stage of the review process.
- 9.2 Members are further asked to provide their comments on the proposal that Population and Household Growth Scenario M be used as the Preferred Growth Option and as a basis to underpin the Preferred Strategy for the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (First Review) up to 2031 prior to this being presented to Cabinet and Council for approval.

10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 Scenarios A, B, E, H and M are the most realistic and robust options to test as part of the stakeholder engagement as part of the pre-deposit public consultation stage of the review process.
- 10.2 Scenario M is the most desirable, realistic and robust option to be used as the Preferred Growth Option to underpin the Preferred Strategy for the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (First Review) up to 2031.

11. STATUTORY POWER

- 11.1 Part 6 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 11.2 Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan)(Wales) Regulations 2005.

Author: Rhian Kyte, Team Leader, Strategic and Development Plans
Consultees: P. Elliott, Head of Regeneration & Planning
G. Williams, Interim Head of Legal Services/ Monitoring Officer
S. Aspinall, Acting Deputy Chief Executive
Cllr K. James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning and Sustainable Development

Appendices:

- Appendix 1 Summary of Stakeholder Feedback from LDP Focus Group and Standing Conference Event
- Appendix 2 Summary of Developer Panel Feedback (LDP Developer Panel – Engagement Event)
- Appendix 3 Summary of Stakeholder Panel – General Consultation Bodies Workshop Feedback (Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (First Review) up to 2031 Stakeholder Event 23 June 2014 - Llancaiach Fawr)
- Appendix 4 Notes of LDP Focus Group Meeting (29.04.2014)
- Appendix 5 Frequently Asked Questions

Background Papers:

BR3: Population and Housing Growth Options Background Paper July 2014

[made available in the resource library]

Reports to Council 23rd November 2010 and 8th October 2013

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback from LDP Focus Group and Standing Conference Event

Population and Household Growth

A summary of the views of each of the events is outlined below. However, there were common themes that were raised in each of the discussions. These included the need for growth to occur, the need to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure and industry are provided to support that growth. Additionally, planning for growth was supported, as long as this was undertaken in a sustainable fashion. Overall, Scenario E (with infrastructure improvements) or H was deemed the most suitable to inform public consultation on the Preferred Strategy.

Summary of comments:

- § Modest growth is needed in order to retain the balance between the economically active & ageing population.
- § There is a need to retain a balance between the economically active & ageing population.
- § Need to try to increase the younger profile of population.
- § Need to maintain population that is currently living in the county borough.
- § The modest growth scenario was felt to best achieve the corporate objectives of the Council in terms of the delivery of services and facilities and in order to sustain the area (Schools / Town Centres / Transport/ Social Services etc).
- § Growth is good and planning for decline is unacceptable.
- § Need to make the county borough an attractive place to live – especially noting the proximity to Cardiff.
- § Housing growth can only be sustained through transport improvements.
- § Transport is key, as is electrification of railways to improve connectivity to jobs and services. East/West link improvements are essential;
- § Need to build housing that people can afford.
- § Flat based apartments required for young that are affordable – however the price between house and flats are similar.
- § Need to provide a wide range of housing that would be flexible and grow/contract as households change.
- § Need to attract entrepreneurs to locate and invest here.
- § County borough cannot be viewed as one – southern part of the borough needs to be dealt with differently to the north
- § Poor opportunity for residents – need to reverse
- § Need to rationalise land and re-align employment allocations within the borough based on need.
- § Housing needs to be aligned geographically in terms of housing and employment and business opportunities.

- § Growth scenarios should be aspirational as well as reflect the different strategies.
- § Need to plan for success i.e. plan for economic growth.
- § Recognition that economic growth is dependent on issues and market forces outside of the county borough.
- § Two higher options (H and E) were the only ones that sought to retain (or gain) an element of the younger population.
- § Middle option provides for a degree of constraint, and therefore environmental mitigation.

This page is intentionally left blank

**LDP Developer Panel – Engagement Event
9th June 2014**

Attendees:

Mark Harris	- Home Builders Federation
Darren Parker	- RPS
Keith Warren	- Asbri Planning
Daniel Hodgekiss	- Persimmon Homes
Gareth Williams	- NLP
Christine Sullivan	- SLP
Zoe Abberly	- Barton Wilmore
Richard Price	- Barratt Homes

Facilitators:

Rhian Kyte, Victoria Morgan, Adeline Santos.

1) Welcome and Introductions

RK welcomed partners to the event and provided a short presentation to set the scene for the review of the LDP and where CCbC are in the review process.

2) Growth Options

VM gave a presentation to the group of the work undertaken to date in respect of the proposed Population and Household Growth Projections (attached).

Key observations from the Stakeholder group:

- § Fundamental to assess the household composition and size and its impact on future average household size – scenarios should consider longer term trends on average household size and also other possible changes in household membership.
- § There needs to be a labour forecast - projected employment and jobs growth and its impact on population levels.
 - All existing scenarios appear to be planning for an decline in economic activity.
- § WG highlight the need to increase house building across Wales, and the need for LPAs to ensure that they have a 5-year land supply.
- § The demand side of Household growth needs to be looked at independently from supply.
- § Flexibility required for deliverability.
- § Agreed that the WG projections in respect of fertility and mortality are acceptable.
- § Policies need to plan for growth – not managed decline.

- This needs to be set out clearly in Background Paper.
- § Caerphilly Basin is very attractive
 - Growth needs to be spread - infrastructure improvements will assist.
- § Need to factor in the Metro line , electrification and city regions in terms of potential impact on Migration patterns.
- § On face value, moderate growth is not favourable, however the group welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft background paper in due course.
- § Mismatch between population growth in the past and future projections (based on strategy of brownfield development).
- § Growth scenario 10,11,12 is required
- § Demand is not just about where developers want to build it's also about building where people want to live
- § Agreement on the methodology to be used to underpin the projections is critical. Whilst the group may not agree with the assumptions factored into the projections if the methodology is agreed then that will save considerable time in the future.

Way forward:

- § Compile a growth model based on an economic strategy that encourages growth.
- § Factor in reducing AHS to revert to past long-term trends and changes in household type.

There was a discussion concerning the need to address the issue of the 5,000 un-attributable people that appeared in CCBC between the 2001 and 2011 Census This has been an issue elsewhere and officers attention was drawn to South Worcestershire Examination Report, where a similar problem occurred.

The Group were thanked for their input and it was agreed that the Council would:

- 1) Test some alternative scenarios to reflect the comments made and assess what impact they would have on the projections;
- 2) Circulate the draft background paper to the group for comment;
- 3) Continue to work with the group with a view to obtaining agreement on the methodology to be used to underpin the projections.

**Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (First Review) up to 2031
Stakeholder Event 23 June 2014
Llancaiach Fawr**

Meeting Notes*Attendees:*

Candice Coombs	Welsh Government
Rebekah Stephens	Welsh Government
Cllr. J Criddle	Blackwood Town Council
Ryan Greaney	Brecon Beacons National Park Authority
Cllr. J Hughes	Rhymney Community Council
Caren Richards	Cardiff City Council
Matthew Sharp	Newport City Council
Rebekah Stephens	Welsh Government
Stephen Thomas	Torfaen County Borough Council
Matthew Todd-Jones	Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water
Justin Waite	Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council
Vic Warren	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales
Clive Williams	Aneurin Bevan Health Board
Cllr. D Williams	Rhymney Community Council
Jill Edge	Monmouthshire County Council

Facilitators from Strategic & Development Plans Team, Caerphilly**Welcome and Introductions**

Cllr James welcomed partners to the event and introduced the planning team (Rhian Kyte, Victoria Morgan, Kelly Collins, Ian Mullis and Timothy Norton).

Presentation: LDP First Review

The purpose of these sessions will be to obtain stakeholder input into the development of the alternative strategic options that will in turn inform the Preferred Strategy that will be subject of statutory public consultation in October 2014/November 2014.

The stakeholder feedback obtained through these mechanisms will serve to inform the Council of the appropriateness, or otherwise, of alternative spatial options and will help to determine the scale of future population and household growth that would result in the most sustainable future for Caerphilly County Borough up to 2031.

The Strategy that will be subject of consultation will be reported to Council in October 2014 (7.10.14).

The Call for candidate sites has taken place and submitted sites are in the process of being assessed. Approximately 170 sites have been received through this process.

Future Population and Household Growth up to 2031 – Facilitated Discussion

The groups discussed in depth how they would like to see Caerphilly County Borough grow and develop, and whether they would like to see the population decrease or to plan for growth.

The main outcomes from this facilitated discussions showed that all agreed that population increase can be positive, and that through growth there is the opportunity to create new housing that meets the needs for all. However, this should be balanced against providing opportunities for the young, and increasing their prospects so that they stay in the county borough. An increase in appropriate industry as well as infrastructure is key, as is balancing environmental factors against growth.

Overall, with regard to social, economic and environmental considerations, there needs to be a consistent approach between the LDP and other, complementary, strategies, particularly the Capital Region. In light of this, although growth in Caerphilly County Borough needs to be stimulated, the role of other LAs, particularly Cardiff, needs to be recognised. Therefore, ambition must be tempered by realism. Care must be taken to ensure that Caerphilly does not become regarded as an overspill for Cardiff.

Presentation on Facts and Figures: Future Population and Household Growth

A detailed presentation was given in respect of the assumptions that underpin population and household projections, in particular trends related to births, deaths and migration were outlined to aid the discussion.

Building on work undertaken with other stakeholders, 5 population & household growth scenarios were outlined as follows:

- Scenario 1 -Welsh Government Principal Projections
- Scenario 2 –Ten-Year Average Migration Projection
- Scenario 3 – Average Migration for SE Wales
- Scenario 4 – SE Wales migration - long term AHS decrease
- Scenario 5 – SE Wales migration - moderate AHS decrease

Facilitated discussion on Preferred Growth Scenarios

The issues raised by each group are outlined below:

Group 1

Future Population and Household Growth up to 2031

The point was made that the level of population and household growth to be planned for should be dependent on the level of economic growth that can be achieved. In other words, employment, rather than housing, should be the determining factor. What type of employment does the Council want to attract?

There is a need to look at additional scenarios when forecasting population growth, including jobs-led. The Council is undertaking a jobs-led scenario.

A key factor in planning for growth is what it will cost. Growth is beneficial if it aids in sustaining, rather than pressurising, facilities, particularly with regard to an ageing population. Housing affordability remains an issue – housing diversification is fine if affordability is addressed.

The question was asked whether growth in Caerphilly should be seen to satisfy its own ends or whether the strategy should be based on its role within the wider region. The view was given that Caerphilly needs to try and take advantage of Cardiff-based prosperity.

The Heads of the Valleys continues to experience economic decline. This is a key issue within the context of the County Borough that needs to be addressed. Improvements to the transport structure in the HOVRA may help. There could also be opportunities to maximise the HOVRA's potential as a tourist destination.

Viability and deliverability are key issues for an LDP. There can be a conflict between deliverability and aspiration – a balance needs to be realised.

Preferred Growth Scenario

The LDP should plan for issues and places, not numbers, although it is assumed that it shouldn't plan for decline. It is hard to look at the numbers without knowing what they mean.

Scenario 1 is not realistic or sensible.

Additional scenarios are necessary – a jobs-led one, and one factoring in the influence of Cardiff.

Why is the existing strategy not working? How does an ageing population fit in with the dwelling requirement? The Council could look at affordable housing requirements in each strategy area.

Scenarios 2 and 3 – is it realistic to assume that the economy will still be in recession over half of the plan period?

More analysis is needed on migration figures. The LHMA should be referred to in terms of determining those areas in greatest need.

Scenario 5 was generally felt by the group to be the most reasonable, within the context of the numbers presented.

Preferred Spatial Option

The group's thoughts regarding each option are as follows:

Option 1

Why repeat a strategy that hasn't worked up until now? The supply of brownfield sites has been largely exhausted, although there may be capacity for 300/400 units in Risca following the completion of the flood alleviation works.

Option 2

Focusing development on sites in the HOVRA would be undeliverable without significant public subsidy. Transport infrastructural improvements may help make the area more attractive to developers, but this in itself would rely on public money.

Option 3

Targeting development to the NCC and the creation of a Maesycwmmmer Bypass may help push development further north.

Option 4

Large-scale release of greenfield land in the SCC, and the development of a South Eastern Bypass, would be the most viable option from the perspective of developers but carries with it environmental concerns and would have no benefit to the HOVRA.

Option 5

Targeting development to the NCC and SCC could bring about development of a Maesycwmmmer Bypass and phase one of a South Eastern Bypass. Development in NCC could have benefits to the HOVRA.

The preferred order of options was:

- First – option 5;
- Second – option 3;
- Third – option 4;
- Fourth – option 1;

Group 2

Future population and household growth up to 2031

What time of place do we want to create?

- Economic growth & employment creation is key – economic growth strategy
- We need to provide somewhere to live – need to consider ageing population & relevant support
- Need to provide affordable housing – either adapt current stock or provide new builds. Caerphilly has a current Council Housing Stock that will be subject to an Investment Programme e.g. in HOVRA. However the need is in the south of the Borough.
- Ideally, more builds > price of new homes decreases.
- Want housing development in HOVRA to be diverse – however, viability and attracting developers is an issue. There is a line where developers won't go north.
- Incentives for house builders in the North (e.g. smaller % affordable housing threshold).

- However, we are trying hard to encourage developers to the North (i.e. Zero CIL Charge) – is this enough? We need WAG incentives and employment creation to attract workers/developers.
- Need to link HOVRA with a core road/links to the M4 - At the moment, accessibility is poor and public transport costs are high (for commuters).
- Regeneration of HOVRA will create opportunities for development.
- Need accessibility without harming the environment – environmental constraints have restricted land availability.
- Need office development & a job industry – these need to be close to the M4 (hence why HOVRA unattractive).
- Need to consider South Wales Metro and link it with the Valleys as well as Cardiff, Newport & Swansea – this will help attract a new worker population.
- Farming & food production needs to be considered.

Do we want to plan based on short or long-term trends and why?

- We need to base population growth projections on 2011 population (census) and 2008 migration figures.

What do short and long term trends in terms of household formation and size, past house-building rates, migration, housing need, and economic growth suggest?

- Inward migration is good as it adds to the economy
- CCBC has a lot of in-migration from the region but not a lot of immigration from outside Wales.

What are the implications for planning for an ageing, declining population? What impact will that have on the economy, social services, facilities (schools, libraries, leisure centres), town centres, public transport, etc.?

- Support needs such as residential/medical care
- Have specific housing requirements – we want to maintain people in their own environment (in terms of care).
- However, under-occupation of family homes is counter-productive
- We need to give residents options to move if they wish (e.g. 1-bed flats or sheltered accommodation) – this can add to the housing mix in the borough.
- However, CCBC doesn't have enough flats available apart from Government or Council owned.
- We have an ageing population with lower income and higher vacancy rates, which leaves a 'worklessness' population that is stuck in poverty.

What are the implications of planning for growth?

- Growth is necessary but it can't be continuous – it has to stop eventually.
- We need to keep our Greenfield land and encourage re-development of available brownfield.

Are we planning to attract economically active people into the area? If so what do we need to do to achieve this - where will they live/work? What facilities and services do they need?

- Employment creation – economic growth strategy

- However, it is difficult for youngsters/workers in HOVRA – we need to upskill the population across the Heads of the Valleys (including neighbouring authorities such as RCT).
- We need to sort out employment in the HOVRA to encourage worker spend.

Preferred growth scenario with reasons why – facilitated discussion

General Discussion

- Registered GP population hasn't grown by the projected amount since 1990s – is there another growth option based on this?
- There has been underestimation of population since Poll Tax introduced.
- Need to focus growth within the boundary but also be aware of the need for cross-boundary cooperation
- What age can 'working-age' be defined as nowadays – people are living longer?
- Concern that, even with an average of 450 homes/year, young people will still be unable to afford housing.
- Until we build over-average, we will still be looking at this issue in 10 years time – we should control development and ensure developers build within limited time periods (e.g. by way of planning conditions).
- We need to be building more housing than average, i.e. 530 homes needed to achieve affordable housing need – however, a plan for 20 years can't necessarily achieve this.
- CCBC is concentrating on upgrading the existing affordable housing stock so unable to build many new at present.
- We need growth that delivers affordable housing
- We need growth that delivers employment opportunities
- At what point will we be unable to accommodate new builds because of environmental constraints? – Restricting land in the south (e.g. Risca).
- We can't base economic growth on housing provision only.
- School rationalisation will release some brownfield sites but we are looking at Greenfield release.

Scenario 2

- Not spreading growth to valleys – instead house building will be concentrated in Cardiff.
- However, to achieve a 5-year land supply we need lower figures such as these.
- WAG commented that 5-year land supply requirement isn't necessarily all down to land allocation – there are other factors

Scenario 3

- Focus should be somewhere between 3&4 – we need to build more houses than we think.

Scenario 4

- Discussion with regards to 'average household size' not being a good enough basis for scenario 4
- CPRW thought this was over-provisional (although the previous LDP over-allocated) – this may be unachievable (e.g. 5 year housing supply).
- Over-providing may have a detrimental impact on services – unsustainable.

- It was noted that the statistics used were based on the LMHA survey and the development-industry fed into this.
- However, WAG commented that there is unattributed growth for 5,000 people that hasn't been factored into these population trends – RK to discuss further.
- One of the participants questioned whether scenario 4 was realistic for 2031 as a reversal of trends.
- WAG commented that we wouldn't want household projections are large as they are in 2031.
- Others favoured this option and commented that we need to take the 'mid-point' and take this forward as a 'best guess' option.
- Aneurin Bevan HB commented that we should use an average household size between 2 figures in order to get a range – however, existing figure for AHS was based on the survey results.

Preferred Option

- The majority preferred Option 4 or 5 – these would be key to promoting growth, delivering affordable housing & encouraging inward migration.
- It should be noted that CPRW disagreed/objected to this scenario as it is 'over-provisional' – preferred scenario 1 or 2.

Alternative spatial scenarios for growth

Advantages	Disadvantages	General Comments
Scenario 1		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most viable – the market is in the SCC • Developer's choice • Could be some ripple effect upwards towards NCC (evidence of this in past e.g. Ystrad Mynach Hospital & College – regeneration). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield allocation would prevent ripple effect across valleys region (not good for regeneration of HOVRA). • Lose sites to Cardiff as not enough suitable land for development (e.g. Greenfield land). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLA or VILL need to be factored in to development • We will eventually find developers if we dictate where to go (i.e. NCC and HOV) – although this will displease larger developers/be unattractive.
Scenario 2		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HOV regeneration (ripple effect upwards) • Encourage developers/new builds in HOVRA • Good for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavily reliant on public subsidy • Release of sites in HOV won't be able to facilitate infrastructure delivery if viability comes into play 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport is usually from 'Cardiff-upwards' – why not across the borough (NCC)? • Metro & upgrading

<p>environment – protect Greenfield in SCC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following existing discussed rail line • Growth & jobs • Preferred option IF we had the money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If no road built then strategy would fail – need to undertake feasibility study • Not deliverable – market (private housing) not attracted to HOVRA 	<p>existing lines will need to be factored in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should dictate where we/the community wants development and take charge – shouldn't be developer led • We need partnership with developers to work out a strategy • The purpose of a plan-led system is to gain control – however this is subject to deliverability/viability issues •
--	--	---

Scenario 3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constrain development in South • Pontllanfraith & Oakdale brownfield school sites could be development opportunities (brownfield) • Open up railway line from Nelson-Merthyr – this would make Nelson an attractive place to live • Crumlin station to be built = good accessibility/solve bottleneck issues • Bypass would help alleviate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliant on strategic site in Maesycwmmmer (for the bypass) • Strategic site owned by multiple landowners – difficulties in securing land • Developer would need to finance part of the bypass (release of the Greenfield land will help fund this) – will be an issue if there isn't enough developer money to fund the bypass • Greenfield loss 	
--	---	--

<p>bottleneck/traffic issues in Maesycwmmmer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good interim for the 2031 period before we consider other sites (e.g. HOVRA) as it will establish development and road infrastructure beforehand • CIL receipt can help fund bypass 		
<p>Scenario 4</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits (remove congestion from the centre) • Massive site by Train Station in Caerphilly – central, remove highly contaminated site, good accessibility • Bring disused Machen railway line back into use • CIL receipts – could generate revenue to be used for northern regeneration in the future • Balance between good sites (Greenfield) & difficult sites (remediation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict between 40% affordable threshold and CIL charge in SCC – needs consideration • Doesn't initially benefit HOVRA but could fund development through CIL receipts 	
<p>Scenario 5</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crumlin & Nelson railway lines opened 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building houses where people want to live 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a dispersal strategy across the NCC more

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equitable growth – win-win for most parties • Smaller releases of land in Caerphilly could encourage developers to move northwards (ripple effect) • Lower affordable housing threshold may encourage developers to go northwards 	<p>drives prices up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an affordable market in the south but this is lacking in the north 	<p>viable than releasing strategic site/s in the centre of the Borough?</p>
---	---	---

LDP FOCUS GROUP
Meeting 9.30am, 29th April 2014
Conference Room, Business & Technology Centre, Tredomen Park.

Notes of Meeting
Present

Councillors

Attendees:

Cllr Andrews	Leader
Cllr Carter	Chair of the Planning Committee
Cllr David	Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee
Cllr Havard	Sustainable Development Advisory Panel Representative
Cllr James	Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Planning & Sustainable Development
Cllr Mann	Leader of the Majority Opposition
Cllr R Passmore	Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning
Cllr D Poole	Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services
Cllr K Reynolds	Deputy Leader
Cllr J Taylor	Cabinet Member for A nominated member of the Majority Opposition

Apologies

Cllr G Jones	Cabinet Member for Housing (Deputy Leader)
Cllr D Rees	Nominated member representing the Independents
Cllr T Williams	Cabinet Member Highways, Transportation & Engineering

Officers

Attendees: P Cooke- Team Leader, Sustainable Development & Living Environment

P Elliott - Head of Regeneration & Planning
R Hartshorn- Head of Public Protection
C Jones - Head of Performance and Property

J Rogers - Principal Solicitor for Planning, Land and Highways
T Shaw - Head of Engineering Services
T Stephens - Development Manager, Planning

Apologies S Couzens - Head of Housing Services
L Jones - Acting Head of ICT and Customer Services
M Donovan - Assistant Director Our Schools Our Future
J Williams - Assistant Director Social Services

Facilitators: R Kyte – Team Leader, Strategic Planning
V Morgan – Principal Officer, Strategic Planning
K Collins - Principal Officer, Strategic Planning
A Santos – Senior Officer, Strategic Planning

1. Introduction

2. Apologies

Apologies given and noted above.

3. Notes of Meeting – 19th July 2013

Cllr Mann raised the issue over female representatives on the Focus Group.

Notes approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

4. Terms of Reference of the Group

Revised Terms of Reference formally approved.

5. Update on LDP First Review

An important feature of the development plan process is the emphasis on identifying and testing realistic strategy options to deliver the Vision and Objectives of the plan over the plan period.

As the Council already has an adopted LDP there will be a need to assess whether the existing Development Strategy for the county borough remains appropriate within the context of the revised plan period and also within the changing regional context.

In order to test the existing strategy against alternative scenarios a series of stakeholder meetings and events will be undertaken throughout the spring of 2014 in line with the Agreed Delivery Agreement (February 2014) as follows:

<u>29 April 2014</u>	<u>LDP Focus Group</u>
30 April 2014	PDM
9 May 2014	Event with Members of Standing Conference
12 May 2014	Stakeholder Event (Developer Workshop)
22 July 2014	Report to Council – Feedback on Stakeholder Event and Council Decision on Growth Options

The purpose of these sessions will be to obtain stakeholder input into the development of the alternative strategic options that will in turn inform the Preferred Strategy that will be subject of statutory public consultation in October 2014/November 2014.

The stakeholder feedback obtained through these mechanisms will serve to inform the Council of the appropriateness, or otherwise, of alternative spatial options and will help to determine the scale of future population and household growth that would result in the most sustainable future for Caerphilly County Borough up to 2031.

The Strategy that will be subject of consultation will be reported to Council in October 2014 (7.10.14).

The Call for candidate sites has taken place and submitted sites are in the process of being assessed. Approximately 170 sites have been received through this process.

6. **Future Population and Household Growth**

A detailed presentation was given in respect of the assumptions that underpin population and household projections, in particular trends related to births, deaths and mortality were outlined to aid the discussion.

In order to consider the impact of different assumptions of future population and household growth, nine separate scenarios have been considered as follows:

Scenario A : WG 2011 based Principal Projection

Scenario B - Ten-Year Average Migration Projection

Scenario C - Zero Net Migration Projection

Scenario D - Average Migration for SE Wales - 5 year average

Scenario E - Average Migration for SE Wales - 10 year average

Scenario F - Moderate Migration - 5 year average

Scenario G - Moderate Migration - 10 year average

Scenario H - Dwelling led - 10 year average completions

Scenario I - Dwelling led, continuation of adopted LDP housing requirement

Officers have considered each of the options in detail, and growth options A, B, E & H were highlighted to the Focus Group as the more realistic and robust options for consultation purposes as part of the pre-deposit public consultation stage. Consideration of these options will serve to inform the Preferred Strategy up to 2031 at the later stage of the review process.

There was a discussion concerning the use of the WG Principal Projection for planning purposes. The group were advised that the Principal Projection is the starting point for consideration and that using local evidence alternative scenarios are also acceptable subject to the availability of robust evidence. This approach has recently been reinforced by a advisory letter from WG.

The Group was split into two to discuss the options. The following Notes outline the discussion in each group:

Session 1: Population

Group 1

§ A broad discussion was had regarding in-migration, house prices, increasing longevity, transportation, improving the perception of

the borough and external factors including increased development along the M4 corridor and in particular the North of Cardiff.

§ It was noted that there is a need to retain a balance between the economically active & ageing population.

§ Discussion was had to the rationalisation of land and the need to re-align employment allocations within the borough based on need.

Group 2

§ Need to try to increase the younger profile of population.

§ Need to maintain population that is currently here, and to add industry.

§ Transport is key, as is electrification of railways.

§ County borough cannot be viewed as one – southern part of the borough needs to be dealt with differently to the north

Session 2: Preferred Growth Scenario

Group 1

§ The group identified the need to achieve modest growth in order to retain the balance between the economically active & ageing population

§ The modest growth scenario was felt to best achieve the corporate objectives of the Council in terms of the delivery of services (Education / Schools / Social Services etc)

§ The Group concluded that growth is good and that planning for decline is unacceptable

Group 2

§ Need to make it an attractive place to live – especially noting our proximity to Cardiff.

§ Attract small industry – get entrepreneurs to locate and invest here.

§ Cardiff is a key link

§ Housing growth can only be sustained through transport improvements.

§ Poor opportunity for residents – need to reverse this.

§ Need to build housing that people can afford.

§ Flat based apartments required for young that are affordable – however the price between house and flats are similar.

§ Need to provide a wide range of housing that would be flexible and grow/contract

§ CCB can't be seen in isolation.

Session 3: Spatial Options discussions

A functional analysis has been undertaken of the county borough as part of the work on the review and it is considered that the existing broad strategy areas remain valid.

Five potential spatial options should be tested for consideration at pre-deposit public consultation stage. Consideration of these options will in turn serve to inform the revised Preferred Strategy up to 2031 at the later stage of the review process.

The various alternative spatial options provide clearly different spatial development scenarios in respect of future new housing and employment development; each of which will have different environmental, social and economic outcomes for Caerphilly County Borough up to 2031.

Many of the component parts of the spatial options will be common to each of the strategies, specifically the future direction for the Principal Towns and Local Centers, the need for the school rationalisation process to be reflected and the need to ensure that the strategic infrastructure to support any new development is fit for purpose.

In particular all options will need to consider the Council's need for improvements to the strategic transportation infrastructure, in particular:

- opportunities to maximise the use of public transport to improve connectivity throughout the county borough;
- opportunities for the reopening of rail lines, specifically: the Caerphilly Machen / Newport rail line; and a passenger service on the Cwmbargoed line to Dowlais;
- provision of new stations, in particular at Crumlin;
- an increased provision of Park & Ride where practicable;

In terms of the Strategic Highway infrastructure there is a need to consider the need or otherwise for:

- a strategic highway corridor for the Upper Rhymney Valley to link New Tredegar and Pontlottyn;
- a Maesycwmmmer Bypass; and for
- a SE Bypass for Caerphilly.

RK outlined are the key components for each of the Spatial Options that serve to highlight the different approach to development across the county borough. The five options considered were:

- **Spatial Option1: Continuation of the Adopted LDP Preferred Strategy**
- **Spatial Option 2: Targeting Growth to the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area and the Northern Connections Corridor**
- **Spatial Option 3: Targeting Growth to the Northern Connections Corridor**
- **Spatial Option 4: Targeting Growth to the Southern Connections Corridor**

- Spatial Option 5: Targeting Growth to the Northern and Southern Connection Corridors

The Group were then asked to consider each option and identify one component for each strategy that they strongly supported and one that they strongly opposed. The table below indicates the views of the two groups:

Spatial Option 1- Continuation of the Adopted LDP Preferred Strategy.

	Group 1	Group 2
Components Support	Generally supported all components, in particular components 4 & 6	All key components
Components Oppose	It was noted that whilst component 3 is supported (Development opportunities in HOVRA), this is difficult to deliver	<i>Viability of schemes</i>

Spatial Option 2 - Targeting growth to the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area.

	Group 1	Group 2
Components Support	The group strongly supported component 3, public sector intervention required to deliver the necessary infrastructure. This was seen as integral to the success of the HOVRA	All key components
Components Oppose	There were no specific components that were opposed	<i>Viability of schemes</i>

Spatial Option 3 - Targeting Growth to the NCC

	Group 1	Group 2
Components Support	Component 5, Maesycwmmer Bypass was strongly supported and was seen as a vital infrastructure link. Component 7, the reallocation of suitable surplus employment land	Partial support of 5 – improvements to infrastructure required.

	was also supported	
Components Oppose	There were no specific components that were opposed	11- Release of some Greenfield sites & Agricultural lands. 7 - Loss of all integral and available employment sites.

Spatial Option 4 -Targeting growth to the SCC

	Group 1	Group 2
Components Support	The Group were generally in support of targeting development to reflect the role & function of individual settlements	5 – improving rail network to facilitate opening of Caerphilly – Machen – Newport rail line 7 – supporting Caerphilly Castle & tourism opportunities.
Components Oppose	The Group felt that targeting substantial development solely to the SCC was not balanced and was tailored to developers and not the community within the County Borough. They felt that this option signalled that we are giving up hope on attracting development to the NCC & HOVRA.	9 – this would impact the SCC severely 4 – would need to be done sensitively, if at all.

Spatial Option 5- Targeting growth to the NCC and SCC

	Group 1	Group 2
Components Support	Component 2, targeting development to both the NCC & SCC was perceived as a more balanced approach to development Component 4, improving the strategic highway infrastructure was also supported but there was more of a bias towards the Maesycwmmmer bypass as this was perceived as a more strategic objective	Improvements to infrastructure.

	with the potential to also improve connectivity to the HOVRA.	
Components Oppose	There were no specific components that were opposed	There were no specific components that were opposed

Overarching themes

- Infrastructure is required against all spatial options to improve resilience. Relief Road in HOVRA estimated to be approx £50 million.

On balance, what is the groups preference for the five options?

	Group 1	Group 2
Spatial Option 1: Continuation of the Adopted LDP Preferred Strategy.		
Spatial Option 2: Targeting growth to the Heads of the Valleys Regeneration Area.	This would be a desirable option – however not viable and unrealistic without significant public subsidy / Regeneration / European funding	This would be the desirable option – however not viable.
Spatial Option 3: Targeting Growth to the NCC		
Spatial Option 4: Targeting growth to the SCC		
Spatial Option 5: Targeting growth to the NCC and SCC	This appeared to be the most preferable option with a bias towards the Maesycwmmmer bypasss	This is the most desirable spatial option, with modifications to include those aspects highlighted in the ‘support’ fields above for other Spatial Options.

The group were thanked for their input.

Meeting closed 12.30.

Frequently Asked Questions

Question 1: Why do we need to develop any more new houses in Caerphilly County Borough?

- 1) The Population is expected to increase up to 2031 and therefore more houses will be required.
- 2) There is an existing shortage of affordable housing within the county borough to meet existing housing need. This has to be addressed, particularly in the south where house prices make it difficult for people to meet their basic housing need. (Latest figures indicate an existing shortfall of 530 affordable homes per annum - 2011).
- 3) The need for more affordable homes will increase over the plan period if new homes are not delivered.
- 4) There is a need to diversify the housing stock so that there is a wider range and choice of housing and housing tenures available to meet the needs of different sections of our community, in particularly the elderly, first time buyers, single person households.
- 5) The diversification of the housing stock will encourage younger and more affluent members of the population to remain in the county borough and will also attract people into the area.
- 6) For every £1 of spending on housing construction it is estimated that £2.60 gross output will be generated across the economy as a whole¹
- 7) There are long-term positive benefits in terms of health and related economic outcomes from ensuring that decent quality homes are provided for all irrespective of income.¹
- 8) Even if the number of people in the county borough stayed the same, we would need more houses.

Question 2: Why do you think we would need more houses for the same number of people in the future?

- 9) We would need to build more housing for the same number of people because we know that:
 - a. Households are getting smaller – albeit at a slower rate than anticipated. So the same amount of people form more households and therefore need more houses.
 - b. The type of household is changing – e.g 1 person households are expected to increase by 19.5% over the plan period.

¹ The Role of Housing in the Economy : A Final Report by Regeneris Consulting and Oxford Economics 2010

- c. We have an existing housing need for additional affordable housing

Question 3: Why are households changing?

- 10) 1 person households are expected to increase by 19.5% over the plan period as people live longer or choose to live alone;
- 11) Lone parent households (1 adult, 1 child) are expected to increase significantly over the plan period as the marriages break down and single people have children;
- 12) Larger households - 5+ person (1 adult, 4+ children), 5+ person (no children), 4 person (no children) are expected to increase significantly over the plan period.
- 13) Some of the larger households are likely to indicate concealed households as:
 - a. First Time Buyers are forced out of the housing market due to issues of affordability;
 - b. More students stay at home to study, instead of moving away (tuition fees);
 - c. Elderly relatives living with children as a consequence of ill health or lack of appropriate housing to accommodate their needs. Why are household sizes getting smaller and changing?

Question 4: Do you know roughly what the Average Household Size (AHS) is in Caerphilly?

- 14) In 2008, AHS was 2.31 and this was projected to drop to 2.03 by 2025?
- 15) The 2011 household based projections indicate that in 2011 Caerphilly AHS was 2.39 in 2011 and expected to decrease to 2.27 by 2031.
- 16) The Adopted LDP assumed an AHS of 2.2 over the plan period, significantly lower than that projected for 2031.

Question 5: Why do you think the local planning authority needs to have regard to Average Household Size and how it is likely to change?

- 17) AHS impacts directly on the number of houses that are needed over the plan period.
- 18) Different size households, require different size homes.
- 19) Different types of household, need different types of housing i.e. students, elderly, lone parents, young couples, families with children all have differing needs and aspirations.
- 20) The more the AHS declines, the more housing is required for the same number of people.

Question 6: Other than AHS what do you think are the other main factors that influence population change and thus housing need?

- 21) Natural change - the difference between deaths and births
- 22) Net migration - the difference between those moving in and those moving out of an area

Question 7: Which of these do you think planning can influence?

- 23) For planning purposes there is a fundamental difference between these two factors, in that:
 - a. natural change is largely uninfluenced by actions of the planning authority;
 - b. whereas migration can be directly affected, for example by the provision of additional land for housing.

Question 8: Who do you think decides how much growth we should take over the plan period?

- 24) It is a policy decision for the Council to determine, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, i.e. residents, development industry, utility providers, other public bodies etc the level of growth that should be provided for over the plan period
- 25) The starting point when considering housing provision should be the latest Welsh Government projections which are the 2011-based projections
- 26) The Local Planning Authority is then required to consider if they are appropriate using all available evidence, such as alternative longer term trends, desirable levels of migration, household formation and size, past housebuilding rates, housing need, economic growth.
- 27) The level of growth proposed will be the subject of full statutory public consultation and is open to challenge and scrutiny through a formal examination process.

Other Considerations

Before we consider what level of growth the county borough should seek to accommodate up to 2031, we need to consider how we see the county borough in 2031.

- 28) Our Vision for Caerphilly is therefore extremely important. What type of place do we want to create?
- 29) Who do we want to live here?
- 30) Do we want to plan based on short or long term trends and why?
- 31) What are the implications of planning based on short term trends?
- 32) What are the implications of planning based on long term trends?
- 33) What do short and long term trends in terms of household formation and size, past housebuilding rates, migration, housing need, and economic growth suggest?
- 34) Ultimately each different set of assumptions factored into a projection will result in a different population and household growth scenario
- 35) Are we planning for a declining, ageing population or something else?
- 36) What are the implications for planning for an ageing, declining population? What impact will that have on the economy, social services, facilities (schools, libraries, leisure centres), town centres, public transport, etc.?
- 37) What are the implications of planning for growth?
- 38) What are the implications of different levels of growth – low, moderate, high?
- 39) Are we planning to attract economically active people into the area? If so what do we need to do to achieve this - where will they live/work? What facilities and services do they need?

- 40) How does our growth strategy fit with our neighbouring local authority strategies and aspirations?
- 41) What do we need to do to deliver the preferred growth option: who, when how?
- 42) What is the environmental capacity of the county borough, can it accommodate further growth?
- 43) Can the infrastructure of the area support further growth , if not what do we need to do to accommodate it?
- 44) The Council in its consideration of these matters needs to ensure that the evidence to support its preferred option is robust and can withstand public scrutiny and challenge.



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

SUBJECT: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2014

REPORT BY: ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 For members to consider the findings and recommendations of the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan 2014 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
- 1.2 To recommend that the 2014 Annual Monitoring Report be approved by Cabinet and thereafter Council.
- 1.3 To recommend to Cabinet and thereafter Council that the 2014 Annual Monitoring Report be submitted to the Welsh Government (WG) in order to satisfy the Council's statutory requirements.
- 1.4 Glossary of terms used in this Report

LDP	Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2021 (Adopted November 2010)
2014 AMR	Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan 2014 Annual Monitoring Report
WG	Welsh Government
SEA/SA	Strategic Environmental Assessment /Sustainability Appraisal

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 It is a statutory requirement that the Council submits an Annual Monitoring Report to the Welsh Government that monitors whether or not the LDP is being implemented successfully. The overall purpose of the AMR is to identify whether the LDP Strategy, or any the Strategy Policies are not being implemented and if they are not identify steps to rectify this.
- 2.2 This is the third AMR to be prepared for Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (LDP) and it monitors the period from 1st April 2013 to 31st March 2014. The Council is required to submit the 2014 AMR to WG by the 31st October 2014.
- 2.3 Monitoring of the plan for 2013/14 indicates that no new Strategy Policies have been triggered. No intervention is necessary at this time, as all policies will be reassessed as an integral part of the LDP Review
- 2.4 The 2014 AMR also includes the results of the SEA/SA monitoring, which is required by the SEA Directive and national guidance. The SEA/SA monitoring found an overall positive change in the state of the environment, meaning that the environmental position has improved slightly

since the adoption of the LDP in 2010.

- 2.5 The 2014 AMR is also required to include information relating to 12 mandatory indicators, which are specified by Welsh Government. These indicators are included in Appendix 5 of the 2014 AMR.
- 2.6 An overview of the LDP Monitoring Data for the 2014 AMR provides an interesting insight into the implementation of the LDP over the monitoring period. Of particular note for 2013/14 is the following:
- The annual house-building rate decreased slightly over the period from 390 to 344 dwellings in the previous year.
 - The housing land supply figure decreased from 3.5 to 2.9 years using the Welsh Government preferred residual method.
 - The average house price fell from £97,272 to £94,272.
 - Unemployment fell from 9% to 8.4%.
 - The number of residents in employment increased from 73,700 to 78,700.
 - There was a general drop in commuting rates as a percentage of all commuting both in terms of out commuting for work, but a slight rise in out commuting generally from 45.9% to 50%.
 - Vacancy rates in the Principal Towns of Caerphilly and Risca/Pontymister decreased over the period whereas vacancy rates in, Blackwood, Bargoed increased. Vacancy rates in Ystrad Mynach remained the same.
 - Footfall in the Principal Town Centres declined by 19.48%, a significant increase from the previous years figure of 7.38%
 - The number of schools over subscribed in terms of the school rolls increased from 4 to 5.
 - The use of aggregates within the construction industry continued to fall.
 - The amount of new development on brownfield sites increased.
- 2.7 The 2014 AMR concludes that substantial progress has been made in implementing the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2021 and that the Development Strategy is being extremely effective.
- 2.8 It is important to note that the 2013 AMR triggered the first review of the LDP in October 2013 as a consequence of its findings. These issues remain the same for the 2014 AMR. Consequently the 2014 AMR recommends that the First Review of the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan continues to be progressed in line with the Welsh Government and Council Agreed Delivery Agreement (13 February 2014).

3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 The Council has a statutory duty to prepare and review a Local Development Plan for its area to provide the policy framework for the development and use of land within the County Borough. On 23 November 2010, the Council formally adopted the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2021(LDP) and has since been monitoring the progress of the plan through its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
- 3.2 The submission of the 2014 AMR to Welsh Government is a statutory procedure associated with the Adopted LDP. The LDP has, through its preparation, incorporated the Council's land use objectives and the AMR monitors whether the LDP, and therefore the Council's Land Use Objectives, are being successfully implemented.

4. THE REPORT

Background

4.1 The Council formally adopted the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan (LDP) on the 23 November 2010. Following the adoption of its LDP, the Council has a statutory obligation, under section 61 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to keep all matters under review that are expected to affect the development of its area. Further, section 76 of the Act requires the Council to produce information on these matters in the form of an Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Welsh Government. The 2014 AMR monitors the period from 1st April 2013 to 31st March 2014 and it is required to be submitted to WG by the 31 October 2014.

4.2 Whilst the LDP was adopted in November 2010 and runs up to 2021, the base date of the plan is 2006. There have been many changes that will impact on the successful implementation of the LDP since this date, the most notable of which are:

- The downturn in the global economy, which has impacted on the commercial and housing property markets;
- The identification and availability of sites for development within the region through the preparation of local development plans, most notably Cardiff City and Newport City given their proximity to the Southern Connections Corridor;

4.3 Given the changes in the Welsh Economy and the changes in the regional context, the 2014 AMR once again considers whether the Development Strategy that underpins the LDP remains valid; and will assess whether or not the Strategy Policies contained in the LDP are being effective in delivering the Development Strategy and meeting the objectives of the plan until such time as the LDP is formally reviewed.

4.4 It is important to note that the 2013 AMR triggered the first review of the LDP in October 2013 as a consequence of its findings. The issues highlighted within the 2013 AMR that triggered the first review of the LDP remain the same for the 2014 AMR.

4.5 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005 and the LDP Manual (available on the Welsh Government web site) specify what the 2014 AMR is required to include as follows:

- An Executive Summary
- Review of changes to national and regional policy and guidance and their implications for the LDP.
- SEA/SA Monitoring based on the SEA/SA Monitoring Framework (LDP Appendix 18).
- LDP Monitoring based on the LDP Monitoring Framework (LDP Appendix 19).
- Statutory Indicators.
- Recommendations on the course of action in respect of policies and the LDP as a whole.

In addition to the above the 2014 AMR also considers external influences which impact on the implementation of the LDP but which are very much outside of the Council's control. Nevertheless the Council should consider whether or not a change in its policy framework could serve to alleviate some of the issue raised by these external factors.

4.6 Copies of the full 2014 AMR entitled "Caerphilly County Borough LDP Third Annual Monitoring Report 2014" together with the background statistical tables have been placed in the resource library for members' information.

Report of Findings

External Influences

4.7 The 2014 AMR considers the external factors that have had, or could have, an influence on the implementation of the plan and thus on development in the County Borough. These include changes in:

- National policy or legislation;
- External conditions;
- Local Considerations

National policy and Legislation

4.8 The 2014 AMR is required to identify documents, at national and regional level, that may have implications for the policies in the LDP and to assess them to identify their implications. Welsh Government has published the following key policy and guidance documents between 1st April 2013 and 31st March 2014:

- Planning Policy Wales, Edition 6, February 2014
- Technical Advice Note (TAN) 21: Waste, 2014
- Technical Advice Note (TAN) 23: Economic Development, 2014

4.9 The changes in national policy and guidance have not resulted in any significant changes that need to be addressed in the short term.

External Conditions

4.10 The downturn in the economy continues to have a marked effect on house building rates and therefore on the delivery of affordable housing. Viability continues to be an issue in overall house building and this has an adverse impact on the levels of affordable housing that can be delivered through the planning system

4.11 If recommendations regarding the introduction of a regional planning tier are taken forward in the Planning White Paper, some matters such as housing numbers, transport infrastructure and the location of strategic employment sites will be determined regionally in the future.

4.12 All neighbouring local planning authorities are well advanced with the preparation of their respective development plans providing a local policy framework for development decisions within the region

4.13 The Cardiff LDP identifies land for the provision of 41,000 dwellings, including 18,000 on greenfield sites in north Cardiff; and Newport LDP allocates 10,350 dwellings, 1,540 of which are in the east of Newport on the boundary with Risca / Pontymister. This provision could undermine the development strategy for the Southern Connections Corridor, which advocates new development on brownfield land

Local Considerations

4.14 The 2013 AMR (2012-13) recommended that an early review be instigated in light of the following significant local considerations. Specifically:

- The lack of a five-year housing land supply is a matter of concern that needs to be addressed, as the evidence available indicates that it is unlikely that this position will improve in the next few years; and
- The need to identify suitable sites for new schools as a consequence of the Council's ambitious school rationalisation programme.

4.15 The LDP is currently under review with an anticipated adoption date of October 2017.

Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal Monitoring

4.16 The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive requires local authorities to undertake

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as part of the preparation of the LDP. In addition to this the LDP Regulations requires a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to be undertaken. In preparing the LDP the council undertook joint SEA and SA and produced and published its SEA/SA Report in conjunction with the LDP.

- 4.17 The SEA Directive also requires that the council monitor the state of the environment through monitoring the sustainability objectives set out in the SEA/SA Report. This forms an integral part of the AMR and is contained in Section 4.

LDP Policy Monitoring

- 4.18 The LDP Monitoring considers each of the 22 Strategy Policies against the LDP monitoring Framework to identify whether the policies are being effective and to identify any policies that are not being implemented. The Framework consists of 29 Indicators (overarching measures considered against time related targets) and 53 Factors (specific measures considered against a fixed Trigger Point). Both the Indicators and Factors are statistical measures relating to the delivery of a specific Strategy Policy and consideration of the Indicators and Factors will indicate whether the Policies are being implemented. Where an indicator does not meet a target, or a factor reaches a trigger point, it could indicate that the policy is not being implemented.

- 4.19 An overview of the LDP Monitoring Data for the 2014 AMR period provides an interesting insight into the implementation of the LDP over the past 12 months. Of particular note for 2013/14 is the following:

- The annual house-building rate decreased slightly over the period from 390 to 344 dwellings in the previous year.
- The housing land supply figure decreased from 3.5 to 2.9 years using the Welsh Government preferred residual method.
- The average house price fell from £97,272 to £94,272.
- Unemployment fell from 9% to 8.4%.
- The number of residents in employment increased from 73,700 to 78,700.
- There was a general drop in commuting rates as a percentage of all commuting both in terms of out commuting for work, but a slight rise in out commuting generally from 45.9% to 50%.
- Vacancy rates in the Principal Towns of Caerphilly and Risca/Pontymister decreased over the period whereas vacancy rates in, Blackwood, Bargoed increased. Vacancy rates in Ystrad Mynach remained the same.
- Footfall in the Principal Town Centres declined by 12.1%
- The number of schools over subscribed in terms of the school rolls increased from 4 to 5.
- The use of aggregates within the construction industry continued to fall.
- There was an increase in customer satisfaction with the countryside recreation on offer in the county borough.

- 4.20 Section 5 of the 2014 AMR provides a detailed analysis of the success of the plan to date against the monitoring indicators and factors in terms of delivering sustainable development. The findings are summarised in the Table below:

LDP Monitoring Summary Table

Strategy Policy	
SP1, SP2, SP3, SP4, SP5, SP6, SP7, SP8, SP9, SP10, SP11, SP12, SP17, SP18, SP19, SP20, SP21	Policy is being met or exceeded. No intervention required.
SP10, SP16, SP22	Policy is not delivering as anticipated but is delivering sufficiently and does not require intervention measures.
SP13, SP14, SP15	Policy is failing to deliver as anticipated and intervention measures should be considered.

- 4.21 Monitoring of the plan for 2013/14 indicates that no new Strategy Policies have been triggered. No further intervention is necessary at this time, as all policies will be reassessed as an integral part of the LDP Review.
- 4.22 Given the importance of housing delivery to the strategy there is a need to consider the following key policies as part of the 2014 AMR.
- SP14 Total Housing Requirements
 - SP15 Affordable Housing Target
- 4.23 The 2012/13 JHLAS indicates that the housing land supply has fallen to 2.9 years using the residual method. Where the land supply is less than 5 years, TAN 1 states that local authorities must take steps to increase the supply of housing land. This may include reviewing the development plan, releasing land in its ownership, expediting planning applications or securing the provision of infrastructure for particular sites.
- 4.24 The review of the adopted LDP has begun and this will look in-depth at the identification of additional development land to satisfy the 5-year land supply requirements of TAN1. However in the intervening period there could be a need to release limited greenfield sites in the short term to address the supply issue.
- 4.25 Further the Council should seek to release housing land in its control to the market and should ensure that planning applications are expedited as far as is practical to make land readily available for development.
- 4.26 No further intervention is necessary at this time, as all policies will be reassessed as an integral part of the First Review of the LDP along with all other policies contained within the plan.

Statutory Indicators

- 4.27 The LDP Manual requires that the AMR include information relating to 12 specific indicators. The information in respect of these is already contained within the LDP and SEA/SA monitoring frameworks and has been taken into account through the monitoring process.
- 4.28 The LDP Regulations also require that the AMR sets out information in respect of housing delivery in the County Borough since the Adoption of the plan. In particular the Regulations require that the AMR includes:
- The housing land supply taken from the current Housing Land Availability Study; and
 - The number (if any) of net affordable and general market dwellings built in the LPA's area

Information must be provided for the period in respect of which the AMR is made; and the period since the LDP was first adopted or approved. This information is set out in the table below:

New Dwelling Completions Private /Affordable Split and Housing land Supply								
	2007 JHLAS	2008 JHLAS	2009 JHLAS	2010 JHLAS	2011 JHLAS	2012 JHLAS	2013 JHLAS	
	Apr 2006 - Mar 2007	Apr 2007 - Mar 2008	Apr 2008 - Mar 2009	Apr 2009 - Mar 2010	Apr 2010 - Mar 2011	Apr 2011 - Mar 2012	Apr 2012 - Mar 2013	Total
Private Sector	835	554	265	189	241	275	236	2595

H.A. Public	17	102	122	111	117	115	108	692
Total	852	656	387	300	358	390	344	3287
Land Supply (Residual method)	17.3*	22.5*	21.2*	14.2*	4.3	3.5	2.9	
Figures taken from Joint Housing Land Availability Studies <i>* Figures realised under the Caerphilly UDP (LDP Adopted November 2010)</i>								

- 4.29 Housing land availability information is monitored for the period April to end of March annually through the Joint Housing Land Availability Study (JHLAS).

AMR Conclusions & Recommendations

- 4.30 The AMR concludes that whilst the LDP Development Strategy remains sound, the downturn in the economy has had a marked effect on house building rates. Viability continues to be an issue in overall house building and this has an adverse impact on the levels of affordable housing being delivered through the planning system.
- 4.31 The lack of a five-year land supply is a matter of concern that needs to be addressed, as the evidence available indicates that it is unlikely that this position will improve in the next few years. There could be a need to release limited greenfield sites in the short term to address the supply issue. The first review of the LDP will further address the land supply issue through the allocation of sites that are capable of being delivered in viable parts of the county borough.
- 4.32 The 2014 AMR recommendations are therefore as follows:

Recommendations

- R1 The 2014 Annual Monitoring Plan has indicated that substantial progress has been made in implementing the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan up to 2021 and that the Development Strategy is being effective.
- R2 That limited greenfield release be considered on sites that are acceptable in planning terms in order to address the lack of a five year land supply in the short term.
- R3 That the First Review of the Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan continue to be progressed in line with the Welsh Government and Council Agreed Delivery Agreement (13 February 2014).

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no direct implications associated with this report. However any future review of policies and proposals contained within the LDP will require an equalities impact assessment to be carried out.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no new financial implications as a consequence of this report.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are no direct personnel implications as a result of this report.

8. CONSULTATIONS

- 8.1 All comments have been taken into account in the Committee Report.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 To consider and note the findings of the 2014 Annual Monitoring Report and the implications of the recommendations contained therein.
- 9.2 To recommend that the 2014 Annual Monitoring Report be referred to Cabinet and Council for consideration.
- 9.3 To recommend to Cabinet and thereafter Council that the 2014 Annual Monitoring Report be submitted to the Welsh Government before the deadline of 31 October 2014.

10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 To comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the LDP Wales Regulations 2005 and the SEA Directive.
- 10.2 To comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the LDP Wales Regulations 2005 and the SEA Directive.
- 10.3 To comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the LDP Wales Regulations 2005 and the SEA Directive

11. STATUTORY POWER

- 11.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to prepare and keep under review a Local Development Plan for the County Borough to act as a single framework for the control and use of land within its administrative boundary.
- 11.2 The Local Government Act 1998. The Local Government Act 2003. The Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) (Wales) Regulations 2005.

Author: Rhian Kyte, Team Leader, Strategic and Development Plans
kyter@caerphilly.gov.uk

Consultees: Cllr Ken James, Cabinet Member For Regeneration, Planning & Sustainable Development
Cllr Tudor Davies, Chairman, Regeneration & Environment Scrutiny Committee
Sandra Aspinall, Acting Deputy Chief Executive
Pauline Elliott, Head of Regeneration and Planning
Gail Williams, Interim Head of Legal Services/ Monitoring Officer
Mike Eedy, Finance Manager, Environmental Finance Group
Colin Jones, Head of Performance & Property

Background Papers:

Caerphilly County Borough LDP Annual Monitoring Report 2014

[made available in the resource library]

Caerphilly County Borough LDP Annual Monitoring Report 2014 – Background Tables

[made available in the resource library]

Report to Council 23rd November 2010



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

SUBJECT: VARIOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

REPORT BY: ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To update the Scrutiny Committee in relation to progress with a number of waste management issues.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 This report outlines a range of key issues that the Waste Strategy and Operations Service is responding to.

- 2.2 Some of these issues have the potential to affect front-line service delivery to the public. These issues include:-

- Welsh Government Consultation on the separate collection of dry recyclables
- Welsh Government Environment & Sustainability Committee investigation into recycling across Wales.
- Organic Waste Procurement (Interim & Long-term)

3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 The Community & Leisure Services Divisional Service Improvement Plan contains specific objectives to meet a range of statutory and non statutory targets. A number of these objectives contribute to the "Greener" theme within "Caerphilly delivers" the Local Service Board Single Integrated Plan.

4. THE REPORT

4.1 Welsh Government Consultation on the Separate Collection of Recyclables

- 4.1.1 Over the last 2-3 years there has been a debate across the UK in relation to the EU waste framework directive (WFD), its transposition into UK law and the effect on collection systems across UK local authorities.

- 4.1.2 The 2008 WFD requires member states to take measures to promote high quality recycling and where it is necessary and technically, environmentally & economically practicable (referred to as TEEP) should accomplish this by setting up separate collections for 4 waste

streams namely: paper, metals, plastic and glass.

- 4.1.3 Although the WFD has been in existence for a number of years, the methods of member states complying with its provisions have been the subject of much debate.
- 4.1.4 In 2011, DEFRA and WG published the Waste (England & Wales) Regulations but a judicial review was then launched against Central Government by the campaign for real recycling. Although the judicial review did not achieve what it set out to do, it resulted in an amendment to the Regulations (the Waste (England & Wales) amendment Regulations 2012).
- 4.1.5 To set the “problem” in context, 50% of Local Authorities across England & Wales operate some form of co-mingled collection for dry recyclables where 2 or more materials are typically co-collected then separated and treated at a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). The “co-mingling” authorities tend to be the highest performing in terms of recycling performance indicators.
- 4.1.6 In the Caerphilly context, a fully co-mingled collection system is operated using wheeled bins or boxes. This has been in operation since 2008/09, has resulted in continually high public satisfaction levels and Caerphilly consistently being one of the top performing Local Authorities in Wales.
- 4.1.7 As a result of the dilemma faced by the high performing Locals Authorities in England operating co-mingled collections, DEFRA has decided not to introduce statutory guidance on separate collections and to leave it to Local Authorities to decide whether the systems they operate are compliant with the regulations.
- 4.1.8 At a recent Waste WLGA/Cabinet Members/Environment Directors meeting with the (former) Environment Minister (Alun Davies), a very positive message was provided by the then Minister. In his introductory speech he outlined the need for collection systems to be easy to use, simple to understand and flexible enough to fit easily into the lives of the Welsh public. Cabinet Members from across Wales were encouraged by this as they thought it would allow for local decision making in delivering local services according to local need and would end the drive for prescription from the WG Environment Division.
- 4.1.9 In contrast, WG have developed draft statutory guidance and launched a consultation on 29th April 2014 (with a response deadline of 31st July 2014). Caerphilly has responded to this Consultation in a consistent format which was agreed with the other Welsh Authorities that collect waste using the same or similar system(s) to Caerphilly (A copy of Caerphilly’s response is attached as Appendix 1).
- 4.1.10 The 2011 Regulations (as amended) do not prohibit the use of co-mingled collections of the 4 waste materials from January 2015. However, they establish separate collection as the default position and set out the conditions under which waste collection authorities can deviate from that default position. However, the regulations set a “high bar” as part of the drive to achieve high quality recycling (the term quality means that the recyclate is similar in quality and quantity to that which can be achieved with good separate collection ie: very effective MRF separation would need to be in place).
- 4.1.11 The draft WG guidance aims to not only increase the quantity but also the quality of the 4 recyclable streams and the requirement for separate collection is subject to 2 tests:-
- (i) whether it is necessary to achieve high quality recycling and,
 - (ii) if it is technically, environmentally and economically practicable or “TEEP”. The guidance also stresses that there should not be a “one-off” application of these tests, but that the situation will have to be kept under review as conditions change.
- 4.1.12 In determining what is “necessary” Local Authorities will need to consider local conditions and look at what is achieved in comparable situations elsewhere in Wales and the rest of the UK.

4.1.13 In considering what is practicable, Local Authorities must think not only about whether achievement is possible by 2015 but also when change (if required) may become practicable – it is about what is feasible (not what is convenient).

4.1.14 Issues to be considered in determining what is TEEP include (but are not limited to):-

- Differences in capital and running costs between collection methods
- Property types and their effect on collection system practicality.
- Very dispersed communities
- Technical capability

However, the guidance makes it clear that “the definition of practicality does not allow for householder or business preferences about collection methods” – this statement totally contradicts the message delivered by the Minister at the recent Environment Directors and Cabinet Members meeting referred to in para. 4.1.8 above and is certainly contrary to any citizen centred service approach.

4.1.15 By January 2015 Local Authorities will need to consider how the duty and WG statutory guidance affects them. Where a Local Authority judges that it is not necessary or, if necessary it is not TEEP for separate collection to be introduced at that time, then it needs to document the judgement and its rationale/evidence base (taking account of each of the TEEP elements, etc.). Furthermore, the guidance stresses that the decision should be reviewed from time to time and action taken accordingly.

4.1.16 The WG appointed regulator will be Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and it will have the ability to issue either a compliance, stop or restoration notice to a waste collection authority that collects waste paper, glass, plastic or metal in contravention of the amended regulations.

4.1.17 Now that the WG Consultation period has ended, each Authority will need to undertake a written assessment and compile an evidence base to establish whether it thinks its current collection regime necessitates change (referred to as the “necessity” test) and if so what regime would be “TEEP” compliant.

4.1.18 This assessment and evidence base needs to be completed before January 2015 and will be quite a complex task if Caerphilly is to demonstrate that its cost effective, popular and very successful co-mingled collection system is to remain in place.

4.1.19 If Caerphilly is forced to change its recyclable collections back to a source segregated system, there are likely to be significant consequences in terms of performance against targets, public acceptability and satisfaction and not least cost.

4.2 **Welsh Government Environment & Sustainability Committee Inquiry into Recycling Across Wales**

4.2.1 At the same time as the consultation period outlined in section 4.1 above, the WG Environment & Sustainability Committee undertook an inquiry into recycling across Wales.

4.2.2 This inquiry involved the submission of written evidence by interested parties followed by 2 meetings of the committee where a selection of those stakeholders that submitted written evidence were invited to attend and answer questions posed by the Members of the Committee.

4.2.3 The Head of Community & Leisure Services submitted written evidence on behalf of the Authority and also attended the verbal evidence session to answer questions from Committee Members.

4.2.4 A copy of the written evidence is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

4.3 Long-Term Organic Waste Procurement

- 4.3.1 When the Authority introduced the collection of Food Waste in 2009 householders were provided with a caddy to collect and store their excess food although this fraction of waste was then co-collected on the same vehicle with the green waste. This collection method has served us well for the past 4 years as the materials (food and green co-mingled in the refuse collection vehicle) are subsequently treated at a local In Vessel Composting Facility (IVC).
- 4.3.2 IVC's are well suited to treating the materials co-mingled and as the facility is located within the borough it eliminates the need for Waste Transfer to a treatment facility outside of the County Borough. This method of treatment has also allowed us to utilise traditional Refuse Collection vehicles which maximises capacity whilst ensuring the vehicles are interchangeable with other collection vehicles in the fleet and this in turn has avoided the need for an additional collection round together with the associated additional costs.
- 4.3.3 The Authority has been working with Blaenau Gwent and Torfaen Councils (Heads of the Valleys Organics – HOV) in a Procurement Hub to procure a longer term contract (15 years) for the treatment of food and green waste. The treatment process preferred by the Welsh Government is Anaerobic Digestion (AD) of the food waste with this process being undertaken in sealed tanks to reduce emissions of odorous pollution to the atmosphere and produce electricity from the process which can be sold to the National Grid. The HOV procurement process has been part funded by the Welsh Government and as part of the funding package there will be a subsidy applied to the AD food treatment as this is considered to be the most environmentally effective solution for the treatment of this kind of waste.
- 4.3.4 The Heads of the Valleys (HoV) Organics Procurement commenced in 2008/09 and the project progressed to the Invitation to Submit Final Tenders (ISFT) stage with 2 bidders:-
- Shanks Waste Management
 - Viridor
- 4.3.5 In March 2014 Shanks Waste Management took a decision to withdraw from both the HoV and S. West Wales Organics Procurements. This has been followed by Viridor's official withdrawal with the result that the procurement has been terminated.
- 4.3.6 The procurement has been financially supported by WG and as stated above the anaerobic digestion solution (WG's preferred treatment technology for food waste) was planned to attract a WG gate fee subsidy.
- 4.3.7 The HoV Project Board has held meetings with senior WG staff and Local Partnerships (the WG transactors on all procurement projects) to examine the implications of the market withdrawal and options for the future.
- 4.3.8 These meetings have resulted in a joint scoping document being drafted which sets out the process for:-
- Identifying the options for securing and procuring replacement food waste recycling services.
 - Collecting the necessary information to appraise all options.
 - Approving options, including the assessment of risks, benefits, deliverability and potential for delivering value for money.
 - Identifying a preferred option(s), recognising that this may involve running one or more options in tandem.
 - Identifying the process for delivering the preferred option(s) and the actions required by each relevant party to make it happen and,

- Outlining a timetable for securing the preferred solutions as efficiently and expeditiously as possible.
- 4.3.9 The market for the treatment of municipal food waste via Anaerobic Digestion (AD) has changed significantly over the last 4-5 years due to other Welsh hubs delivering infrastructure and the market becoming more mature and competitive. In addition, there is a clearer steer from the market in relation to the required separation of food from green waste at the collection stage to achieve maximum benefit and competitive gate fees from anaerobic digestion facilities.
- 4.3.10 As a result of these market changes there is an opportunity to approach the market on a different basis to the Design, Build, Finance, Operate and Maintain approach previously employed.
- 4.3.11 WG are keen for the hub to continue to work together and on this basis will to continue their gate fee subsidy commitment and funding support for a new procurement process.
- 4.3.12 The meetings with WG and Local Partnerships have identified a number of options as follows:-
- (i) Securing spare capacity at existing or planned AD facilities currently being delivered for other Welsh hubs.
 - (ii) Securing spare capacity as a result of the expansion of the above facilities.
 - (iii) Secure merchant capacity at an existing facility, at a site(s) either within Wales or elsewhere.
 - (iv) Secure merchant capacity at a proposed facility, at a site(s) either within Wales or elsewhere.
 - (v) Identify and make available a suitably located site(s) in public ownership, offering it to the market with the benefit of outline planning consent having been secured.
 - (vi) Undertake a new Design, Build, Finance, Operate and Maintain procurement on a similar basis to that employed previously.
- 4.3.13 At the latest meeting between the HoV hub and Welsh Government it was concluded that a new procurement would commence this Autumn and that the maturity in the market was now capable of delivering any combination of the solutions outlined in 4.3.12, above. It was also agreed that all parties would aim to complete the procurement process within 12 months as the “traditional” competitive dialogue process would not be the procurement route.
- 4.3.14 In addition to the procurement process issues, Monmouthshire County Council have now formally asked to join the HoV hub which has been agreed at Project Board (officer) level but needs a Joint Committee decision before the new procurement process commences. The inclusion of Monmouthshire County Council will provide additional economies of scale and will further stimulate market interest in the hub procurement.
- 4.3.15 A further issue for the Authority to consider is the current collection regime where householder’s present food & garden waste separately for collection but it is then mixed in the collection vehicle and taken for in-vessel composting treatment.
- 4.3.16 As stated above in 4.3.9 above, the AD market is now such that separate food waste is required for AD treatment (green waste can then be treated by the less complex, cheaper windrow composting process).

4.3.17 Consequently, before any long term HoV contract commences, the Authority will need to change its organic waste collection fleet to keep food and green waste separate. In this regard, officers are currently working with WG staff in accordance with the Waste Collaborative Change Programme (CCP) with the aim of securing WG CCP capital funding to make this change to its collection fleet (which is estimated at £1.3m over 3 years to introduce split bodied refuse collection vehicles for food and green waste rounds). In the long term this will be a more cost effective option than paying the premium rates suggested by the market for dealing with co-mingled food and green waste i.e. future cost avoidance.

4.4 Interim Contract for Organic Waste Treatment

4.4.1 The Authority has to procure an interim organic waste contract to provide us with suitable security of treatment capacity from the expiry of the current contract (November 2014) to the commencement of any new HoV hub contract.

4.4.2 The existing contract (which expires in November 2014) is with Bryn Compost Ltd. Expressions of interest are currently being sought from contractors interested in tendering for a new interim organic waste contract.

4.4.3 This new contract will provide the Authority with sufficient flexibility (ie: a 2-4 year contract) to allow for the uncertainty in relation to the new HoV procurement and resultant service commencement date.

4.4.4 The new interim contract will be awarded before the existing contract expires in November 2014.

4.4.5 The interim and longer term contract procurements, do however, carry risks in terms of the Authority's lack of Waste transfer Station (WTS) capacity for organic waste in the event of contracted solutions being outside the County Borough. This matter has been the subject of separate discussions and the recent consideration of a report by the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet relating to the Dyffryn House site.

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no significant equalities implications associated with this report.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no financial implications associated with the report in its current form although there are obvious, potential financial implications that could arise from:-

- The need to change the dry recyclable collection regime (if required by WG)
- Organic waste procurements
- Change to organic waste collection fleet.

6.2 The financial implications of these elements would need to be the subject of specific consideration at the relevant time.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no personnel implication associated with this report.

8. CONSULTATIONS

8.1 The report reflects the views of the listed consultees.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 The Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the contents of the report.

10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 To ensure that the Authority is fully compliant with relevant waste management legislation and achieves value of money in service delivery.

11. STATUTORY POWER

11.1 Local Government Acts, Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Author: Mark S. Williams, Head of Community & Leisure Services
e-mail: willims@caerphilly.gov.uk tele: 01495 235070

Consultees: Sandra Aspinall, Acting Deputy Chief Executive
Tony White, Waste Strategy & Operations Manager
Hayley John, Principal Waste Management Officer
Councillor David Poole, Cabinet Member for Community & Leisure Services
Councillor Tudor Davies, Chair of Regeneration & Environment Scrutiny Committee
Councillor Liz Aldworth, Vice Chair of Regeneration & Environment Scrutiny Committee

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Caerphilly CBC response to Welsh Government Consultation on Separate Collection of Recyclables.

Appendix 2 Caerphilly CBC response to WG Environment & Sustainability Inquiry into Recycling

This page is intentionally left blank

Response by Caerphilly County Borough Council to Welsh Government Consultation on Draft Statutory Guidance on the Separate Collection of Waste Paper, Metal, Plastic and Glass

1. Caerphilly County Borough – Area, Characteristics & Recycling Performance

Wales has a diverse mix of Local Authorities in terms of their population, socio-economic conditions and land status. Caerphilly County Borough is a “Valleys” Authority characterised by densely populated settlements with a significant amount of terraced housing (often with very small or no garden space at all) interspersed with large areas of countryside. The Authority has developed a service that meets the needs of all stakeholders and is crucially achieving the key objective of continuous increases in the amount of materials recycled and diverted from landfill. In this regard, the Authority has tried a range of collection systems from kerbside sort through to the various comingled options. The present basket of collection services delivered by the Authority enables statutory recycling targets to be met and at the same time satisfies residents and other stakeholders.

Caerphilly County Borough Council, has, in recent years, been consistently in the top 5 performing Authorities in Wales in terms of recycling/composting and currently has a public satisfaction level of 95% for its recycling service.

2. Legal Aspects of the Guidance and the Welsh Government Application of the Directive

(i) Proportionality

The concept of proportionality requires that measures adopted by Member states do not exceed the limits of what is appropriate and necessary to achieve the legitimate objectives of the Directive in question. Furthermore, when there is a choice between several appropriate measures, it should be the least onerous measure that prevails and the disadvantages caused must not be disproportionate to the aims being pursued.

The Committee of Ministers to member states have produced a Code of Practice for Good Administration. This document outlines principles and rules which should be applied by Public Authorities (such as the Welsh Government) in order to achieve good administration. In particular, Article 5 (principals of proportionality) states that:

- Public Authorities shall impose measures affecting the rights or interests of private persons only where necessary and to the extent required to achieve the aim pursued.
- When exercising their discretion, Public Authorities shall maintain a proper balance between any adverse effects which their decision has on the rights or interests of private persons and the purpose they pursue. Any measures taken shall not be excessive.

The Welsh Government has maintained that the aim of separate collection is high-quality recycling. Caerphilly County Borough Council maintains that the introduction of a separate collection system is not necessary if the aim of high quality recycling can be achieved just as well with a form of co-mingled collection of dry recyclables followed by effective MRF separation – this would then be in line with Article II and the principles of the waste hierarchy. Caerphilly County Borough Council maintains that its current collection system is meeting EU goals and regards the radical change proposed by the draft WG guidance rather onerous when you consider the principle of proportionality. In addition to the relevant Code of Practice outlined above, the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union (TFEU) provisions also include the principle of proportionality. Caerphilly County Borough Council contends that the draft WG guidance is at odds with the principal of proportionality which flows through everything that the European Union aims to achieve.

(ii) The Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009

The Local Government (Wales) Measure (LGWM) 2009 provides that:-

- (i) A Welsh Improvement Authority must make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions.
- (ii) In discharging its continuous improvement duty, an Authority must have regard in particular to the need to improve the exercise of its functions in terms of:-
 - Strategic effectiveness, if it exercises its functions in a way which is reasonable, likely to lead to the achievements of, or assist in achieving, any of its strategic objectives.
 - Service Quality, if there is an improvement in the quality of its service.
 - Fairness if

Disadvantages faced by particular groups in accessing, or taking full advantage of services are reduced or

Social well-being is improved as a result of the provision of services or the way in which functions are otherwise exercised.

- Sustainability, if services are provided or functions are otherwise exercised in a way, which contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development in the Authority's area.
- Efficiency, if there is an improvement in the efficiency with which resources are used in the provision of services or in the way in which functions are otherwise exercised, and
- Innovation, if the way in which services are provided or functions are otherwise exercised is altered in a manner which is reasonably likely to lead to any outcome described above.

In addition, for the purposes of discharging the above duties and setting its future improvement objectives, an Authority must consult representatives who live, pay rates, use or are likely to use services and have an interest in the Authority's area. It is also important to note that sustainability is only one of the LGWM considerations and although there is an additional duty for WG to promote or improve the environmental well being of Wales in accordance with section 60 of the Government of Wales Act 2006, Caerphilly County Borough Council would argue that prescription over collection methods prevents compliance with the LGWM and may not achieve the aims of section 60 of the Government in Wales Act as it may alienate the public whose backing is essential if recycling services are to work effectively.

The draft WG guidance explicitly states that "the definition of practicability does not allow for householder or business preferences about collection methods" Caerphilly County Borough Council would argue that this is completely at odds with the LGWN and the whole concept of citizen centred services. Central prescription over collection methods and the underlying message in the draft guidance that citizen views do not matter is also completely at odds with recent Ministerial statements such as those provided by the Environment Minister in a recent interview with Materials Recycling Week (MRW) where the Minister stated that, when discussing waste collections,

"that's really a matter for local authorities and I would hesitate for a very, very long time before I started walking into town halls up and down Wales telling them how they manage their waste collections".

In addition, the Minister stated, in the same interview

"my approach is to emphasise simplicity and ease of working. I'm not obsessed with process, I'm not obsessed with delivering new fangled ways of working, I'm obsessed with what helps people to recycle".

As can be seen from the above text there is clear disconnect between the duties placed on the Council by the LGWM, the prescription over waste collection services and clear disregard for citizens in the draft guidance and the public messages being provided by the Minister. In conclusion, it is the Council's view that the WG prescription over recyclable service delivery is fettering the Council in complying with its LGWM duties and delivering services efficiently and effectively in accordance with the views of its electorate.

3. Economic Issues

As stated above, Caerphilly County Borough Council is delivering its recycling services in a way that is:-

- Popular with the electorate;
- Performing extremely well in terms of target achievement;
- And is benchmarked favourably in cost terms.

With this in mind, it is difficult to comprehend why the Welsh Government would wish to prescribe a service change. The Local Government Minister has recently told Local Authorities to prepare for a revenue support grant cut of up to 4.5% next year. In Caerphilly terms this would equate to circa £30 million and is likely to result in decimation of some services with resultant job losses. It is therefore beyond comprehension that the Welsh Government could produce guidance which suggests that an Authority like Caerphilly should replace a perfectly good recyclable collection service with a centrally prescribed alternative where the cost of change would not be insignificant.

Even if the cost of change was supported by Welsh Government funding it would still be viewed as a blatant waste of public money by citizens at a time when many other services and/or facilities that they currently enjoy are potentially ceasing or being drastically downsized.

4. Practical Issues

There is the potential for a very long debate over a number of practical aspects of recycling. A number of these debating points are outlined below:-

- (i) Definitions - There is confusion and contradiction prevailing in the waste industry in relation to definitions and "buzz" words such "up-cycling", "down-cycling", "closed – loop recycling", "high quality recycling", etc and how they impact on the waste hierarchy. In particular recycling is one of 3 available sub-categories of recovery

(preparing for re-use, recycling and other recovery) – Both recovery and recycling may use the same process but the end result provides the distinction between the 2 (i.e. reprocessing waste materials into products, materials or substances whether for the original or other purpose constitutes recycling). The phrase “high quality recycling” only occurs in one place in rWFD, paragraph 2 of Article II(1). However, it is not defined in the rWFD and for the remainder of the Articles the rWFD refers simply to “recycling”. This lack of definition and clarity over “high quality recycling” combined with the fact that Article 4(2) makes the waste hierarchy subservient to the “best overall environmental outcome” which means taking into account (amongst other things) technical feasibility, health, economic and social impacts leads the Council to believe that there are 2 crucial factors to be considered in delivery of its collection services - ie: are materials being recycled and citizen acceptability (which has economic, health and social impacts).

- (ii) End destinations – There is considerable debate amongst waste professionals over the use of end destinations data in determining what is the best system for collecting recyclables, particularly where there are examples of co-mingled collections out performing source segregated collections for certain material types (e.g.: plastics separated into different types at co-mingled MRF v mixed plastic sold from a source segregated collection). There is also evidence to suggest that the amount sent to closed – loop recycling by some co-mingled authorities is higher than some kerbside sort authorities.
- (iii) The Local Economy – There is often a disconnect between the quest for closed loop recycling v local economic development. There are live examples in S.E.Wales where the WG preference for closed loop paper recycling could result in paper being transported huge distances to mills in Kent or Deeside when there is a local loft insulation manufacture within the region. This consequently has local economic implications.

The purpose of highlighting the 3 items above, is to demonstrate that there are grey areas in terms of practicality and local circumstances and local decisions not central prescription are best placed to deal with these issues.

Conclusion

Caerphilly County Borough is an area in the heart of Industrial South Wales. It is heavily urbanised and has a significant amount of deprivation in its communities. The introduction of recycling was challenging, but gradually the Council has developed its services and reconfigured them to achieve the right balance of high level performance and citizen, workforce and end market user satisfaction. This has been no mean feat and has allowed the Council to reap the rewards of public engagement in recycling. Presently, the service is user friendly and delivered to all its residents in rural and urban areas. The comprehensive suite of services is more popular than ever before and is sustainable in terms of finance (with SWMG support) and frontline delivery.

Benchmarking clearly demonstrates the progress made in public recycling services. Indeed it is significant to note that Caerphilly continues to be the top performing “Valleys” Authority and moreover compares well with the other Welsh Authorities (being in the top 5 performers in recent years). Caerphilly has continued to achieve the progressive Welsh Government statutory targets whilst maintaining compliance with relevant Environmental and Health and Safety legislation. Being forced to reconfigure services at this juncture is likely to be a retrograde step and there is major concern that introducing a new collection regime will do irreparable damage to the recycling cause in terms of performance against targets. Moreover, it would be perceived by the electorate as a blatant waste of public money to change a service that is performing well and is extremely popular with its users (particularly at a time of unprecedented Local Government austerity).

The Council acknowledges that there is always room for improvement (particularly concentrating on targeting the minority of persistent non participants). However, the Authority is concerned, particularly given the genuine positive feedback from its residents, that any change in dynamic will have a detrimental effect on the service and in turn the reputation of the Council and Welsh Government as resource focussed and efficient organisations. Where central prescription prevails then the Welsh Government should provide assurance to Local Authorities that if their recycling performance reduces and they fail to achieve the statutory targets then there will be no fines levied.

It is also the Council’s contention that central prescription over collection methods disregards the Council’s wider duties set out in the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009. Furthermore, it ought not to be automatically assumed that the separate collection of waste promotes or improves the environmental well-being of Wales as set out in section 60 of the Government of Wales Act 2006. On the contrary, the restrictive and prescriptive enforcement of separate collection by Welsh Government may be acting contrary to this power and/or the intentions of section 60. Given the duties placed on them by the Local Government (Wales) measure to consult residents, etc the local agenda and social impact considerations should not be overridden by sustainability considerations. It is therefore crucial that the views of the residents of the County Borough on service delivery are taken into account and that central prescription must never take priority over the ability to make local service choices.

It is also worth noting that Caerphilly has recently come out top of the Welsh Government’s “National Survey of Wales” which further demonstrates the satisfaction with the citizen focused services delivered by the Council. Consequently, given all of the issues outlined in this consultation response, the Council is firmly of the opinion that Local Service choice (as long as it achieves the agreed outcomes ie: the WG recycling targets) should be allowed to prevail and that Local Authorities should not be constrained by central prescription over service delivery.

**RESPONSE FROM CAERPHILLY COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL (CCBC) ON
THE CONSULTATION ON THE ENQUIRY INTO RECYCLING IN WALES**

RECYCLING IN WALES/RECYCLING IN CAERPHILLY

**Explore Reasons for and Impacts of Variations in Local Authority
Household Waste Recycling Practice in Wales**

Wales has a diverse mix of Local Authorities in terms of their population, socio-economic conditions and land status. Caerphilly County Borough is a “Valleys” Authority characterised by densely populated settlements interspersed with large areas of countryside. The Authority has developed a service that meets the needs of all stakeholders and is crucially achieving the key objective of continuous increases in the amount of materials diverted from landfill.

**To what Extent Local Authorities’ Recycling Practice Aligns with the
Welsh Government’s Municipal Waste Sector Plan Collections Blueprint,
and to Explore Barriers and Enablers to Adherence**

CCBC has tried a range of systems from source segregation through to the various comingled options. CCBC is now at the stage where it operates a system that suits the needs of its locality. The present service enables the Authority to meet the statutory recycling targets and at the same time satisfies the majority of residents and other stakeholders.

**Assess the Availability of Information and Guidance to Householders
about why and how they should be Recycling, and to Explore Potential
Barriers and Enablers to Improving Recycling Rates**

Caerphilly has developed a robust and comprehensive communications campaign to ensure that all residents are provided with the information and guidance they need to participate in the range of collection services.

Explore Local Authority Reactions to the Recently Published Waste Regulations Route Map and the Potential Impacts and Implications of this on Recycling Practice Across Wales

Caerphilly has always configured its frontline collection services to tie in with the requirements of its end markets. Caerphilly continues to be alert to the dynamics of the waste industry and will endeavour to comply with the ever more stringent requirements where practical.

Gain Greater Understanding of the Relationship Between Recycling Collection Practice and Recycling Rates

CCBC acknowledges that each Welsh Local Authority has different operating conditions to suit their local demography and their proximity to local disposal routes – there is no ‘one size fits all.’ People of Caerphilly can recycle wherever they work, rest and play and the Authority has proved that its current collection methods are the most suitable for its stakeholders as evidenced by continuous increases in recycling, exceeding Welsh Government recycling targets, and continuous improvement in customer satisfaction and participation rates.

1.) Setting the Scene

In 1998 Caerphilly County Borough Council introduced recycling collection services for the public. This regime was implemented in selected pilot areas across the County Borough initially delivering to 14,000 properties. The system consisted of the use of green 55 litre boxes for the placement of separated household materials.

2.) Developing a recycling service

The collection vehicles used were compartmentalised allowing an army of operatives to separate out the range of household recyclables. This collection system operated on a fortnightly basis. This was a revolutionary new service and like many other Local Authorities Caerphilly experienced many challenges.

This new collection system proved to be very labour intensive, time consuming, compounded by safety and capacity issues and generally proved to be quite an inefficient collection system compared to established services like refuse collection. In addition, the service suffered from low levels of public participation, limited coverage across the County Borough and inadequate collection frequencies.

Due to all these problems the Authority received a constant stream of complaints regarding:

- The frequency of collections (fortnightly was not sufficient)
- Insufficient storage (the boxes were too small)
- Capacity issues
- Materials being contaminated

- Containment issues (recyclables were subject to the vagaries of the weather, scavenging animals and littering)
- Burden on the public to separate at source
- Traffic congestion as a result of longer loading times on the highway

At the same time the Authority introduced a garden waste collection service on a fortnightly basis. This proved a very popular addition to the suite of frontline public services. However, this was only a seasonal service (operating between April and September) and there was a clamour from residents to increase the frequency of collections.

3.) Listening to local voices and meeting the needs and aspirations of its customers

As part of the Authority's continuous improvement process, Caerphilly has listened to the views and concerns of residents, elected members and partners and to this end trialled new ways of working that have been fined-tuned and currently operate today. These include:

- Weekly dry recycling (comingled)
- Weekly Food and Garden collection all year round
- Household Waste Recycling Centres (open all year round including weekends)
- Recycling on The Go! (24-hour facilities in a range of public places).

In 2007 the Authority trialled a weekly kerbside collection with wheeled bins. This pilot resulted in an immediate and dramatic increase in the public participation rate

and the tonnage of recyclable materials collected. Significantly, the council also received a stream of positive feedback from residents participating in the new scheme/trial and there followed many requests for this system to be rolled out across the County Borough. This happened in 2009.

4.) Continuous improvement

Public Participation

Following the major change to the collection regime the recycling performance has continuously improved with more people being encouraged to do their bit. For example, participation rates have increased significantly and have continued to improve (see table below).

Year	Participation Rate
2007/08	49%
2008/09	57%
2009/10	66%
2010/11	70%
2011/12	75%
2012/13	78%

Recycling Tonnage

In line with the increase in public participation, the amount of recyclable material diverted from landfill has also increased proportionally.

Year	Tonnage (kerbside dry recycling)
2005/06	4,768
2006/07	6,236
2007/08	8,229
2008/09	9,621
2009/10 (weekly co-mingled wheel bin service introduced)	16,286
2010/11	17,635
2011/12	20,106
2012/13	22,283

Recycling Percentages

The percentage of waste recycled has also increased year on year. In 2012/13 the Authority was just 1% shy of achieving the Welsh Government's 2015/16 statutory recycling target of 58% by i.e. achievement some 3 years early.

Year	Recycling Percentage (%)	Welsh Government Target
2007/08	32%	25%
2008/09	32%	
2009/10	44%	40%
2010/11	51%	

2011/12	55%	
2012/13	57%	52%

Satisfaction Rates

The recycling collection systems are geared towards busy, modern-day lifestyles and this is reinforced by public satisfaction levels which increased following the service change and remain constantly high and increasing. Since 2007 public satisfaction with recycling services has increased progressively. This is evidenced by the feedback received from biennial public satisfaction surveys (see table below).

Year	Public Satisfaction
2007	84%
2009	88%
2011	94%
2013	95%

In addition, the feedback from the public during door knocking sessions and road show events is generally very positive and constructive reinforcing the above satisfaction data.

5.) Rewarding Professionalism & Excellence

The Waste Management team at Caerphilly are enthusiastic, citizen focussed professionals experienced in all aspects of the sector. These attributes have helped

them develop an exemplar service that stands up to scrutiny and compares favourably to any other local authorities across the Country. This is a bold statement but is evidenced by the recognition they have received recently from a number of respected organisations that have bestowed a number of awards upon the Authority for their high performance levels, communication work and innovative developments in resource efficiency and frontline public recycling.

Caerphilly CBC has attained the following awards:

- Apse Service Awards – Waste Management and Recycling Service Team of the Year 2012 & 2013
- Larac Awards – Best Improved Recycling Rates (Target Success) 2012
- Chartered Institution of Waste Management – Local Authority Waste Hierarchy champions 2013
- Plant and Waste Recycling Show (PAWRS) – Food Waste Award 2012 and Local Authority of the Year 2013
- Zero Waste Awards – Waste hierarchy and minimisation campaigns 2012, 2013 and 2014
- CA Site of the Year Award 2012 (Lets Recycle.com)

6.) Sharing with Others

Whilst awards are important particularly the feel good factor they can generate to residents and staff alike, it is worth noting that our peers including neighbouring Authorities and third sector bodies communicate with staff regularly to see how Caerphilly functions and the waste team are always willing to share

experiences and practices to help create a better environment for us all. This is reinforced by a number of events that have been arranged to promote good practice, for example bodies including WRAP, CIWM, WLGA and LARAC have hosted seminars here.

7.) Closing the Loop

In line with Welsh Government's ambitions Caerphilly CBC has sustainable development as a guiding principle to all that it does. To this end, its procurement process and general day-to-day working systems do as much as practicable to ensure that the Authority avoids waste and reuses materials etc as per the waste hierarchy as well as buying products with a high recycled content. For example, the Highways department use kerbs made of recycled plastic and have used recycled glass in a number of construction schemes. In addition, the Parks department use compost created from our own organic waste in their parks and open spaces.

8.) Constant changes of waste composition

The packaging industry is constantly looking at ways of refining the composition and structure of containers for environmental and financial gain. It is interesting to note that over the last 15 years container packaging has evolved considerably and there is now a propensity of plastic containers in place of glass bottles and jars in the waste composition. Plastic containers are likely to continue to be more popular with retailers and freight companies and with this in mind, it seems likely that the proportion of the heavier packaging materials (such as glass and

metal) in the waste stream will continue to diminish. Therefore, Caerphilly recognises that it needs to continue to monitor its waste/recycling stream to ensure that appropriate reprocessing points remain available.

9.) Communications

Integral to the operational elements of the service is the communication of user information and awareness messages. The Authority has relentlessly shaped and fined-tuned the information to customers to ensure that everyone is singing from the same song sheet and not compromising the progress achieved to date (see attached Appendix 4 and 5 public information leaflets). The Authority realises the importance of continuing to engage and retain the support and commitment of its service users.

To this end the communications team regularly issue bulletins in the local press, update the corporate website and social media, report on performance and topical issues affecting waste and resource management. Complimenting this media work, the Waste team run a regular programme of road show events and door knocking exercises to reinforce the cleaner greener corporate and national campaign messages.

10.) Financial Implications

Caerphilly has worked towards a kerbside recycling regime that is proven, robust, safe and efficient. This has involved major investment in vehicles, communication and training. The positive outcome of this is that Caerphilly is ranked as the 9th

lowest cost Authority in the country. More importantly, Caerphilly has been ranked 1st in Wales for the capture rates per household for kerbside recycling (WLGA Waste Finance Report 2012-2013).

Therefore, any future changes to recycling schemes will impact significantly on the Authority's precious finances at a time when budgets are extremely limited. New systems will require major investment in new vehicle and reprocessing technologies. This will be difficult and indeed could be impractical to implement.

It is acknowledged that the end points for recycle are subject to change and the market price for materials is constantly fluctuating. Moreover we are under no illusion that the waste sector is continuing to research, invest, develop and refine technologies to mechanically separate materials and make system improvements that will inevitably make the industry more sustainable and economically practical and make the sorting process less onerous and less complex for all.

11.) Conclusion

Caerphilly Council is an area in the heart of Industrial South Wales. It is heavily urbanised and has a significant amount of deprivation in its communities. The introduction of recycling was challenging, but gradually the Authority has developed its service and configured it to meet the needs of its residents, workforce and end market users.

This was no mean feat and allowed the Authority to reap the rewards of public engagement in recycling. Presently, the service is user friendly and delivers to all its residents in rural and urban areas and now lends itself to being sustainable in terms of finance and frontline operations. This comprehensive suite of services is more popular than ever before and crucially it is sustainable in terms of finance and frontline delivery. In short, the people of Caerphilly “can recycle wherever they work, rest and play,” as set out in the ‘Towards Zero Waste’ mission.

The national table below clearly demonstrates the progress made in public recycling services at Caerphilly. Indeed it is significant to note that Caerphilly continues to be the top performing Authority in the “Valleys” region and moreover compares very well to other Welsh local authorities. Caerphilly has continued to achieve the progressive Welsh Government statutory targets whilst maintaining compliance with relevant environmental and health and safety

legislation.

Municipal waste reuse/recycling/composting rates by local authority (a)

	<i>Per cent</i>					
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	
					Old definition (b)	New definition (c)
Isle of Anglesey	45.9	51.2	55.8	57.1	55.2	55.2
Gwynedd	36.7	43.0	45.9	48.1	51.2	51.2
Conwy	38.7	37.3	40.2	48.1	56.5	56.4
Denbighshire	33.7	52.5	56.8	55.7	57.4	58.0
Flintshire	42.4	43.2	47.1	48.3	50.6	54.9
Wrexham	37.4	41.0	48.8	53.3	53.0	52.8
Powys	41.3	39.7	37.7	42.6	51.2	50.9
Ceredigion	48.7	48.5	51.4	58.4	56.0	53.6
Pembrokeshire	38.9	44.3	48.9	50.0	52.9	53.1
Cardiganshire	33.8	40.1	43.4	49.3	54.3	53.8
Swansea	32.1	34.9	40.5	45.2	48.4	47.9
Neath Port Talbot	34.9	37.1	44.0	43.9	48.3	48.3
Bridgend	38.4	33.5	48.0	56.3	57.1	57.1
Vale of Glamorgan	40.4	41.2	43.8	52.4	54.5	54.5
Cardiff	34.5	38.3	41.6	51.2	49.1	52.2
Rhondda Cynon Taf	37.2	36.9	44.7	47.3	45.7	46.2
Merthyr Tydfil	31.6	35.7	36.4	43.2	49.2	49.1
Caerphilly	36.5	47.3	53.7	59.1	56.2	57.1
Blaenau Gwent	25.0	29.2	35.5	42.3	53.0	51.2
Torfaen	49.0	47.5	46.7	47.5	47.1	47.1
Monmouthshire	38.5	40.9	48.6	55.3	55.7	55.5
Newport	38.2	40.7	45.7	48.2	49.2	49.2
Wales	37.5	40.5	45.3	50.0	51.7	52.3

Source: WasteDataFlow

The Council has worked tirelessly to establish a sustainable and practical solution to the waste mountain. Reconfiguring services at this juncture is likely to be a retrograde step and there is major concern amongst officers and elected representatives that introducing a new regime will do irreparable damage to the recycling cause in terms of performance against targets. Moreover, it would be perceived by many in the borough as a blatant waste of money and resources to change a service that is operating extremely well and proving popular with all stakeholders. There is also significant concern among the controlling Labour administration that forced service changes against the wishes of citizens may have political implications with citizen views which will be expressed via the ballot box in the forthcoming elections.

The council acknowledge that there is room for improvement (particularly concentrating on targeting the minority of persistent non participants). However the Authority is concerned, particularly given the genuine positive feedback from residents that any change in dynamics will have a detrimental effect on the service and in turn the reputation of the Local Authority and Welsh Government as resource focussed and efficient organisations. Where central prescription prevails then the Welsh Government should provide assurance to Local Authorities that if their recycling performance reduces and they fail to achieve the statutory targets then there will be no fines levied.

In particular, central prescription over collection methods, disregards the wider duties set out in regulation 2 of the Local Government (Wales) Measure 2009 which include: strategic effectiveness; service quality; service availability;

fairness; efficiency; and innovation; whilst focusing on sustainability alone. Furthermore, it ought not to be automatically assumed that the separate collection of waste promotes or improves the environmental well-being of Wales (section 60 of the Government of Wales Act 2006). On the contrary, the restrictive and prescriptive enforcement of separate collection by Welsh Government may be acting contrary to this power and/or the intentions of section 60.

It is Caerphilly's understanding that for the purposes of deciding how to: fulfil their duties as an improvement authority; when making arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the exercise of its functions (section 2(1)); and, when setting its improvement objectives (section 3(1)), they must consult representatives who live, pay rates, use or are likely to use services and have an interest in the Authority's area. The local agenda and social impact consideration should not be overridden by sustainability considerations. It is therefore crucial that the views of the residents of the county borough on service delivery are taken into account and that central prescription must never take priority over the ability to make local service choices.

It is also worth noting that Caerphilly has recently come out top of the Welsh Government's *National Survey of Wales* which further demonstrates the satisfaction with the citizen focussed services delivered by the Authority. Consequently, given all of the issues outlined above, the Authority is firmly of the opinion that Local Service choice (as long as it achieves agreed outcomes) should

be allowed to prevail and that Local Authorities should not be constrained by Central Prescription over service delivery.

12.) Things to be Proud of

- National Awards
- Amount of Recycling material diverted from landfill
- Participation levels
- Increasing public satisfaction levels
- Recognition in the 2014 WG "National Survey of Wales"
- Household Waste Recycling Centres
- Recycling on the Go! Facilities
- Campaign work on public recycling, waste minimisation and resource efficiency
- Over 10, 000 bags for life issued (and pledges signed)
- 12,000 composter bins issued to residents
- Professional team/workforce

This page is intentionally left blank



BRYN COMPOST LIAISON GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, YSTRAD MYNACH ON 3RD JUNE 2014 AT 2:00 PM

PRESENT:

Councillor D. V. Poole Chair

Councillors:

A. Angel, D. Bolter, H.W. David, W. David, G.J. Hughes and J.A. Pritchard.

Together with:

Residents: Mr G. Reynolds, Mr. W. Griffiths, Mr R. Matthews, Mrs G. Davies and Mrs A. Gray.

Gelliargwellt Farm: Mr P. Colley and R. Thomas

Natural Resources Wales: Mr. J. Harrison, Mr A. Carter and Mrs E. Roe

Environmental Health: Ms C. Edwards

Officers: E. Sullivan (Democratic Services Officer), R. Barrett (Committee Services Officer)

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chair welcomed Mrs Emily Roe from Natural Resources Wales to her first meeting of the Bryn Compost Liaison Group and advised Members that Mrs Roe would be taking over the regulation of the site from Mr Alex Cater. The Chair on behalf of the Members of the Group thanked Alex for all his hard work and wished him every success in his future endeavours.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S. Morgan and Residents Mr M. Davies, Mrs P. Lapsa, Mr T. Matthews and Mrs C. Woods and from Public Health Wales Mrs M. Bowley and Mr H. Brunt.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received at the start or during the course of the meeting.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 10th February 2014 were received and noted.

4. MATTERS ARISING

The Chair referred to the query in relation to mobile phone charges and the cost of calls to the Natural Resources Wales (NRW) incident line. It was confirmed that calls made from mobile phones to the call centre would be charged at the mobile providers standard network tariff, this was standard working practice but any further information from the NRW Call Centre in this regard would be reported back to the Group.

5. UPDATES FROM NATURAL RESOURCES WALES

Members were updated on the progress on the on going investigation into the waste volumes received at the site and noted that the findings would be presented to the NRW Enforcement Panel meeting later this month. **The Liaison Group would be informed of the outcome of those deliberations as soon as possible.**

Clarification was sought with regard to the accuracy of food waste input data from Merthyr Tydfil Borough Council and NRW confirmed that they were satisfied that the data provided was accurate. Members were advised that not all the information received could be discussed in this forum due to commercial confidentiality issues but assurance were given that a comprehensive audit of all possible data streams had been undertaken and appropriate checks and balances had been put in place to ensure the adherence to permitted input volumes.

Reassurance were given that the data used to inform the investigation had been sourced from as wide a range of sources as possible in order to get a more accurate picture of the volumes being processed. The co-mingled (food and green waste) nature of Caerphilly waste was discussed and the difficulty in mathematically calculating the volume of the individual elements noted. Concerns were expressed that the volumes being recorded were based on estimated values and could therefore skew the data set.

Members were referred to the complaints data as appended to the minutes of the last meeting and the breakdown of odour complaints received from the 1st May 2013 to the 26th May 2014.

NRW referred to a query raised at the last meeting with regard to a possible increase in the number out of hours incidents. Having revisited the data it was confirmed that there had been no significant change in reporting patterns with 50% received Monday-Friday and 50% received during evenings and weekends. There had been no increase in out of hours complaints and there was no evidence of a developing trend.

Regarding a query raised on the recording of odour incidents and in particular issues where home addresses rather than the location of the odour were being recorded. It was confirmed that both the home address and the odour location were being logged by the call centre and therefore reflected in the complaint data presented to Members. A Member expressed concern that this information was not being consistently logged and referenced calls he had made where he had been asked for his home address but not the location of the odour. **Assurances were given that requesting both sets of information should be standard working practice for the call centre, further checks would be made and the outcome of these enquiries reported back to the next meeting.**

Members were referred to the table detailing the total number of odour complaints received, complaints not attended, substantiated compost odours, farms odours, no odour detected and

compost events. NRW confirmed that resources were being targeted on site with regular site audits conducted in order to ascertain the root causes of any odour issues. Assurance were given that although the number of visits to the site had been reduced; when on site NRW were able to make recommendations and changes to site operations and proactively prevent odours rather than reacting to odour incidents once they have occurred. It was noted that the number of visits to the site had reduced but so had the number of complaints received.

The number of complaints received again showed an improvement and the complaints by location had also improved and followed a similar pattern to previous years. References were made to seasonal differences and NRW were hopeful that the improvements now being noted would continue on through the summer months.

Members referred to the number of complaints received in relation to those not attended and substantiated. Concerns were expressed that in both April and May, 13 complaints had been received and yet none had been attended and none had been substantiated. NRW confirmed that whether or not an incident was attended depended on a variety of factors, not just the number of complaints received. The geographical concentration of the complaints for instance would be a factor however all complaints were being monitored and any patterns investigated.

In order to get a clear picture of the nature of the complaints the Chair proposed that the data for a 3 month period be presented on a day by day basis as this would readily identify any concentration when captured over a limited period of time. This was unanimously agreed by Members and **NRW confirmed that they would be able to present the data for June, July and August 2014 to a meeting in September 2014.**

It was noted that as the volume of complaints had been low a programme of planned audits rather than reactive visits had been pursued by NRW in order to identify any fundamental flaws in operations and rectify them before an odour incident occurred. Members were assured that this did not mean that residents complaints were not being closely monitored. Resources were simply being realigned in order to secure the best possible outcome for residents. NRW emphasised their commitment to securing sustainable improvements at the site and confirmed that they would continue to work to current best practice, however Members were reminded that this can change and develop over time and site operations would always need to be adapted and realigned to ensure they continued to meet best practice. Reference was made to the Composting "Best Practice Document" which was currently in draft form however once published a copy would be shared with the group.

Clarification was sought the regard to progress on the development of the anaerobic digester facility the Member believed that if all odorous waste stream from the site went through the AD plan then this could lead to a reduction in odours coming from the site including those from the farm activities. Representatives from Bryn Compost confirmed this to be the case and advised that talks with companies on the development had commenced.

A Member welcomed the improvement in the reduction of odour incidents and confirmed that she had detected no odours for the last 3 months at Mountain Way, Nelson but expressed concern that should the volume of material received on site increase so would the risk of an odour incident and sought clarification as to whether the site planned to take in any other Council's waste food products. Representatives from Bryn Compost confirmed there were no such plans and advised that Caerphilly and Merthyr Tydfil Council's waste were all the site could manage at this time.

A Member reference a complaint he had received with regard to smoke/burning smell coming from the site at 6.00am on a Sunday morning. The Environmental Health Manager confirmed that she had received the complaint and would be responding to it in due course and would be happy to talk further with the Member after the meeting.

The Chair closed the meeting at 14.40pm.

This page is intentionally left blank



GRANTS TO THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR PANEL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, TREDOMEN PARK ON TUESDAY, 16TH JULY 2014 AT 5.00 PM

PRESENT:

Councillor Mrs G. Oliver - Chair
Councillor R. Gough - Vice Chair

Councillors:

Mrs A. Blackman, C. Hawker, A. Lewis, K. Lloyd and E. Stenner.

Together with:

S. Harris (Interim Head of Corporate Finance), D. Roberts (Principal Group Accountant - Financial Advice and Support), C. Evans (Committee Services Officer).

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

Councillor Mrs Gaynor Oliver was appointed Chair of the Committee for the ensuing year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

Councillor Robert Gough was appointed Vice Chair of the Committee for the ensuing year.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors C. Cuss, A Higgs and R. Saralis.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors C. Hawker and K. Lloyd declared an interest in Agenda Item 5 (2) Revision of Criteria for Financial Assistance, when discussing budget allocation for Allotment grants. Details of the declaration are recorded with the relevant item.

5. MINUTES – 18TH MARCH 2014

The Panel received and approved the minutes of the Grants to the Voluntary Sector Panel held on 18th March 2014 (minute nos. 1 - 4; page nos. 1 - 3).

6. APPLICATIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

6.1 Statement of Expenditure

Members noted the available budget for 2014-2015 together with the total amounts requested, as detailed within the report.

Further information was sought in regard to how Discretionary Rate Relief (DRR) works and the organisations in receipt of DRR awards. Officers agreed to prepare a detailed report for presentation at the next meeting of the Panel.

6.2 Welsh Church Act Fund

The report highlighted that Caerphilly County Borough Council has received written confirmation that the 2014/2015 budget allocation is £40,084.00. Monmouthshire County Council have confirmed that the underspends from previous years of £132,720.00 can be carried forward, resulting in a total available budget for the current year of £172,804.00. Members noted that it has been highlighted that due to the present economic climate, allocations in the future could be reduced considerably due to declining returns on investments.

Members noted the Welsh Church Act Fund applications received and approved by officers since the last meeting in accordance with the agreed criteria as set out in Appendix 4. The total allocated amounts to £7,568.00.

Members' attention was directed to Appendix 5, which provided a breakdown of applications that have exceeded the 18-month time limit to claim funding as set out in the terms and conditions. Members noted this amount totalled £20,075.45, the applicants have received notification that the grant has now been withdrawn.

Members noted the process and the information contained within the report.

6.3 Applications for Financial Assistance: Panel Awards

Members were asked to consider the applications listed in Appendix 1 to the report and to make appropriate recommendations to the Acting Head of Corporate Finance for approval.

RECOMMENDED that the following applications for financial assistance be referred to the Acting Head of Corporate Finance for approval under delegated powers:-

	£
(a) Croespenmaen Baptist Church	£250.00
(b) Newbridge Community Theatre Group	£250.00
(c) Rhymney Valley Music Club	£200.00
(d) Lower Machen Festival	£200.00
(e) Rhymney Valley South Wales Flying Club	£200.00
(f) Cardiac Fitness Solution	£400.00
(g) Blackwood Christian Centre (Oasis)	£50.00
(h) Mid Valleys East (Argoed Ward) Art Society	£100.00

RECOMMENDED that for the reasons outlined at the meeting, the following application for financial assistance be deferred, pending the receipt of further information:-

- (a) The Parent Network

RECOMMENDED that for the reasons outlined at the meeting, the following applications for financial assistance be refused:-

- (a) Aimee Casey
- (b) Newbridge Online
- (c) Salvation Army

6.4 Applications for Financial Assistance: General Criteria Awards

Members noted the applications received since the last meeting, as listed in Appendix 2, which are in accordance with the agreed criteria and to be processed by officers.

7. REVISION OF CRITERIA FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Councillors C. Hawker and K. Lloyd declared a personal interest when discussing budget allocation for Allotment grants, due to involvement with Cefn Fforest Allotment and Pentwyn Allotment respectively. They took no part in the discussion or vote.

In the form of an interactive group discussion and training session Members considered Appendix 2 of the report, which demonstrated how the 2013/14 spend of £24,315.40 could be allocated against a set of proposed revised criteria. During 2013/14 the Panel recommended approval of 39 applications that did not meet the current criteria. These were also reviewed and assigned under suggested new categories. Members were asked to consider the proposed revised criteria and suggest alternative categories and allocations wherever appropriate.

Having consideration for the Council's six Improvement Objects for 2014/15 and the revised criteria and award amounts as presented in Appendix 2, Members recommended to the Interim Head of Corporate Finance that the revised set of criteria be approved under delegated powers.

Members noted that, as a result of the revised criteria, it is anticipated that there would be less grant applications brought to the Panel for their consideration in future meetings.

The meeting closed at 6.06 p.m.

Approved and signed as a correct record subject to any amendments agreed and recorded in the minutes of the next meeting.

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank



VOLUNTARY SECTOR SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, TREDOMEN ON WEDNESDAY, 18TH JUNE 2014 AT 10.30 A.M.

PRESENT:

Mr. R. Cooke – Chair

Councillors:

D. Carter, C. Hawker, Mrs. J.A. Pritchard, R. Woodyatt, A. Lewis, A. Rees, P.J. Bevan, Mrs. E. M. Aldworth, R.W. Gough, Mrs. P. Griffiths, K. James, Mrs. J. Summers, Mrs. P. Cook, J. Bevan

Together with:

Abbeyfield	-	Mr. P. Jones
Abertridwr Community Church	-	Mr. L. Clay
Age Cymru	-	Ms. S. Brown
Bargoed YMCA	-	Ms. J. Price
Caerphilly 50+ Forum	-	Mr. D. Morgan
Caerphilly Care & Repair	-	Ms. P. Jones
Caerphilly Groundwork Trust	-	Mr. R. H. Cooke
Caerphilly Parents & Carers Forum	-	Mrs. B. Helps
Caerphilly People First	-	Mr. C. Luke
Cancercareline	-	Mr. A. Read
Cruse Bereavement Care	-	Mrs. C. Williams
GAVO – Assistant Chief Executive	-	Mrs. E. Forbes
Graig Y Rhacca Communities Partnership	-	Mr. G. Mitchell
Homestart Caerphilly Borough	-	Ms. G. Jervis
New CLURV	-	Mrs. J. Morgan
The Parent Network	-	Ms. M. Jones
The Vanguard Centre	-	Mrs. M. Wade
Van Road United Reformed Church	-	Mr. J. Wade
Vice Chair, Voluntary Sector Representatives	-	Mr. D. Brunton

Also present:

J. Dix (CCBC Policy & Research Manager), J. Elliott (CCBC Senior Research Officer), Alison Palmer & Geraint Jones (GAVO), Mr. D. Morgan (Town & Community Council Representative), Mrs. Alison Gough (ABUHB), Sgt. R. Davies (Gwent Police), Mrs. M. Chapman (Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Gwent), Mrs. D. Crossman (South Wales Fire & Rescue Service), Hayley Evans (CCBC – Principal Waste Management Officer), Ms. Ann Mathews & Lisa McLain (Caerphilly & Blaenau Gwent CAB).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr. Ms. L. Ackerman.

Also from Ms. J. Lawton (Caerphilly MIND), Mrs. H. Williams (Disability Can Do Organisation), Mr. M. Thorne (SYDIC), Mr. K. Viney (The Settlement), Mr. G. Mitchell (Graig-y-Rhacca Communities Partnership), Mr. M. Featherstone (Chief Executive - GAVO), Ms. S. Crane (ABUHB), Mr. H. Llewellyn (Town & Community Councils Representative)

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

None declared.

3. MINUTES

3.1 Mrs. E. Forbes (Assistant Chief Executive – GAVO) stated that she did attend the meeting in March but was not included on the attendance list.

3.2 Accuracy of minutes of 19th March 2014 was agreed.

4. LAUNCH OF THE COMPACT ACTION PLAN ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

4.1 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Keith Reynolds launched the Compact Action Plan Annual Report, with the following words: "As the new Leader of Caerphilly county borough council, I am delighted to be involved in the long-standing, vibrant and successful collaboration that has developed between all partners within the Compact since it was established back in 1999.

4.2 The Compact is more than just a strategic document, it reflects the very essence of what we are all trying to achieve, working together for the benefit of everyone across our local communities.

4.3 As you know, the aspirations outlined in the Compact are delivered through an annual Action Plan. This key document provides a detailed programme of work involving all partners and it is encouraging to see that so much has been achieved over the past 12 months.

4.4 It is vitally important that we continually review and evaluate our work to ensure we are on track. That is why this Action Plan is such a key document which allows us to track progress and take any corrective measures if needed.

4.5 The ongoing financial constraints facing public services means that there are tough times ahead for us all, but I'm confident that we can overcome these challenges by continuing on our journey together and presenting a strong, united front.

4.6 I now look forward to the year ahead and I'm sure that we will see many more excellent examples of successful partnership working at its finest thanks to our innovative Compact agreement."

5. PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE CAERPHILLY & BLAENAU GWENT CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU BY ANN MATHEWS AND LISA MCLAIN (OPERATIONS MANAGERS)

5.1 Ann Matthews said the CAB has been delivering Outreach Services for over 12 years, which was originally funded by the Coalfields Regeneration Fund and Big Lottery. Outreach advice is delivered throughout Caerphilly & Blaenau Gwent. Currently there are two projects which are funded by the Welsh Government, these are **Better Advice for Better Lives** and **Community First Shared Outcomes Project**.

- Better Advice for Better Lives aims to maximise income for those people living in deprived areas, and is delivered primarily at GP surgeries / Health Centres.
- Community First Shared Outcomes Project is working in partnership with Community First Cluster Managers, to provide advice in community settings. Clients have help within their local communities, so there is no need to travel.

5.2 Lisa McLain introduced this part of the presentation on CAB Specialist Services. The services provided are:-

- The Physical Contact Centre which is staffed by 29 volunteers contributing to the national Citizens Adviceline Service.
- Proof of Concept. Only 35% of calls to Adviceline are answered, so there are plans to make this service more accessible, and achieve a rate of 70,000 answered calls per year.
- Quality Coaches. This covers monitoring the quality and consistency of Adviceline Cymru.
- Three full time bi-lingual Quality Coaches are employed.
- Face-to-Face Debt Advice. There are three FTE specialist debt advisors across Caerphilly & Blaenau Gwent.
- CCBC Rents Project. Working with tenants with a view to reducing rent and council tax arrears, whilst also addressing other debts.
- Supporting People Project. This is a debt casework project for clients receiving assistance through the Supporting People network.
- Integrated Digital Money Advice. This is a six-month pilot, delivering debt advice via web chat and online enquiry (email).

Contact details:- Ann Matthews 01443 878051, Lisa McLain 01443 878067

Various questions were asked of the two managers:-

1. It does seem that debt problems are now an increasing trend with the CAB client base. It was agreed that these are now where crisis is becoming the norm.
2. Isn't there an overlap between other services, which are provided from other organisations, in the voluntary sector? The CAB has regular meetings with a number of voluntary organisations, but if there are more organisations with whom we could discuss issues, we would be keen to know of them.
3. For communities in poverty, travelling costs are a problem. The CAB are aware of this and the outreach services are designed to eliminate or minimise travel costs within communities.

4. Formal debt remedies are applied with clients.
5. The CAB is working well with other organisations including Credit Unions.
6. Are drop in centres open at times which would maximise their use by clients who work during the day? A drop in centre has been provided for Thursday evenings.
7. Is advice on debt issues for youngsters covered by the CAB, as some youngsters have to pay off student loans? There are no age barriers for debt advice. The CAB works with 'The Basement' in Blackwood to engage with young people.
8. Cllr. C. Hawker praised the recent BBC television programme which covered the good work of the CAB, for providing financial advice to people, in various circumstances in the county borough.

6. VOLUNTARY SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES QUESTION: A QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION AROUND WASTE COLLECTION / DISPOSAL CHARGES FACING THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR (HAYLEY EVANS – PRINCIPAL WASTE MANAGEMENT OFFICER CCBC)

- 6.1 Bargoed YMCA raised a point as to whether it was permissible for voluntary organisations that are sharing premises, to share waste bins. The response was that it is permissible, however, one of the voluntary organisations would have to sign the waste certificate (as it can only be placed in one name) and take responsibility for the duty of the care for the certificate.
- 6.2 If a voluntary organisation decides to have a small waste bin to reduce charges, the Council needs to be assured that the organisation is able to dispose of all of its waste responsibly.
- 6.3 A voluntary organisation mentioned that it was developing an environmental green policy, including recycling and reducing waste, and the Officer commented that the Council would be happy to help with this.
- 6.4 The Officer advised that orange recycling bags should be put out on the normal recycling day, for the area. However, these bags may be placed out for collection on any day, within town centres, for collection. The comment was made that the Council was removing bins from organisations that had decided not to pay the charges, and sign a waste contract with the Authority.

7. VOLUNTARY SECTOR EVENTS: VERBAL UPDATE FROM JACKIE DIX (CCBC – POLICY & RESEARCH MANAGER)

Voluntary Sector Achievement Awards

This event will be held on the 2nd July, at Penallta House, from 6.30 p.m. to 8.30 p.m.

One Beat

This event will also be held in Penallta House, on the 25th October, from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. The guest speaker will be David Roberts, CBE a Paralympic Swimmer who trained in the Caerphilly borough, and is now a professional disabled swimmer representing Caerphilly County Swim. Invitations will be sent out from the Council in August regarding voluntary organisations having a display at the event. Last year there were over 90 voluntary sector stands on display.

Compact Partners Awareness Event for Middle Managers

At the request of the Voluntary Sector Liaison Committee, it was felt that although the Compact was well received by Directors and Senior Managers across the Compact Partner organisations, middle managers tended to be unaware of the Compact and its requirements. To address this a Compact awareness event will be held targeting middle managers across the Compact organisations at Penallta House in late autumn. Compact Partners were asked to send names to Jackie Dix, of appropriate staff members, to attend the event.

8. ITEMS OF INTEREST CONCERNING THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR FROM COMPACT PARTNERS

Agenda Item No. 8(a) - Digest of Committee reports from Caerphilly County Borough Council

With regard to the Caerphilly Youth Service Strategy consultation 2014 – 2019, Dave Brunton said he was consulting with children and young people, and voluntary organisations and would be submitting a response on the CCBC Youth Strategy Consultation. However, the response would be submitted close to the consultation deadline. He commented that the Strategy needs to have more 'meat on the bones around partnership working,' and on the role of the Voluntary Sector.

Agenda Item No. 8(b) - Gwent Association of Voluntary Organisations

Emily Forbes (Assistant Chief Executive – GAVO) talked through the GAVO written update, and commented that the Committee will be provided with more information on the work of GAVO as a Compact Partner, representing the Voluntary and Community Sector in the Caerphilly county borough.

Cllr. J. Pritchard noted that Draethen, Waterloo and Rudry Community Council (DWRCC) attracted some funding from the Valleys Voices – Active Engagement Portfolio, and was this not unusual for a community council, to attract funding in this way?

Alison Palmer (Community Planning Co-ordinator, GAVO) replied that the successful funding came from the Big Lottery Community Voice programme. Under the GAVO portfolio programme was 'Citizen's Engagement', which was designed to support LSB's across Caerphilly and Blaenau Gwent, Newport and Monmouthshire councils. The total was for £3 million over 5 years. This was undertaken by engaging with the DWRCC to host this part of the project.

Agenda Item No. 8(c) - Aneurin Bevan University Health Board

Cyril Luke (Caerphilly People First) said that he could not see any reference by the ABUHB on the Pan Gwent Learning Strategy, which does need to be mentioned, under the Gwent Mental Health and Learning Disability Partnership update.

Cllr. Andrew Lewis said that he was concerned about the situation regarding the closure of the surgery in Trinant. In reply, Alison Gough (Partnership Manager, ABUHB) said that a colleague, Sarah Congreve, would be able to update Cllr. Lewis on this matter. She will ask Sarah to get in touch with Cllr. Lewis.

Agenda Item No. 8(d) – Caerphilly Business Forum

No update available.

Agenda Item No. 8(e) – Caerphilly Community and Town Councils

No update available.

Agenda Item No. 8(f) - Gwent Police

Cllr. Dave Carter gave an update on some policing matters, which he had obtained from a recent council conference. A major event which is planned for Newport, the NATO Summit, will be held on the 4th and 5th September and will be based in the Celtic Manor Hotel. There

are expected to be 150 high profile world leaders, representing their countries, both within the NATO Alliance, and outside the alliance. They will have approximately 10,000 support staff, and 10,000 to 20,000 demonstrators are expected. There will also be 10,000 police, protection officers. It is expected that on occasions delegates will travel from Newport to the Cardiff area and return so Gwent Police are warning of considerable traffic delays, at times, to and from those locations over those two days. Police recommendations suggest varying degrees of disruption to travel, two weeks before the dates above, and also one week later.

Cllr. John Bevan said that it was good to see that some police station front counters had re-opened, but unfortunately that was not the case in Rhymney. Sgt. Robert Davies said that he would take those comments back to his Inspector.

The Chair thanked Sgt. Davies for his report and wished all local police personnel who are retiring, well and hoped that they had a long and happy retirement.

Agenda Item No. 8(g) - South Wales Fire & Rescue Service

Contained within the report, which caused members of the committee some concern, were the figures showing an increase in car fires, and the question was asked "were these fires as a result of increasing malicious damage, or as a result of accidents / electrical / fuel faults?" Donna Crossman (Partner Agency Manager, SWFRS) said she would check on the figures and provide an update for the next meeting.

Agenda Item No. 8(h) - Police & Crime Commissioner for Gwent

Maria Chapman updated the committee with her attached report. The Commissioner has held twelve public surgeries across Gwent, three of which were in Caerphilly County Borough. Funding has been provided by the Commissioner for a Co-ordinator post to enhance the operation of the OWL scheme.

A committee member asked about the future of PACT meetings? There is work in progress to retain PACT meetings where there are substantial members of the public regularly attending but in areas where the PACT meetings are poorly attended, it was felt that police attendance was not an efficient use of police resources. Therefore PACT meetings in areas of poor attendance may not continue.

Maria Chapman also gave some information to the committee, with reference to the Gwent Police Report, on the re-opening of front desks at certain police stations. She said that should a community wish to see this facility opened at their local police station then the written request must have evidence of the degree of usage, by the public. This may take the form of a diary to indicate the number of issues, where the public would have wanted face-to-face access, to the police.

9. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ITEM

9(a) Community Planning Quarterly Briefing April to June 2014

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS:- 17TH SEPTEMBER AND 3RD DECEMBER 2014

Next meeting on the 17th September, will be held at 10.30 a.m. in the Sirhowy / Ebbw Rooms on the 1st floor, at Penallta House. The meeting on the 3rd December will be held at 10.30 a.m. in the Council Chamber at Penallta House.

Meeting ended 11.50 a.m.



BARGOED TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, PENALLTA HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY, 21ST MAY 2014 AT 4.00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillors:

H. A. Andrews, D. T. Davies, A. Higgs, K. James, D. Price, K. Reynolds

Together with:

H. Llewellyn (Town Councillor), D. Morgan (Town Councillor), A. Collis (Town Councillor)

Also:

Inspector James Hill (Gwent Police), A. Dallimore (Team Leader – Urban Renewal & Conservation), A. Highway (Town Centre Development Manager), S. Wilkes (Assistant Town Centre Manager), D. Smith (Principal Engineer), A. Jones (Clerk)

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Mr. Highway opened the meeting and asked for nominations for Chairman. Councillor Davies was nominated and seconded and all agreed, Councillor Davies accepted the position and continued with the meeting.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Davies requested nominations for Vice Chairman. Councillor Price was nominated and seconded and all agreed. Councillor Price accepted the position.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors: E.M. Aldworth, D. Carter, Insp Greening (Gwent Police), Jan Bennett

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. TO NOTE THE PREVIOUS MINUTES OF 29TH JANUARY 2014

The previous minutes were taken as read.

6. 'A' FRAMES PROTOCOL

Mr Barry informed the group that the policy presented is now in place. If there are any contentious issues raised the protocol can be revised and any feedback will be considered.

7. CINEMA UPDATE

Mr. Dallimore advised the group that the Council is looking to work with Odeon on two areas. The first is looking at a procurement process with regards to fit out and more competitive market.

Secondly to, secure external funding. The Council are in positive discussions with the Welsh Government, an application is to be submitted to go to the minister.

Mr. Dallimore confirmed that meetings with Odeon and the council's Chief Executive recently have confirmed that Odeon are very committed to the scheme.

There is a revised programme whereby works are likely to start in January 2015, with an anticipated open date of late March/Easter 2016.

Members were pleased that Welsh Government are looking to assist with funding but expressed their concerns over the delay and feel that a public statement should be sent out reiterating that Odeon are still committed to the project.

Mr. Dallimore is going to look into the wording for a statement to be released.

8. HJJJ BUILDING UPDATE

Mr. Dallimore confirmed that the monies have been secured for the demolition of the building. The legal process is still ongoing and there are a number of conditions such as a claw back for future sale of site that need to be sorted prior to us taking ownership. These conditions have been agreed in principle and are currently with the WG and our Legal team.

The project is due to start mid summer with an end date of just before Christmas. Completion of this work will then enable the cinema build to commence.

Councillor Davies asked for confirmation of the deadline for all works to be completed with regards to the regeneration.

Mr. Dallimore confirmed that all works would need to be completed by March however there is a possible extension time of a further 3 months. Confirmation of the deadline date will be provided closer to the time.

Councillor Davies asked if traffic would be affected. Mr. Dallimore confirmed that traffic will be affected but it will be kept to as minimum disruption as possible.

9. FORMER WOOLWORTHS BUILDING UPDATE

Mr Dallimore read out the following statement provided from Mr Gwyn Williams in the Council's IT Department.

“Open Reach have now resolved one of their issues and therefore the first part of the circuit installation can proceed; we have been informed by our suppliers that the duct in the High Street will be laid and paving slabs re-laid by 31st May. Following this, another Open Reach team will then put the fibre-optic cable through the duct into the building, which will be followed by another team who will install the Open Reach equipment on the fibre-optic cable. I have contacted our suppliers this morning but Open Reach have not put any dates on the activities beyond the 31st May. As you can see this is a onerous task with matters beyond our control, however, we continue to work with our supplier to bring this matter to a conclusion as quickly as possible.”

Mr. Dallimore advised the group that no definite date is known at present.

10. CHOOSE THE HIGH STREET

Mr. Highway presented his report, which informed the group that since the Christmas campaign feedback was brought to the group. Town Centre Management, have been working on a number of platforms to raise consumer choice throughout the towns.

The aim of the campaign is to increase importance of supporting local retailers by promoting their businesses and raise awareness of consumer choice. Support the High Street, increase footfall and encourage new businesses.

As part of the advertising, 5,000 bags have been ordered and will be distributed from Customer First centres and libraries in each of the five towns; all members were given a bag. Information will be going out to all businesses and local banks have been contacted and provided with leaflets to provide to potential new businesses.

Advertising will continue in a number of ways such as banners, billboards, twitter, facebook and youtube.

Councillor Davies thanked Mr Highway for his report and hard work and hopes that this will boost trade in the town but has some concern with regards the Northern end of the town, as there are a number of vacant properties.

Inspector James Hill introduced himself to the group as the new inspector for Bargoed. Inspector Hill queried as to how other towns are managed as the police service has 7 stations in different towns.

Mr. Highway advised that it was a Council decision only to manage 5 at present there are no other towns managed by the Town Centre Management team.

Councillor Davies welcomed Inspector Hill to the group.

11. POCKET PARK NEW VISUALS

Mr. Dallimore provided the group with visual displays along with a plan for the draft designs for parking.

The consultation exhibition had a massive response. It was felt that the design took up too many parking spaces in the Northern trench. Capita Simmons redesigned the plan and came up with three options.

The Town Council overwhelming voted for the design passed around. This design provides a 3D visual centre, which will focus around the daffodils artwork this gives focal point from all areas of the small events space and adds area for people to eat outdoors. Councillor Price asked for the current position on the daffodils artwork. Mr. Dallimore advised that they have

not been fabricated yet.

Mr. Dallimore advised that the floor would be in natural stone (flagstone), which is the same as the flooring in Hanbury Square. Replacement trees will be put in to have good chance of growing. The non-slip surface lay down in Chisholm's Lane is not really working so will need to be replaced.

Councillor Llewellyn raised concerns over the tight angle of the turn; members agreed that this would need to be looked at. Mr. Highway advised that this can be placed on the audit and brought to the next meeting.

Councillor Collis raised concern over the safety of children climbing the daffodil sculptures. Mr. Dallimore advised that the girth of the structure would be too wide for anyone to climb. Seating was a concern previously and this has been changed to comply with Health and Safety.

12. REPORT ON ACTION TAKEN BY COUNCIL TO LIASE WITH NETWORK RAIL

Councillor Davies informed the group that he raised this as a query. As no officer was available to provide update it is requested that Huw Thomas and Clive Campbell provide an update on this matter. It was suggested that a site meeting maybe required.

13. TRAFFIC REGULATIONS MEMBER'S REQUEST CLARIFICATION ON TWO ISSUES

Mr. Smith presented the group with the report and plan. The report is designed to reduce the levels of obstructions and reduce incidents. A number of options were considered but only one option has been preferred as a temporary order for 18 months.

The advice is preferable to make Cardiff Road one way in a northerly direction from its junction with Ruth Street and this would not affect bus routes.

Councillor Davies advised that a site visit with Phil Anstis proved that double yellow lines have been tried but did not make any difference, mainly due to lack of enforcement. Also traffic travelling through Gilfach Street is too fast.

Councillor Davies agreed that the preferred option would be the best to try as an experimental order for up to 18 months.

Mr. Smith highlighted that this would increase traffic on Gilfach Street. With regards to the parking issue in Wood Street double yellow lines could be introduced to prevent the parking on both sides.

Mr. Dallimore confirmed that this would be placed on the audit.

Councillor Davies thanked Mr. Smith for his report.

14. BARGOED TOWN CENTRE AUDIT REPORT

Councillor Price requested confirmation on whether the fire routes from the Morrisons store were adequate as there have been complaints at how low the bar to the car park is and concern as to whether a fire engine would be able to get in.

Mr. Dallimore advised that he will ask for clarity but he has been advised that there is a planned fire route into the building and the height on the basement level is normal, it is mainly an issue with signs hanging down that restrict the access.

Mr. Dallimore confirmed that he is still trying to obtain money to tidy up the steps on Hanbury Road. Other problems on Hanbury Road have been identified such as the stone slabs that have come up and not replaced but tarmac put down. There is an ongoing dispute with Alun Griffiths and Capita Simmons to establish responsibility. Until the dispute is resolved damage can only be patched.

Another area of concern is the dip outside Barclays Bank which has been identified as snagging and Mr. Dallimore will look into this and keep members updated.

Railway fencing. Councillor Price to chase AM for update.

Illegal parking in town centre. Mr. Dallimore advised that double yellow lines will go down soon and also bollards to be put in as part of the Public Realm Phase 4 Works sometime in February.

Councillor Davies requested that more urgency be placed on this matter. Mr. Dallimore is to liaise with engineers.

Unit Shops, Lowry Plaza. Mr Dallimore confirmed that Gregg's are trading, Subway is going in and there is a national retailer interested in Units 1 & 2. The opening of the cinema is the main link to national retailers and he is awaiting new marketing materials to promote shops more widely. This will be brought to the Council next meeting.

Mr. Dallimore will arrange a site visit with Simons reference the next Town Council notice board.

Inspector Hill informed the group that the police have increased the patrols in the town in relation to the groups of youths hanging around Morrisons car park. It has been agreed that these resources are to remain to keep the police presence there.

Councillors requested clarification as to responsibility of the security of the car park and were advised that it is down to Morrisons to provide security.

Angel Artwork spotlights. Councillor Higgs raised this as an ongoing matter, which has not been resolved and advised that Alun Griffiths had informed him that this matter had been resolved so he will take it back to them.

The meeting closed at 5:35 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank



BLACKWOOD TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, PENALLTA HOUSE ON FRIDAY, 16TH MAY 2014 AT 12.30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillors:

Councillors: P. Cook, N. Dix, K. James, C. Hawker, P. Leonard, A. Rees

Together with:

C. Erasmus (Town Councillor), Z. Hammond (Town Councillor), Inspector M Smith (Gwent Police)

Also:

A. Highway (Town Centre Manager), S. Wilcox (Assistant Town Centre Manager),
A. Dallimore (Team Leader - Urban Renewal & Conservation), A. Jones (Clerk)

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Mr. Highway opened the meeting and asked for nominations for Chairman. Councillor Dix was nominated and seconded and all agreed, Councillor Dix accepted the position and continued with the meeting

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Dix asked for nominations for Vice Chairman. Councillor Rees was nominated and seconded and all agreed, Councillor Rees accepted the position

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors: T. Williams, D. T. Davies (Consultee), E. Aldworth (Consultee), Bob Campbell (traffic management).

5. WELCOME INTRODUCTION FOR NEW MEMBER COUNCILLOR ALAN REES

Councillor Dix introduced Councillor Rees to the group and the group introduced themselves to Councillor Rees

6. TO NOTE THE PREVIOUS MINUTES (7TH FEBRUARY 2014 MIN NO'S 1-3, PAGE NO'S 1-3)

The previous minutes were taken as read

7. 'A' FRAMES PROTOCOL

Mr Highway advised the group that there were no officers available to attend the meeting however the report was for information as this report has been brought to the group previously. If there were any concerns over the report they were to be made to Mr Highway for him to take up with the service area.

8. CHOOSE THE HIGH STREET

Mr Highway presented his report, which informed the group that since the Christmas campaign feedback was brought to the group. Town Centre Management has been working on a number of platforms to raise consumer choice throughout the towns.

The aim of the campaign is to increase importance of supporting local retailers by promoting their businesses and raise awareness of consumer choice.

As part of the advertising, 250 bags have been handed out from the Customer First office in Blackwood, all members were provided with a bag. Information will be going out to all businesses and local banks have been contacted and provided with leaflets to provide to potential new businesses.

Advertising will continue in a number of ways such as banners, billboards, twitter, facebook and youtube.

Councillor Hawker stated that the billboard design is very good and really stands out. Mr. Highway confirmed that this was designed in house and it is a credit to our organisation that we have officers who can do these things.

Councillor Dix added that this was excellent work and is a really good initiatives, he hopes that this will boost trade in the towns and that Blackwood will remain robust with trade. He thanked Mr Highway for his hard work and report.

9. CINEMA UPDATE

Mr Highway confirmed that he is in regular contact with the cinema operator and advised that the cinema was due to open in June but unfortunately this has now been delayed until the end of July. It was confirmed that there will be five screens and they will be showing current blockbuster movies.

Mr Dallimore advised the group that there are workmen on site continuing to work to get the cinema opened as soon as possible.

Mr Hold advised that the Town Council has been in talks with Blackwood Rotary Club to hold a premier film event in the Maxim cinema with possible dates of the 17th or 24th July. All

monies would be donated to charity and are in discussions with the operator.

Mr. Highway has met with Beverley Edwards from Tidal's store with regards to trying to find a suitable location for the opening event and this is still ongoing. Councillor Dix confirmed that the Mayor has been invited to open the event.

Councillor Leonard asked how would the cinema be promoted.

Mr. Dallimore advised that the Town Centre Management team are going to work with the operator to help promote the cinema.

Mr. Highway advised that the Town Centre Gazette would be used to advertise the opening of the cinema promoting that it has five screens showing latest releases

Choose the High Street will also be a good marketing tool for the promotion of the cinema

10. CHANGING OF DISABLED PARKING BAYS IN HIGH STREET

Mr. Highway advised that Bob Campbell was not able to be at the meeting.

Town Councillor Z. Hammond and Mr. Hold highlighted that there has been a lot of work with regards to improving the high street which should have been carried out after the disabled bays were put in place not before.

Mr. Highway requested that all queries be sent to him and he will contact Traffic Management.

11. TOWN CENTRE BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Dallimore informed the group that due to budget cuts, improvements and maintenance for all five towns has been reduced to £20,000. This will have a big impact on what repairs and maintenance will be undertaken throughout the towns.

Mr. Dallimore advised that the Council will continue to work hard to secure additional external funding and will look to work with the Town Council to achieve this.

Councillor Dix agreed that more focus and smarter thinking in looking to acquire funding externally is the way forward.

Councillor Hawker asked for clarification as to where the external funding would come from and could the Heritage Lottery be used for older buildings like the cinema.

Mr. Dallimore advised that there are a number of possible routes some of them being Welsh Government grants, European and Lottery monies. With regards to the cinema, the developer decided to go alone without any external funding.

12. AREA FORUM BUDGET

Mr. Dallimore advised the group that there is £7,657 in the area forum budget, which in the past has been used for events.

Councillor Dix requested that the group and Mr. Highway look at possible ideas where this money could be used within the town.

Possible suggestions were that the old toilet block has a mural on it. Mr. Dallimore would look to work with the owners of the toilet block to see if an arrangement could be made for a mural

to be painted and the owner maintains afterwards. Mr Dallimore would look into possible designs and costs. Improve the steps, which lead from Wesley Road or replace old bins were other ideas.

Councillor Dix invited the group to vote on exploring the mural on the toilet block with the owner. This was put to the group and the votes were unanimous to take this option forward.

13. BLACKWOOD TOWN CENTRE AUDIT

Councillor Dix informed the group that Colours is under new ownership and they are looking to turn the premises into a wine bar and make improvements to reduce the noise volume by fitting an internal door. Anyone under the age of 16 will have to leave by a certain time.

Mr. Dallimore advised that the studs outside Argos are not having the impact to stop parking. Arrangements have been made to go and look at the area again with NCS to see alternative solutions.

Mr. Highway has made enquiries with the owners of Poundstretcher who have advised that the matter is with the Insurance Company.

The number of Homeless people in Blackwood has reduced and Kath Peters is meeting with the police to discuss this matter.

Mr. Dallimore advised that the planning application for former junior school has been discussed with planning and it is only an outline application so it will be brought back to the audit once a full application has been submitted.

Councillor Dix raised concerns over the safety of the structure and that people are gaining access to the premises. Mr Dallimore requested that these concerns be passed to him so that they can be referred to Planning and Property Services.

Defective step could not be identified more information has been requested to be able to refer this back to Highways.

The Manager of Asda was grateful that the potholes on Cliff Road are to be repaired.

The group were advised that Inspector Mark Smith will no longer be covering the Blackwood area and will be replaced by Inspector Mark Thomas. Councillor Dix on behalf of the group thanked the Inspector Smith for all of his support and hard work over the years and wished him well in his new role.

Inspector Smith thanked the group and stated that he had enjoyed his time working with the group.

The meeting closed at 1.31 p.m.

CHAIRMAN



CAERPHILLY TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES, PENALLTA HOUSE ON TUESDAY, 3RD JUNE 2014 AT 2.00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillors:

P J Bevan, C. Elsbury, C. Forehead, J. Fussell, K. James, B. Jones, S. Kent, M. Prew

Together with:

Mrs. M. Hall (Community Councillor), Mr. K. Williams (Clerk Caerphilly Town Council), Mr. T Payne (Cadw), Mrs. S. Cooper (Caerphilly Access Group), Inspector G. Jones (Gwent Police), CSO John McDonnell (Gwent Police), Mr. Tidridge (Heol Trecastell Residents Association), Mr. K. Robottom (Caerphilly Residents Association)

Also:

A. Highway (Town Centre Development Manager), A. Dallimore (Team Leader – Urban Renewal & Conservation), S. Wilcox (Assistant Town Centre Manager), M. Godfrey (Environmental Health Officer), G. Richards (Highways Maintenance Manager), P. Hudson (Marketing & Events Manager), A. Jones (Clerk)

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Mr Highway opened the meeting and asked for nominations for Chairman. Councillor C. Forehead was nominated and seconded and all agreed, Councillor Forehead accepted the position and continued with the meeting.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Forehead asked for nominations for Vice Chairman. Councillor B. Jones was nominated and seconded and all agreed. Councillor Jones accepted the position.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors: E.M. Aldworth, D.T. Davies, E. Forehead, J. Pritchard, Professor R Deacon (Community Councillor), Mr. J Dilworth (Clerk Van Community Council).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr. K. Williams (Clerk Caerphilly Town Council) declared an interest in item 10 on the agenda as the town council have requested funding.

Councillor Elsbury declared an interest in item 11 on the agenda, as he knew the person who had donated the monies for the plaque.

5. TO NOTE THE PREVIOUS MINUTES ON 11TH FEBRUARY 2014

Mr. Robottom requested that his apologies be noted for previous meeting as he did send apologies and was not listed.

Councillor B. Jones requested that a slight amendment be made to item 4 on the minutes by placing a comma after the word father in the first paragraph.

The minutes were then taken as read.

6. 'A' FRAMES PROTOCOL

Mr. Richards informed the group that the policy presented to the group is now in place. If there are any contentious issues raised the protocol can be revised and any feedback will be considered.

Councillor Elsbury asked for confirmation as to whether insurance will need to be checked each year to ensure businesses are covered.

Mr. Richards advised that insurance is checked annually and any queries would be referred to the Council's Insurance Department.

Councillor Bevan raised concern about the fruit and vegetable shop near the zebra crossing in Cardiff Road as they display a lot of their wares on the pavement.

Mr. Richards advised that the owners do own a section of land outside the shop but as long as they do not go on to the Council land it should not be a problem. It was identified that they also display things by placing them on the fencing.

Mr. Richards informed the group that there is a question as to whether or not this adds vibrancy to the town centre. The application will be vetted and anything contentious will be referred to the Head of Service for a decision to be made.

Councillor Fussell requested clarification on signage that is currently up in the main street pointing visitors to their businesses in the side streets. Does this protocol cover these signs and if so it may be worth looking into fingerposts to direct visitors to the shops in the side streets. Mr. Richards advised that this is under the protocol.

The contents of the report were noted.

7. AIR QUALITY UPDATE

Ms Godfrey apologised to the group for not being able to attend the previous meeting. The consultation from December to March only received one response from a resident in Lansbury Park supporting what was being undertaken and no other responses for anyone else.

The group were advised that the Air Quality Action Plan is going to Cabinet on 4th June. Once all comments passed back it will then go through a procurement process for consultants to be appointed. It is anticipated that this should all be in place by mid July.

There is an issue with regards to finance but Welsh Government are making grants available, however the council cannot apply for modelling.

The air quality area has expanded to include Nantgarw Road, this is a working document which can be amended, any suggestions could they be passed direct to Ms. Godfrey.

Ms. Godfrey was thanked for the update and then left the meeting.

8. MORGAN JONES FORMER LIBRARY UPDATE

Mr. Dallimore advised that there are four options and a report setting out the options has been prepared to go to Cabinet. Colin Jones will be attending to take any questions on the report.

The options for Cabinet to consider are:-

1. Sell the property on the open market
2. Dispose of CCBC's interest in the property to a party with the best business case
3. Conduct an asset transfer exercise to a third sector organisation
4. A staged approach where option 1 is tried first, then options 2 and/or 3 if this fails.
5. Councillor Bevan enquired as to which organisations have expressed an interest in the building.

Councillor Prew advised that a number of organisation have expressed an interest to take over the building which include the Caerphilly Cwrt Rawlin football team and others but until the report has gone through Cabinet no decision will be made.

Mr Dallimore advised that the group would be kept updated on the position.

9. "CHOOSE THE HIGH STREET"

Mr. Highway presented his report, which informed the group that since the Christmas campaign feedback was brought to the group. Town Centre Management has been working on a number of platforms to raise consumer choice throughout the towns.

The aim of the campaign is to increase importance of supporting local retailers by promoting their businesses and raise awareness of consumer choice. Support the High Street, increase footfall and encourage new businesses. Advertising will continue in a number of ways such as banners, billboards, twitter, facebook and youtube.

As part of the advertising, 5,000 bags have been ordered and will be distributed from Customer First centres and libraries in each of the five towns; all members were given a bag. Information will be going out to all businesses and local banks have been contacted and provided with leaflets to provide to potential new businesses.

Councillor Bevan asked if the discount card worked. Mr. Highway advised that it was not really achieving what it should have done and the scheme was a lot of hard work with not much coming out of it.

Mr. Highway advised that the next stage for "Choose the High Street" is to link up with Mr. Hudson's team to hand out leaflets and bags at all the events being carried out in the towns.

Councillor Jones raised a possible vacant building in the town, which is Wimpy. It seems that the premises has been vacated and this could be a prime location for a new business.

Mr. Highway was thanked for the report.

10. FLOWER FESTIVAL FUNDING REQUEST FROM TOWN COUNCIL

Mr. Highway informed the group that a request for funding has been received from the Town Council and read out the report.

The group were advised that the area forum budget has £14,182.00 available and invited the group to vote on the request for funding of £1,500 for the flower festival event.

The vote was put to the group and 12 voted in favour. The motion was carried.

It was requested that the Town Centre Management Group be noted as contributing to the event but was advised by Mr. Williams that leaflets had already been printed so could not be changed.

Mr. Highways suggested that at the awards presentation the group could be mentioned then as contributing to the event.

11. CAERPHILLY TOWN CENTRE SENGHENYDD MINING DISASTER MEMORIAL

Mr. Dallimore referred the group to the report and advised that Dolmans Solicitors approached the Council with a request to install a plaque outside Caerphilly Library to commemorate the mining disasters which occurred at Universal Colliery, Senghenydd. A local gentleman, recently deceased, has bequeathed the plaque.

The design was left for the Council to decide and the draft image was included in the report. Mr. Dallimore advised that the heritage group in Abertridwr has agreed the wording.

The dimensions will be 0.8m x 0.8m and produced in bronze.

Councillor Fussell asked if the design could be changed to the image of the girl with a younger sister instead. Mr. Dallimore advised that this could be passed back to the design group and a final decision will be made.

Concern was raised over the location of the plaque as it is going to be placed on the pavement and could be a hazard for tipping over or slippery. The location is also an area where vehicles park on the pavement as well.

Mr. Dallimore confirmed that they could possibly consider moving the location closer to the library entrance and all factors will be taken into consideration.

Recommendations moved

12. SUMMER EVENTS

Mr. Hudson apologised for not being able to provide the information previously. The group were advised that there are two events that will not be going ahead this year, which are the Tour of Britain and Proms in the Park.

Mr. Hudson ran through the events for the year and advised that there will be additional stewards to control access to Heol Trecastell, Brynccenydd and Bondfield Park. There will be

additional cones placed along St. Martin's Road.

There is a play day event, taking place in Morgan Jones Park on the 6th August. This is not an event run by the events team as it is funded by GAVO and they have asked for advice on holding the event. Mr. Hudson's team is seeking to offer support to the event.

Mr. Tidridge asked if there were specific areas for disabled parking for the event. Mr. Hudson advised that there would be drop off points on Crescent Road and provision with the 'park and ride' locations and regular scheduled bus tops used.

Caerphilly Access Group questioned whether the event would have walkways in place on grassed areas as this could be a problem for disabled users. They are happy to provide any assistance to the events holder. Mr. Hudson will feedback concerns to Park Services.

13. CAERPHILLY AUDIT

Caerphilly access group informed the group that there was a complaint submitted with regards to a number of issues with disabled doors being too heavy and not wide enough, toilet roll holder being too high to reach at the library and it has been brought to their attention that the response sent states that all works were done with approval from the access group. This is not the case.

The access group felt that the inspector was ignoring their concerns with regards to these issues.

Councillor Bevan advised that builders could appoint their own inspector as it does not have to be an inspector from the Council.

Councillor Jones stated that this was very unfortunate as the Council strongly supports the access group.

Mr. Highway requested that the group were provided with an update on homeless people in the town from the police.

Inspector Jones advised that there is an emerging trend with growth of homeless people across the towns. The police have been monitoring this on their patrols and other agencies such as Age Concern and Drug Aid Cymru are supporting these individuals

Mr. Highway advised that Age Cymru have submitted an application for shutters to be put up on their shop front due to homeless people sleeping in the doorway and during the nights have been subjected to individuals passing them and urinating on them.

Inspector Jones confirmed that police do carry out patrols to move people on. Any offence being committed will be dealt with accordingly. Support is provided to homeless and night shelters are available but unfortunately individuals choose not to use them.

There has been an incident recently where a number of homeless people have been residing in a property in Park Lane and the appropriate action has been taken and notices served.

A further meeting has been arranged for the 10th September to review this issue.

The police were thanked for their work and Mr. Highway wished to thank the Cleansing Team for their work also.

There were no other issues raised from the audit

The meeting closed 3.33 p.m.

CHAIRMAN



RISCA TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE, TREDOMEN PARK ON TUESDAY, 24TH JUNE 2014 AT 2.00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillors:

N. George, K. James

Together with:

B. Hancock (Community Councillor), D. Hobbs (Community Councillor), G. James (Clerk Risca East)

Also:

A. Highway (Town Centre Manager), A. Dallimore (Team Leader – Urban Renewal and Conservation), T. White (Waste Strategy and Operations Manager), P. Hudson (Marketing and Events Manager), A. Jones (Clerk)

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

The meeting was delayed from commencing, as not enough members were present to nominate and elect the Chairman. Mr. Highway left the meeting to discuss the protocol and how the meeting should proceed under the terms of reference with Officers in Legal Services. At 2.28 p.m. Angharad Price, a Barrister from Legal Services, came into the meeting and advised the group that the meeting could continue with the previous chair overseeing the meeting and that the voting of the chair be delayed until the next meeting.

At 2.30 p.m. Councillor George opened the meeting and advised that this item will be adjourned to the next meeting

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor George advised that this item would also be adjourned to the next meeting.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

E.M. Aldworth, D.T. Davies, P. Griffiths, D. Rees, M. Parker (Community Councillor), Ms. C. Mortimer (Clerk Risca Town Council), S. Wilcox (Assistant Town Centre Manager).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. TO NOTE PREVIOUS MINUTES OF MEETING DATED 18TH FEBRUARY 2014

The previous minutes were taken as read.

6. RECYCLING COLLECTIONS FROM COMMERCIAL LANE

Mr. White introduced himself to the group and apologised for not being able to attend previous meetings. Members were advised that the report presented to the group previously was the result of the Task and Finish Group, which was set up to look at where the recycling bins were collected.

Mr. White advised the group that the vehicles are far too large to travel down commercial lanes and there is nowhere for the vehicles to turn around if the BT site at the bottom of the lane is locked. Reversing vehicles has resulted in a number of accidents and this would not be possible in this area due to the size of the vehicles, which have been increased in size to enable larger amounts of waste to be collected.

Whilst members of the committee were dissatisfied with the decision they understood the reasons given and accepted that not collecting recycling from the lane was the safest option.

Mr. White was thanked for attending and for his report and then he left the meeting.

7. A FRAMES PROTOCOL

Mr. Highway advised the group that the report was for information as it has been brought to the group previously. If there were any concerns over the report they were to be made to Mr. Highway for him to take to the service area.

8. CUCKOO STATUE

Mr. Dallimore advised that there were 4 issues raised with this area.

The first issue is the location of the cuckoo statute and whether or not it could be moved to a different location. Mr. Dallimore advised that this could not happen until money is available.

The second issue is the cleanliness of the site. Mr. Dallimore informed the group that the owner is responsible for maintaining cleanliness of the site and if the Council were to arrange for the area to be tidied up, then consent from owners would be needed.

The Council will contact the owners and request that they maintain the site on a regular basis.

The third issue is the slow worms and whether or not they could be relocated. Mr. Dallimore advised that the Council's ecologist has stated that the slow worms could be removed but this would be at a cost. There are currently no funds available for this to be carried out.

The ecologist is looking into the possibility of spreading where the slow worms are housed around the plinth so that it is more aesthetically pleasing.

There is also a possibility that the slow worms could be housed underground beneath the statue. Costs will be looked at, but consent from the landowner would also be required.

The fourth issue is the advertising on the railings and fencing. Mr. Dallimore has spoken to the planning department who have confirmed that enforcement action will be taken for those who have not complied with planning legislation.

Members did confirm that since the last meeting they have noticed some of the advertisements have been removed.

Mr. Dallimore advised that highways and appropriate action taken would monitor this.

9. UPDATE ON TOILET BLOCK MURALS

Mr. Dallimore informed the group that the budget is available and designs agreed. Artist is free from 6th July to start works. Timeframe is 4 weeks dependant on the weather.

Chairman advised that the Community Council has agreed to pay to keep the toilets open on Sundays. Councillor Hancock raised concern over individuals abusing toilet block and is disappointed that these acts could result in toilets being closed if not monitored. This will be taken back to the community council.

Councillor Hancock raised concern over the amount of weeds surrounding the toilet block. Mr. Dallimore confirmed that Parks undertake spraying to kill the weeds and this will happen 3 to 4 times.

10. CHOOSE THE HIGH STREET

Mr. Highway presented his report, which informed the group that since the Christmas campaign feedback was brought to the group. Town Centre Management has been working on a number of platforms to raise consumer choice throughout the towns.

The aim of the campaign is to increase importance of supporting local retailers by promoting their businesses and raise awareness of consumer choice.

As part of the advertising, 5,000 bags have been handed out from the Customer First offices across the County Borough; all members were provided with a bag. Information will be going out to all businesses and local banks have been contacted and provided with leaflets to provide to potential new businesses.

Advertising will continue in a number of ways such as banners, billboards, twitter, facebook and youtube.

Mr. Highway informed the group that his team would see how the campaign goes through the summer and feedback at the next meeting.

Chairman thanked Mr. Highway for his hard work and report.

11. TOWN CENTRE IMPROVEMENT GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT-PROCESS CHART

Mr. Highway ran through the procedure explaining how the items are placed on the agenda and presented the chart to members for guidance.

12. RISCA AUDIT

Mr. Hudson informed the group that this exciting event is different from any other events they have put on. The theme is the Wild West, titled Hoe Down and Show Down and leaflets will be distributed shortly.

It is all-American themed and will include catering, funfair rides, shooting galleries and Country and Western music. There will also be a marquee with hay bales. The number of stalls is restricted for health and safety reasons as in the past a number of gazebos have blown over.

Mr. Hudson went on to say that feedback from the Christmas event was disappointing due to clash of dates with other events in the borough.

Mr. Highway confirmed that the event will go on the next audit report and Mr. Hudson will then be able to provide an update.

Mr. Dallimore advised that the new footbridge rear of Lidl's is still an ongoing matter and he will go back to Legal for an update as there is still an issue where Lidl's solicitors and Tesco's solicitors have not been corresponding with us.

Councillor Hobbs asked if Tesco decided to not go ahead with the bridge what would happen. Mr. Dallimore advised that there is no legal commitment however Lidl's would have to consent. All concerns will be referred to our Legal Department and Mr. Dallimore will report back.

Mr. Highway advised that this item will remain on the audit and any updates will be provided.

Mr. Dallimore informed the group that the Town Centre Action Plan has been presented to full Council and is now an official document. Councillor Hancock requested that the town council be more involved in any future matters in relation to the Town Centre Action Plan. This will be noted and Mr. Dallimore will look to build further relationship with the town council.

There were no further issues raised on the audit.

Meeting Closed at 3.14 p.m.

CHAIRMAN



YSTRAD MYNACH TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT PENALLTA HOUSE ON TUESDAY, 15TH JULY 2014 AT 2.00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Councillors:

A. Angel, M. James, J. Pritchard

Together with:

PC Carl Morgan (Gwent Police), CSO Rebecca Chilvers (Gwent Police), Mr. W. Jeff (Tredomen Allotments Association), Mr. K. Jones (Ystrad Mynach Community Partnership).

Also:

A. Highway (Town Centre Development Manager), S. Wilcox (Assistant Town Centre Manager), A. Dallimore (Team Leader – Urban Renewal & Conservation), A. Jones (Clerk).

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Mr Highway opened the meeting and asked for nominations for Chairman. Councillor Angel was nominated and seconded and all agreed. Councillor Angel accepted the position and continued with the meeting.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Angel asked for nominations for Vice Chairman. Councillor M James was nominated and seconded and all agreed. Councillor James accepted the position.

3. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors: D. Bolter, K. James, C. Mortimer (Clerk) and Inspector Bond (Gwent Police).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. TO NOTE THE PREVIOUS MINUTES OF MEETING 4TH MARCH

Councillor Pritchard requested that reference to C. Mortimer be noted as the Clerk to Gelligaer Community Council.

On point 2 of previous minutes it is to be noted that some members, this should have stated members of Community Partnership.

On paragraph 5 of point 4 it should read and so the group should wait to see how things work out.

The minutes were taken as read.

6. 'A' FRAMES PROTOCOL

Mr Highway advised the group that the report was for information as this report has been brought to the group previously. If there were any concerns over the report they were to be made to Mr. Highway for him to take up with the service area.

Members expressed concern over cluttered pavements as this does cause problems from pedestrians to pass and in particular wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs.

7. CHRISTMAS TREE PLANTING

Mr Dallimore introduced himself to the group and referred the group to the previous meeting. Investigations have been carried out as to the possibility of installing a permanent Christmas tree to be situated in Siloh Square.

On 31st March the Town Centre Management Team met with the Senior Arboricultural Officer, local members were invited but it was difficult for them to attend.

The Arboricultural Officer has advised that it would not be viable for a tree to be planted in Siloh Square for the following reasons:-

- There is insufficient room within the border area for the tree roots to grow and the tree pit would be made difficult with utility runs.
- There has been recent bed planting which would suffer with lack of light.
- With regular gritting in winter months the grit washed down would pollute the soil.

The only option really would be to look for an alternative site to locate the tree. After investigations, there are only two sites that could be considered where there would be sufficient room for the tree to grow and also have access to the power supplies for the lights.

There were two possible sites located: one is in the grounds of Ysbyty Ystrad Fawr, close to the war memorial and the other site is the land to the front of the Bryn Sion Baptist Church.

Members requested that the Arboricultural Officer write his comments and findings down and Mr. Dallimore can then pass these comments back to the group.

Mr. Jones (Ystrad Mynach Community Partnership) recommended to the group the possibility of having an artificial structure depicting a tree placed in the square.

Mr. Dallimore advised that there is a ready-made process in place to commission artwork but the problem would be funding the artwork. The group would need to discuss further and look at options and funding.

Chairman requested that Mr. Dallimore continue looking into the possibility of locating the tree in the hospital grounds, as Amber skips are keen to pay for the tree and the installation.

8. ARTWORK SILOH SQUARE

Mr Dallimore presented the group with photographs of the artwork currently in Siloh Square. The group were advised that the funding for the artwork came from the Section 106 Agreement from Tesco and was a project for the Urban Renewal team but there is no funding available for the upkeep.

Over time the artwork has come into disrepair and the artist has been back on a number of occasions to repair any damage but the artwork is deteriorating further.

Mr Dallimore informed the group that this area needs to be improved and opened the subject up for discussion. Members were asked to vote on two options.

It was agreed that this area is in need of repair; the police confirmed that this area is a problem where groups gather drinking and generally hanging around. The area needs to be utilised to prevent this going on, the group discussed the possibility of it being used as an events space.

Mr. Highway advised that an events space would be a good use of the area and adds vibrancy to the town. All other towns have an events space, which, is used to promote the area and increases footfall and can be used for different groups like the police to meet people.

The first option of removing the artwork and concentrate on developing the area for events was put to the vote. This would include removing the mosaic and the dome and replacing with pavements. Members voted and 5 were in favour of this option.

The second option to look at remedial works to the mosaic in order to reserve it. Members voted and there were no votes for this option.

Mr Dallimore is to investigate and take further and look into funding.

9. CHOOSE THE HIGH STREET

Mr. Highway presented his report, which informed the group that since the Christmas campaign feedback was brought to the group. Town Centre Management has been working on a number of platforms to raise consumer choice throughout the towns.

The aim of the campaign is to increase importance of supporting local retailers by promoting their businesses and raise awareness of consumer choice.

As part of the advertising, 5,000 bags have been handed out from the Customer First offices across the County Borough; all members were provided with a bag. Information will be going out to all businesses and local banks have been contacted and provided with leaflets to provide to potential new businesses.

Advertising will continue in a number of ways such as banners, billboards, twitter, facebook and youtube.

Mr. Highway confirmed that due to the campaign a new business has been attracted to the town and has been to view a premise in the town and are awaiting any developments.

The Chair thanked Mr. Highway for his hard work and report.

10. AUDIT

Councillor James requested an update on archway and signage was raised but Mr Dallimore advised that any budget would be prioritised for the works on Siloh Square.

There were no other issues raised on the audit.

Meeting closed 2.58 p.m.

CHAIRMAN



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

**SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEMBERS' ATTENDANCE – QUARTER 1 – 8TH MAY
2014 TO 30TH JUNE 2014**

**REPORT BY: ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES AND SECTION 151
OFFICER**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To report Members' levels of attendance at scheduled meetings of Caerphilly County Borough Council.

2. THE REPORT

2.1 Appendix 1 details Members' attendance for quarter 1 (8th May 2014 to 30th June 2014), at the following meetings:

- Council;
- Cabinet;
- Scrutiny Committees;
- Planning Committee;
- Audit Committee;
- Democratic Services Committee; and
- Sustainable Development Advisory Panel.

2.2 The information is compiled from attendance sheets signed by Members at these meetings.

2.3 The appendix also allows for a comparison with the same period in the preceding two years. When making comparisons to previous quarters/years, please note that overall averages given are the weighted average to reflect the number of meetings in each quarter.

2.4 Details for the next quarter (1st July 2014 to 30th September 2014) will be reported to the next appropriate meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.

3. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no specific equalities implications arising as a result of this report.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no specific financial implications arising as a result of this report.

5. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no specific personnel implications arising as a result of this report.

6. CONSULTATIONS

6.1 None.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 That Members note the content of the report.

8. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 To inform Members of attendance levels at scheduled meetings of Caerphilly County Borough Council from the Annual Meeting of Council, 2014.

Author: C. Evans (Committee Services Officer)

Background Papers:
Member attendance sheets

Appendices:
Appendix 1 Schedule of Members' Attendance 2012 to 2015

Quarterly Summary of Attendance Levels (Percentages)

AGM to AGM

	2012-2013					2013-2014					2014-2015				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
Council	89	88	85	81	84	87	82	82	88	85	84				84
Crime & Disorder		38		59	59		69		94	82					0
Education For Life	75	78	66	69	72	72	75	69	75	73	66				66
Health, Social Care & Wellbeing	88	75	85	88	84	75	66	78	69	72	75				75
The Living Environment															
Regeneration															
Regeneration and Environment	69	77	71	88	76	69	63	81	84	74	81				81
Policy & Resources	81	88	71	79	77	69	78	84	85	79	78				78
Planning Committee	75	83	80	74	78	75	82	85	89	83	85				85
Audit Committee		58	50	42	48	83	75	67	83	77	58				58
Democratic Services Committee		44	63	69	60	69		69	75	71	88				88
Sustainable Development Advisory Panel	73	45	64	45	61	64	64		64	64					0
Average Attendance per quarter	78	67	71	71	74	74	72	77	81	76	77				77
Cabinet	90	94	93	88	91	95	82	92	93	91	93				93

This page is intentionally left blank



REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

**SUBJECT: REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

**REPORT BY: ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES & SECTION 151
OFFICER**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report the Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 Forward Work Programmes are essential to ensure that Scrutiny Committee agendas reflect the strategic issues facing the Council and other priorities raised by Members, the public or stakeholders.

3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 The operation of scrutiny is required by the Local Government Act 2000 and subsequent Assembly legislation.

4. THE REPORT

- 4.1 The Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme identifies reports that are due to be presented to scrutiny during the period August to October 2014 and have followed consultation process which includes key stakeholders and the public.
- 4.2 The forward work programme is made up of reports which originate from a number of different sources; Cabinet pre-decision scrutiny reports, major consultation exercises, Ombudsman or other regulatory bodies which contain information about the Council's processes or performance, Task and Finish Group reports, budget monitoring reports and certain requests from committee members, members of the public, stakeholders and Council Officers.
- 4.3 For information, the latest Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme is attached at Appendix 1.

5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no specific equalities implications arising as a result of this report.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no specific financial implications arising as a result of this report.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no specific personnel implications arising as a result of this report.

8. CONSULTATIONS

8.1 There are no consultation responses that have not been included in this report.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 That Members note the Forward Work Programme.

10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 To improve the operation of scrutiny.

11. STATUTORY POWER

11.1 The Local Government Act 2000.

Author: Catherine Forbes-Thompson Scrutiny Research Officer
Consultees: Jonathan Jones Democratic Services Manager

Appendices:
Appendix 1 Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme

Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee Forward Work Programme – August to October 2014		
Subject Area	Report Title	Proposed Meeting Date
Pre-Decision Scrutiny	Caerphilly County Borough Local Development Plan: First Review up to 2031: Population and Household Growth Options	16 th September 2014
	Adopted CCBC LDP – Annual Monitoring Report	16 th September 2014
	Gwent Trading Standards Project full Business Case	28 th October 2014
	Conservation Strategy	28 th October 2014
Consultation & Information	Forward Work Programme	16 th September 2014
	Waste Management Issues	16 th September 2014
Performance Management; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WAO Service Performance Reports • Improvement Objectives • Council Self-evaluation • Service Improvement Plans 	<u>There are no reports for this area</u>	
Budget Monitoring	Community Schemes Budget	16 th September 2014
	MTFP – Public Protection	Special Scrutiny – 4 th September 2014
	MTFP – Regeneration & Planning	Special Scrutiny – 1 st October 2014
Ombudsman Reports	<u>There are no reports for this area</u>	
Task and Finish Group	<u>There are no reports for this area</u>	
Members/ Public Requests, Call-ins & CCfA	An overview of Communities First Projects to date, their aims and anticipated outcomes to date	28 th October 2014
Scrutiny of Designated Persons and Other Organisations	<u>There are no reports for this area</u>	

This page is intentionally left blank