

# 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](http://www.caerphilly.gov.uk)  
[www.caerffili.gov.uk](http://www.caerffili.gov.uk)

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

**Date: 24th September 2014**

Dear Sir/Madam,

A **Special** meeting of the **Regeneration and Environment Scrutiny Committee** will be held in the **Sirhowy Room, Penallta House, Tredomen, Ystrad Mynach** on **Wednesday, 1st October, 2014** at **5.30 pm** to consider the matters contained in the following agenda.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue 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 receive and consider the following report:-

- 3 Medium Term Financial Plan - Savings From Regeneration and Planning Services - Items For Consideration.

A greener place Man gwyrddach



**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



## SPECIAL REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 1ST OCTOBER 2014

**SUBJECT: MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – SAVINGS FROM REGENERATION  
AND PLANNING SERVICES – ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**REPORT BY: ACTING DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To consider Medium Term Financial contributions from Regeneration and Planning Services in accordance with the Cabinet Report – next stages of MTFP 2015/16 and 2016/17, dated 16th April 2014.

### **2. SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) agreed by Council on the 26<sup>th</sup> 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.
- 2.2 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 strand of the agreed budget strategy is a review of the 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.
- 2.3 This report outlines savings options for the Regeneration and Planning Division to support the agreed budget strategy. The first set of appendices offer savings with no compulsory redundancies, the second set of appendices details savings options from minimal impact to cutting the entire service, including details of financial, legal and service implications.
- 2.4 Appendices 1 to 2 provide further details of each option.
- 2.5 Members of the Scrutiny Committee will be aware of the letter from the Minister for Local Government on the 24<sup>th</sup> 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 on the 16<sup>th</sup> 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 Budget decisions impact on all Council strategies. This report relates to the Authority's Medium Term Financial Plan and the resultant efficient and effective use of revenue and capital resources moving forward.

### 4. THE REPORT

- 4.1 Regeneration and Planning operates a range of statutory and discretionary services. These are: Strategic and Development Management Planning, Building Control, Rights of Way, Street Naming and Numbering, Local Land Charges (Statutory) and Countryside and Landscape Services, including country parks, Arts and Tourism venues, Industrial and Business property portfolio, Business Support, Urban Renewal, Town Centre Management, Events and Marketing and EU Funding (all non-statutory). The service also delivers the Communities First Programme and the Rural Development Programme. The latter two are not included (apart from a match-funding saving) as they are almost entirely externally funded and so efficiencies would offer no financial saving to the authority. In many cases the discretionary services add value/contribute to the statutory ones. This is explained in the appendices to the report. Moreover, many discretionary services operate within legal and funding constraints which would have to be considered if Members wished to further explore savings in these areas. For example, in areas such as Countryside the statutory/discretionary split is not clear cut and total "closure" is not a realistic option.
- 4.2 The first table below lists savings which can be delivered without the option of redeployment/ compulsory redundancies – and whilst maintaining a service across both statutory and non-statutory services. The £151,000 proposed savings from statutory services is 14% of the statutory budgets which is greatly in excess of the 3% efficiencies proposed. However, as these are considered achievable whilst still delivering services and with no compulsory redundancies, it is felt important to put these before Members for consideration. Details of the savings without redundancies are all covered in detail in the first set of appendices (proforma numbers 1-21). The total saving from these proposals in 2015/2016 is £608,014 which is 12.6% of the Regeneration and Planning Services net budget. (These are put forward for consideration on top of the 12% saving of £715,000 which the Service delivered for 14/15.) In some services additional savings have been explored for 16/17 onwards as well. These savings are presented to Members as the first option.
- 4.3 The second set of appendices in table 2 (proformas 1-12) list net costs of all discretionary services. Members are where possible given details of some "medium" options – i.e. between the "no redundancy and total removal of the service options. Where it is either impractical to totally 'close' a discretionary service, the issues and constraints are explained – including where it is technically possible to close a service but where penalties such as grant repayments and legal responsibilities would negate any savings achieved for a considerable period. In addition some background information about what the services actually entail is provided. This is to ensure that Scrutiny Members are able to make fully informed comments/suggestions regarding any savings proposals.

**TABLE 1**

<b><u>Proposed Savings – (Without Redeployment/Compulsory Redundancies)</u></b>		
<b>Details are in Appendix 1</b>		
	<b><u>Statutory Services</u></b>	
Proforma 1	Reorganise Building Control	£10,000
Proforma 2	Reorganise Development Management	£96,000
Proforma 3	Delete Trainee Planner Post	£20,821
Proforma 4	Rights of Way, Budget Realignment	£25,000
	<b>Sub Total:</b>	<b><u>£151,821</u></b> (14% of statutory budgets)
	<b><u>Non-Statutory</u></b>	
	<b><u>Countryside &amp; Landscape Services</u></b>	
Proforma 5	Reorganise Ecology Team	£ 3,000
Proforma 6	Derelict Land Maintenance Budget Realignment	£10,000
Proforma 7	Country Parks – Income and Budget Realignment	£15,000
Proforma 8	Rural Development Team and Budget Realignment	£11,000
Proforma 9	Sustainable Development Team Budget Realignment	£13,000
Proforma 10	Section 106 Income	£13,000
	<b><u>Arts and Tourism Venues</u></b>	
Proforma 11	Theatre and Arts and the Blackwood Miners’ Institute Budget Realignment	£ 5,000
Proforma 12	Cwmcarn Forest Budget Realignment	£15,000
Proforma 13	Winding House Budget Realignment	£15,000
Proforma 14	Visit Caerphilly Centre – Budget Realignment	£16,000
Proforma 15	Llancaiach Fawr – Budget Realignment	£14,000
Proforma 16	<b><u>Industrial Property and Business Centres</u></b> Budget realignment	£50,000 (15/16)
Proforma 17	<b><u>Business Support</u></b> – Vacancy Management/Budget Realignment	£60,000
Proforma 18	<b><u>Urban Renewal</u></b> – Vacancy Management	£41,000
Proforma 19	<b><u>Events and Marketing</u></b> – Vacancy Management /Budget Realignment	£109,693
Proforma 20	<b><u>EU/Funding</u></b> – Budget Realignment	£ 7,500
Proforma 21	<b><u>Area Forum Budget</u></b> – Cease Provision	£72,000
	<b><u>Total Savings with no compulsory redundancies</u></b>	<b><u>£622,014</u></b>

**TABLE 2**

<b><u>DISCRETIONARY SERVICES</u></b>		<b>APPENDI X 1</b>	<b>APPENDIX 2</b>
<p>(Although several areas have statutory responsibilities and support statutory services such as Planning – therefore the statutory/discretionary split is not clear cut</p> <p><b>Details are in Appendix 2</b></p>		Table 1 (No Redundancies /Retain Service) Min. Option	Max. Total Service Cost – before any deductions for redundancies, disposals, security etc. – details of areas which will have to be taken into account as part of any decision to close or cease are included in the proformas
Proforma 1	Urban Renewal	£41,000	£222,514
Proforma 2	Town Centre Management	-	£115,994
Proforma 3	Business Support	£60,000	£483,638
Proforma 4	Events and Marketing	£109,693	£482,638
Proforma 5	Theatre and Arts & Blackwood Miners' Institute	-	£143,198
Proforma 6	Visit Caerphilly Centre	£5,000	£297,842
Proforma 7	Visit Caerphilly Centre	£16,000	£ 88,753
Proforma 8	Cwmcarn Forest Drive – Toursim Venue	£15,000	£280,974
Proforma 9	Winding House Museum & Heritage Service	£15,000	£283,328
Proforma 10	Llancaiach Fawr	£14,000	£381,845
Proforma 11	Country Parks and Ranger Services	£38,000	£311,623
Proforma 12	Countryside & Landscape (Support) Service	£ 3,000	£331,238
	Sustainable Development & Living Environment	£13,000	£130,620

## 5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are Equalities implications to options listed in Section 4 that must be recognised in order for proper consideration of the options to be made. It is likely that despite these issues, difficult decision will have to be made due to the current need to make such significant savings, however these implications must be recognised and understood as part of the process, otherwise decisions made could be open to challenge.
- 5.2 This report contains wide ranging proposals for savings within the Regeneration and Planning Services Division and represents the first stage of a longer process which will involve consultation with relevant groups and stakeholders. Any consultation on service reductions will have to be made in line with the Council's approved Public Engagement Strategy and the guidance in the Equalities Consultation and Monitoring document to ensure that the views of those potentially affected are taken into account.
- 5.3 The equality issues will need to be addressed as part of this consultation process, as any reduction in provision will potentially have a greater risk for those people in minority groups in the community, as service reductions could potentially increase their sense of isolation and vulnerability, by reducing their ability to interact with young people from different backgrounds.

## **6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The financial implications are dealt with in the main body of the report and the relevant implication notes.

## **7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 The relevant personnel implications have been identified in the main body of the report and the relevant implication notes.
- 7.2 Non-statutory areas will require further consultation with staff and trade unions if they are to be implemented. Consultation will be undertaken with staff and their designated representatives as appropriate.

## **8. CONSULTATIONS**

- 8.1 The report reflects the views of the listed consultees.

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 9.1 The views of the Scrutiny Committee are sought in relation to the suggested savings from the Regeneration and Planning service.

## **10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 10.1 To ensure that Scrutiny Members' views are taken into account in the future budget setting process.

## **11. STATUTORY POWER**

- 11.1 Local Government Acts 1972 and 2000.

Author: Pauline Elliott – Head of Regeneration and Planning

E-mail: [elliop@caerphilly.gov.uk](mailto:elliop@caerphilly.gov.uk)

Consultees: Councillor Ken James – Cabinet Member (Regeneration, Planning & Sustainable Development)

Sandra Aspinall – Acting Deputy Chief Executive

Tim Stephens – Development Control Manager

Rhian Kyte – Team Leader (Strategic & Development Plans)

Paul Cooke – Team Leader (Sustainable Dev/Living Environment)

Phil Griffiths – Acting Countryside & Landscape Services Manager

Helen Hotchkiss – Principal Admin Officer

Ian MacVicar – Group Manager, Operations

Tina McMahon – Community Regeneration Manager

Jan Bennett – Group Manager, Business Enterprise Services

Antony Bolter – Group Manager (Strategy & Funding)

Allan Dallimore – Team Leader (Urban Renewal)

Paul Hudson – Marketing and Events Manager

Mike Eedy – Finance Manager

Nicole Scammell – Acting Director of Corporate Services

Gal Williams – Acting Head of Legal Services & Monitoring Officer  
Sian Phillips – HR Manager  
David A Thomas – Senior Policy Officer (Equalities & Welsh Language)

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Savings with no compulsory redundancies

Appendix 2 Non-statutory services where cuts will involve compulsory redundancies, details of total costs and other savings options/constraints



**APPENDIX 1****SAVINGS WHICH DO NOT INVOLVE REDEPLOYMENT/REDUNDANCIES****Proforma 1**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Reorganise Building Control and delete 1 Team Leader post</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	Remove 1 Team Leader post and replace with Building Inspector - £10,000 2015/16 Since 2012/13 there have been 2 x Team Leaders in Building Control, both on honoraria, following the retirement of the previous Manager. This proposal involves a restructure which will mean that there is one team only instead of two.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A – assuming retirement – otherwise there could be pension release costs if member of staff of retirement age were not to achieve successful redeployment.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A – assuming retirement – otherwise notice period would have to be factored in.
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Possible salary protection if retirement does not proceed.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy / Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	1 post grade reduction or retirement.
<b>Other Issues:</b>	
There are five staff only in team – it is considered that 1 Manager is sufficient.	

**Proforma 2**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Re-organise Development Management</b>
Savings (£):	1 x grade 12 post} £55,000 1 x grade 10 post} <u>£37,000</u> p/t £92,000
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	Previously, planning applications have been dealt with by 3 area teams (South, East and North). This saving is possible by restructuring staff into 2 area teams, deleting one Team Leader post and one Senior Planner post. (Both are vacant posts as result of retirements).
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Nil – vacant posts.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	N/A
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Nil – vacant posts.  Development Management work would be redistributed between the two proposed new teams – could cause capacity issues but application numbers have fallen in recent years due to the recession. There is a loss of expertise to the service but this is considered manageable.
<b>Other Issues:</b>	.

**Proforma 3**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Delete post of Planning Student/Trainee Planner</b>
Savings (£):	£20,821 (split between Development Management & Strategic Planning)
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	The Trainee Planner is employed on a one year post sharing time between Strategic and Development Management Planning. Since no suitable candidate was attracted this year the post is offered as a budget saving.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Nil – vacant post.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Nil – vacant post.
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 4**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Public Rights of Way</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£25,000 15/16 ROW is a statutory function. It is proposed that a saving of £25,000 can be made by using fewer external contractors, using in-house staff/volunteers and the third sector to cover some of the work. This is 30% of the £84,000 budget available for maintenance work. It is not considered that this will have a major impact on current staff.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Minimal risk.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

## **Proforma 5**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Ecology Team – Replacement staff member with a trainee post</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£3,000 15/16 A vacancy in the Ecology Team means we can recruit on a lower grade – thus saving 3k per annum.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	None
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	N/A
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 6**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Environmental/Derelict Land Maintenance Budget Reduction</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£10,000 2015/16 This saving can be made by using in-house staff, the third sector and volunteers to undertake some maintenance instead of external contractors. This represents an 18% reduction of the £55,000 in the budget. It is not anticipated that this will have a significant impact on current staff.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Can be implemented immediately.
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Low
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

## **Proforma 7**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Country Parks &amp; Countryside Management</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	Operational efficiencies of £15,000 (budget realignment).  Savings have been identified of £15,000 (10%) of materials and maintenance budget.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Medium/low risk.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 8**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Rural Development Programme (RDP): Reduction in Match Funding Budget. (Budget Realignment)</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£11,000 15/16 onwards RDP allocations are becoming clear for 2015/20 at time of writing. The vast majority of RDP is externally funded. At present indications suggest that CCBC would require to make a match funding contribution of c. £105,000 p.a., which would represent a saving of £11,000 p.a.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:  Not Achieving Timeframe:	Medium risk – dependant on final details of the programme – TBC, but likely at time of writing.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	
RDP is funded by the European Union. Allocations for the new programme are being confirmed at time of writing. The RDP Team deliver integrated work with Countryside, the Rural Development Team and Sustainable Development as well as Communities First and Business Support. It therefore has synergies and delivers joint initiatives with statutory and non-statutory services and external partners.	



**Proforma 9**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Sustainable Development Team – Projects/Contractor Budget</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£13,000 – Budget realignment (total budget = £32,762) 2015/16 The Sustainable Development Team have already lost one post in the MTFP for 14/15, delivering a saving of £38,983. Together with the contribution of £13,000 income, this equates to 30% of the cost of the team. The reduction in budgets can be partly supplemented by income – team is raising income on initiatives such as solar schools work, and is very successful in obtaining external funding from a variety of sources.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	
Sustainability is non-statutory but is high on the WG agenda, supported by legislation.	

**Proforma 10**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Section 106 Management Payments (Budget Realignment)</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	13,000 15/16 Countryside receive £13,000 p.a. from a 25 year S.106 Agreement to deliver maintenance along the Sirhowy Enterprise Way. Delivering this from existing budgets enables £13,000 to be offered as a saving.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	N/A
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 11**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Theatre and Arts and The Blackwood Miners Institute</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£5,000 additional income – budget realignment. 15/16 The BMI underwent a £1.6 million refurbishment in 13/14 aimed at increasing accessibility and making the facility more sustainable. The £5,000 additional income is on top of budget realignment of £25,000 in 14/15 – making £30,000 over 2 years. In addition, a staff restructure in 13/14 delivered £27,000 in savings.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	NA
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Low
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 12**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Tourism Venue – Cwmcarn Forest</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	Increase income by £15,000 – budget realignment. 15/16 Cwmcarn is a successful tourist venue which has increased its income considerably in recent years by budget realignment, raising income and enhancing facilities. This proposal offers to increase income by £15,000 by increasing sales and monitoring expenditure, this is in addition to the £25,000 saving already generated as part of the 2014/2015 MTFP making £40,000 over 2 years.. If the trend continues a similar sum could be offered for 16/17.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Medium – dependant on weather for visitor numbers.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 13**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Winding House – Museums &amp; Heritage Service</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£15,000 income increase (budget realignment). 15/16 reduced operating costs and cost savings. This is a combination of budget realignment and reduced operating costs.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Medium
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 14**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Visit Caerphilly – Tourist Information Centre and Café</b>	
Savings (£):	£16,000	£15,000
Financial Year:	15/16	16/17
Comment:	The net cost of the Visit Caerphilly Centre is £88,753 (13/14). This has reduced from £99,239 In 2013/2014 due to income generation. Income in the coffee shop and from sale of gifts and souvenirs is on an upward trend and it is considered that an increase of £16,000 for next financial year is achievable. In addition, following recent trends, a similar figure can be offered for 16/17.	
<b>Cost to Implement</b>		
Staff Costs:		
Resource Costs:		
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>		
Consultation:		
Statutory Process:	N/A	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>		
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Risk of not achieving – but saving is on trend.	
Not Achieving Timeframe:		
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>		
Redundancy:		
Redeployment:	N/A	
Redirected Resource:		
<b>Other Issues:</b>		

**Proforma 15**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Llancaiach Fawr Manor – Increase Income</b>		
Savings (£):	£14,000	£20,000	£23,000
Financial Year:	15/16	16/17	17/18
Comment:	<p>Llancaiach Fawr's income has been increased significantly in recent years by staff restructuring, use of volunteers alongside paid staff and increasing income from conferences, weddings and other events. There was a contribution of £25,000 from the 14/15 MTFP – meaning a saving of £39,000 over 2 years.</p> <p>Following these trends and taking into account the Heritage Lottery Grant of £1 million which will improve access to the historic Manor House it is considered that additional income as detailed above is achievable for 16/17 and 17/18.</p>		
<b>Cost to Implement</b>			
Staff Costs:	N/A		
Resource Costs:	N/A		
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A		
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>			
Consultation:	N/A		
Statutory Process:	N/A		
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>			
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Risk of not achieving income – although proposed saving is on trend.		
Not Achieving Timeframe:			
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>			
Redundancy:	N/A		
Redeployment:	N/A		
Redirected Resource:	N/A		
<b>Other Issues:</b>			

**Proforma 16**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Industrial Property and Business Centres</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£100,000 budget realignment (£50,000 * 2 years). 2015/16 (and 16/17) The industrial/office portfolio as run by Regeneration and Planning is self funding and generates in excess of £850,000 in revenue to help support other services. By contributing to maximise occupancy and conference bookings based on recent trends it is considered that an additional £50,000 income can be raised for 2015/16. Dependant on how this progresses an additional £50,000 could be offered for 16/17. At the time of writing we have only one vacant industrial unit out of a portfolio of 249 units. In our office portfolio we have 14 vacant office units out of a total of 49 – in 3 business centres – on the Tredomen campus. All office units at Oakdale are fully let.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Not achieving income – although recent performance makes this seem feasible.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	



**Proforma 17**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Business Support</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	1 x grade 10 post (vacant) - £50,000 Cut in subscriptions budget - £10,000 2015/16 A Manager has left the team and the closure of a project has enabled work to be redistributed amongst other team members. It is considered that a further £10,000 can be offered from the subscriptions and training budget.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Nil – vacant post
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	N/A
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Nil – vacant post
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 18**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Urban Renewal Team</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	1 x grade 9 post - £41,000 15/16 Following retirement, the Urban Renewal Team has a vacancy and it is proposed to offer this up for a saving. Although some capacity is potentially lost it is envisaged that work can be redistributed amongst existing staff and that this is manageable..
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Nil – vacant post
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	N/A
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Nil – vacant post
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 19**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Reorganise Staff/Reduce Events Activity</b>
Savings (£):	1 x grade 9 Marketing Officer (currently vacant) - £40,693 Vacant Post – FTE has returned @ 3 days Saving £14,000 Removal of Bargoed ice rink (intended as temporary project) £20,000 Increase fees and sponsorship £15,000 Reduce advertising 16% (from marketing Budgets) <u>£20,000</u> £109,693
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	Further savings can be delivered for 16/17 by reducing paid advertising and increasing sponsorship and income – other options are detailed in appendix 2.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Nil – vacant post
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Can be introduced from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2015.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Minimal risk.
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Low risk. Core events will be protected. Sponsorship can be further pursued and social media used more extensively to reduce paid costs. The proposal cuts the Events Team budget by 20% whilst still enabling core services including community events to continue. In addition, by not operating the Bargoed ice-rink, car parking services will benefit by an estimated £1,500 of income which they lose when their car park is out of action.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Nil – vacant post
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 20**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>EU/Funding (Budget Realignment)</b>
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£7,500 15/16 Two retirements have led to a redistribution of duties.  This delivers a saving of £7,500 for 15/16.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	N/A
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation: Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	N/A
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	N/A
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

**Proforma 21**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Area Forum Budget</b>
Savings (£):	£72,000 annual budget. (A reserve of £162,000 also exists in the budget – to be subject to separate discussions).
Financial Year:	
Comment:	This budget is used to fund environmental schemes throughout the County Borough, usually adding value to schemes promoted by community groups. Some ward members spend the allocation for their wards regularly but despite this a large sum of money remains. It must be noted that these are <u>additional</u> schemes – for benches, notice boards etc. It is in addition to core maintenance budgets. The proposal is to remove the budget for 15/16 – saving £72,000.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	
Resource Costs:	N/A
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	
Statutory Process:	N/A
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	N/A
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	
Redeployment:	N/A
Redirected Resource:	
<b>Other Issues:</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADDITIONAL POSSIBLE SAVINGS TO NON-STATUTORY AREAS (All requiring Service removal/reduction and redeployment/redundancies)**

**Proforma 1**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Urban Renewal</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £222,514 from full deletion of the service. 5 FTEs (1 is externally funded) – plus Manager’s post which currently funds a secondment to support Regeneration Programme (cost = £61,356). Total cost of service = £222,514 Option 1 = £41,000 – from not filling vacant post (proforma 18) Other options – savings from 16/17 achievable when secondment ends – Manager’s post = £61,356 (option 2 from 16/17) Remaining 4 posts = £181,514.
Financial Year:	
Comment:	
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Further costs
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation will be required to be undertaken with affected staff and relevant notice periods factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	
<b>Other Issues:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The team could be reduced in size with a corresponding affect on projects. Staff would require to remain in place to deliver any funding schemes already underway.</li> <li>• The team generates income from working on and charging capital projects and its removal/reduction could impact on the Council’s ability to attract European funding for large development projects.</li> <li>• The ability to deliver comprehensive physical regeneration in town and village centres and to bid for funding to achieve this would be greatly diminished.</li> <li>• This team has been responsible for achieving grant funding of many millions for regeneration projects in recent years and this expertise would be reduced or lost.</li> <li>• Multi million pound project funding opportunities under the new EU Structural Funds Programme and other initiatives would be lost. (The Team has secured £28 million funding for Caerphilly in the last 8 years).</li> </ul>	

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Town Centre Management</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £115,994: total cost of the service
Financial Year:	15/16
Comment:	Including 2 fte staff posts £78,076 and other operational costs of £37,918. The TCM Team consists of 2 staff members – a Manager and Assistant. The Team supports Town Centre Partnerships and delivers promotional activity for 5 Caerphilly Towns – Caerphilly, Blackwood, Bargoed, Risca and Ystrad Mynach. One option could be to reduce the operational budget to make a small saving. The Team could cut its operational budget as a second (option 2) by 20% - saving c. £7,000. Another (option 3) would be reduce to 1 member of staff and place within the Urban Renewal Team – this would reduce activity considerably and make it very difficult to deliver a service across 5 towns.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation periods with affected staff and relevant notice periods will require to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Redundancy/redeployment costs to be calculated
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	
<b>Other Issues:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The function costs £78,076 (salaries) and with a budget of £37,917 for other operational costs including marketing and promotion, office costs, banners etc.. The staff also draw on other services such as the Reactive Maintenance Team which sits within Engineering Services. This Team is also under review as part of the MTFP). They commission work – raised by the community businesses and members for that team to carry out. They also draw on the area Forum Budget and Community Assets Budget to deliver physical schemes raised by the communities.</li> <li>The Team contribute to the maintenance of attractive town centres, increasing footfall. This means our vacancy rates are lower than other towns in SE Wales.</li> <li>They also act as a first point of contact for grant schemes operated by colleagues in Business Support and Urban Renewal. Town Centre Management contributes to the Welsh Government's reducing poverty agenda.</li> </ul>	





<b>Other Issues:</b>	
----------------------	--

- The staff savings if the function was cut totally are £311,235 and this includes £50,000 for one vacant posts included in appendix 1 proforma 17 but this excludes redeployment and redundancy costs.
- This team administers grants to businesses and social enterprises. Most grants are externally funded with a budget of £62,000 within the Business Development overall budget of £483k.
- The Team also administers grants to community organisations.
- The Team, like other regeneration staff work with colleagues in planning regeneration, property, housing, highways to act as a 'One Stop Shop' for business enquiries. They have strong links with the Caerphilly Business Forum and a large number of local businesses. They offer economic development advice to inform planning applications and together with other regeneration colleagues assist with economic data to support/inform the strategic development management process.
- Removal of this service will mean the loss of the only Council department dedicated to serving the local business community and creating and safeguarding jobs.
- They run regular events for local businesses to inform them of funding, training opportunities and are a key link for WHQs (Housing) and Communities First.
- Some staff would have to remain in post until the current round of business and social enterprise grants are delivered (circa 3 staff until June 2015 and 2 until August 2015).
- The Business Grants and Social Enterprise schemes created a total of 487 jobs in 2013 and safeguarded more than 4,400. The team out performs most other Business Teams in SE Wales in jobs creation.
- For many small business start ups the grants available through this team is their only source of possible grant funding. Business survival rates are good – at 85% still trading after 1 year – which is well above average. UK average is 55% survival.

**Proforma 4**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Events and Marketing</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £482,638 from full deletion of service.
Financial Year:	Costs – staff = £209.736 (5.8 FTE) (1 vacant post is offered in Option 1 – on proforma 19 saving £40,693, plus £14,000 (due to a part-time vacancy) £53,714 – tourism, marketing £68.938 – Inward investment marketing £150,250 – Events costs – (net of £192,000 income) Total net budget = <u>£482,638</u> Option 1 (proforma 19) offers savings of £109,693 – 23% of the budget via vacancy management cutting and budget realignment.
Comment:	
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation with affected staff and notice periods will required to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.

**Other Issues:**

- If the team is removed or reduced further than the 20% offered in appendix 1 proforma 19 above then all major events – Big Cheese, Blackwood Beach Party, Christmas Markets etc. would be under threat. The team also offers advice, support and expertise to other departments e.g. the Caerphilly 10k race and community groups e.g. the event to mark the centenary of the Senghenydd Mining Disaster. The Urdd Eisteddfod is already arranged for 2015 and would need to be supported. The team raise considerable income to offset the costs of the events and attract thousands of visitors to the area with direct and indirect spend into the economy. Core events generate an estimated economic impact of £2.2 million. (This is calculated using the STEAM model, which is the methodology used UK wide for calculating the economic benefits of tourism and visitor numbers to a locality).
- Cutting/reducing the team and activity would also impact on the promotion of Caerphilly as a tourism business restoration and the pleasure which many residents get from the events.
- Further savings can be made by increasing income, raising sponsorship and maximising external funding – which will make some events almost self-funded.
- There are many options around reducing core and / or community events, reducing marketing etc. which can be explored following guidance from Members.
- Members should note that having an Events Team means we can deliver events with no Council operational budget except for staff time (money provided by community organisations, external funding etc.).
- Other even more drastic options could be explored, dependant on the aspirations of Members.
- Other possible savings options
  - Option 2
    - (i) Option 1 plus reducing programme plus charge entry fees – e.g. Big Cheese, Funfair – possible savings £25,000. (Drastic for Big Cheese)
  - Option 3 (short of totally cutting service)
    - (ii) Realigning brochure to produce electronic version only - £12,000.

These 3 options do not include staff reductions/redundancies which would be inevitable if Members decided to proceed.

**Proforma 5**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Theatre and Arts and the Blackwood Miners' Institute</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £297,842: from Full closure of BMI Saving £143,198: from Full deletion of Arts Development  This includes 9.7 fte staff (BMI) and 2.3 fte staff (Arts Development)
Financial Year:	15/16
Comment:	This is the net budget saving after income generation of £247,616 for the BMI as the BMI generates income to cover 45% of its gross running costs.  As an alternative to full closure, savings of £5,000 are proposed in 2015/2016 from increased income generation (see appendix 1 proforma 11) with a possibility of future further savings.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Securing/mothballing building – substantial costs to be calculated.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation with affected staff and notice periods will required to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.

<b>Other Issues:</b>	
----------------------	--

- The net cost of the BMI has reduced because of operational efficiencies and a restructure from £365,297 in 13/14. The authority invested £1.6 million in the building (2012/13). This was intended to reduce maintenance costs moving forward as the building is now in good order and lends itself much better to a modern, flexible community facility (improved income reflects this).
- The BMI is the only professional arts venue in the Borough. It is used by local community and amateur groups of all ages enabling them to perform in first class facilities.
- There were 31,000 theatre attendances in 13/14 and 21,000 visitors to the building.
- Arts Development draws down considerable amounts of external funding for a range of youth projects, delivered not just at the BMI but in communities throughout the Borough including Communities First areas, which are the areas of greatest need in the County Borough.
- If the BMI were closed then residents of the Borough would have to go elsewhere to visit the theatre/pantomime etc. meaning that income would be lost from the area.
- Partial closure or a reduction in programme as a cost-saving exercise has been considered. However, the BMI is currently open 6 days a week with an average income of £2,595 (not including the pantomime). To close 1 day per week would save £237 per week on staffing costs against a loss of potential income of £432.50 from room hire, shows and workshops. (The BMI's income is not subject to seasonal fluctuations like some other venues).
- The BMI has charitable status which means the building cannot be sold for a capital receipt – it would have to be transferred to another charity – (Charity Commission).

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Visit Caerphilly Centre</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £88,753: from Full Closure of the Visitor Centre  This includes 3 full time staff posts, 2 p/t posts plus 2 weekend posts
Financial Year:	15/16
Comment:	This is the net budget saving after income generation of £83,861 as the Visitor centre generates income covering 49% of running costs. <u>Option 1</u> As an alternative to full closure, savings of £16,000 are proposed from increased income generation (see appendix 1 proforma 14) with a possibility of further savings in future years.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	
Resource Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Costs of disposal of the building – tbc.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Relevant consultation and notice periods for affected staff would have to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	
<b>Other Issues:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased income has reduced costs considerably in recent years by coffee shop income and sale of local products and gifts.</li> <li>The facility is the main Tourist Information Centre in the County Borough visited by 233,000 visitors and patrons in a year. However its proximity and prime view of Caerphilly Castle means that it is popular with locals as well as tourists, who stop for a coffee at all times of the year and buy gifts and souvenirs.</li> <li>Other attractions, accommodation providers facilities benefit from the Visitor Centre as it is able to refer/signpost visitors to other locally available facilities.</li> <li>The facility could be closed and sold for a capital receipt and if necessary some provision for tourist information facilities moved into the Library, which may safeguard one or more posts. However, the building does not easily adapt to other uses and in the current climate it would be unlikely to generate a large capital receipt. Net savings of disposing or renting the building to another party would be fairly low – est. £34,000 because of loss of income generation.</li> <li>If current trends continue income could be increased by £16,000 (as in appendix 1) which would reduce net costs to £66,000 whilst preserving jobs and the service.</li> <li>Partial closure (2 days per week would offer a minimal saving of £1,000 – after lost income – based on recent performance.</li> </ul>	

**Proforma 7**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>		<b>Cwmcarn Forest Drive – Tourism Venue</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £280,974: from Full closure of Cwmcarn Visitor Centre / Country Park. This includes 8 full time FTEs staff plus 6 p/t and seasonal staff	
Financial Year:	2015/2016	
Comment:	<p>NB: In theory Cwmcarn and the other Country Parks which sit in Countryside Services are non statutory. For this reason they are included, for Members information. However, since we run them we incur a huge raft of legal responsibilities. It is not practical to “close” country parks totally. All that is possible is reduction in maintenance, events, educational and health programmes and facilities.</p> <p>This is the net budget saving after income generation of £339,000 as Cwmcarn generates income covering 55% of running costs.</p> <p>Savings of £15,000 are proposed in 2015/2016 from increased income generation (see appendix 1 proforma 12) with a possibility of further savings in future years. Additional staff reductions/savings can be explored – short of total closure, which is unachievable in any case.</p>	
<b>Cost to Implement</b>		
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored..	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>		
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Relevant consultation and notice periods for affected staff would have to be factored in.	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>		
Not Achieving Cost Savings: Not Achieving Timeframe:	Raft of legal responsibilities. Total closure of the Park is impossible because of these.	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>		
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.	
	.	



Other Issues:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cwmcarn Forest has received significant European Funding in the past years to enable the site to develop and to improve facilities. Closure may lead to claw back of grants.</li><li>• Over 250,000 visitors came to the site in 13/14.</li><li>• Cwmcarn is a key element in the SE Wales Mountain Bike Centre of Excellence. It now offers two cross-country trails and two downhill courses.</li><li>• Service/facilities reduction will impact tourism activity in a wider area due to the number of bike shops, B&amp;Bs, small hotels, pubs etc. who benefit from visitors to the facility.</li><li>• Options to save money such as reducing the menu in the cafe to operate as a coffee shop. However, the savings look unlikely to exceed the £180,000 which the cafe raises in income.</li><li>• Officers are constantly looking at ways of raising income and reducing costs. Members will note that appendix 1 offers budget realignment (raised income), saving £15,000 p.a. without reducing staff or services.</li><li>• As far as partial closure of the centre is concerned, looking at this year's income, a 2 day closure would potentially deliver a net <u>loss</u> of £15,000 p.a. – because of lost income.</li></ul>	

**Proforma 8**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Winding House Museum &amp; Heritage Service</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £283,328: from Full closure of the Winding House  This includes 7 FTE staff
Financial Year:	2015/2016
Comment:	This is the net budget saving after income generation of £26,842 as the Winding House generates income covering 8.5% of its running costs.  As an alternative to full closure, £15,000 is proposed as a saving in 2015/2016 from reduced operational expenditure (see appendix 1 proforma 13) with a possibility of further savings in future years.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Relevant consultation and notice periods with affected staff would have to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Costs of maintaining listed building and winding machine.
Not Achieving Timeframe:	Costs of storing artefacts.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	

Other Issues:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Low income – Museum status means no entry fees are charged.</li><li>• The Winding House is the only museum in the County Borough. There are regulations around the return of artefacts to donors and storing, “archiving” the collection in special climate-controlled conditions. This has ongoing revenue implications.</li><li>• The Grade II* Listed Winding House and engine are maintained and operated weekly by an expert volunteer and staff. Non usage would damage the valuable machine and there are legal responsibilities which we have to fulfil, which if not adhered to, could prove very costly.</li><li>• Loss of educational opportunities which would see the withdrawal of curriculum led heritage services for schools in the Winding House.</li><li>• Loss of volunteering and work experience opportunities which have led to 11 people since 2008 accessing paid work building on skills learned volunteering at the Museum.</li><li>• The Winding House is a key tourism facility and community resource in the north of the Rhymney Valley. The Museum sits in a Communities First cluster and generates income in the local area. Closure would see an end to the social, economic and educational benefits which heritage can provide to a deprived area.</li><li>• Special exhibitions – such as that to commemorate the centenary of World War I attract national press due to their quality. This benefits local people who see the direct link to their heritage and generates free publicity for the County Borough, benefitting the visitor economy.</li><li>• Closing the Museum on Mondays. Tuesdays and weekends would mean a small net loss of £850 p.a.</li><li>• Possible claw back of EU Funding if facility is closed.</li></ul>

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Llancaiach Fawr</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £381,834: from Full closure of Llancaiach Fawr  This includes 17.22 FTE Staff Plus c.30 relief staff
Financial Year:	15/16
Comment:	This is the net budget saving after income generation of £443,592 as Llancaiach Fawr generates income covering 54% of its running costs.  Option 1 offers savings of £57,000 over 3 financial years are proposed from increased income generation (see appendix 1 proforma 15)
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation periods with affected staff and relevant notice periods will require to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	Cost of repaying grants – over £1 million. Cost of securing building.
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.

<b>Other Issues:</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Llancaiach Fawr is a unique heritage asset in the County Borough – a Grade I Listed Building – a valuable resource to the County Borough and S.E. Wales.</li> <li>• The Manor is hosting the Urdd Eisteddfod in 2015, one of the biggest national events in the Welsh calendar. This would constrain any closure in the next financial year.</li> <li>• The Manor is currently undergoing a £943,000 refurbishment funded by the Heritage Lottery fund. Grant conditions constraint possibilities of disposal/closure as if strict terms laid down by the HLF are not adhered to, CCBC are liable to repay the grant.</li> <li>• Other grants from Cadw and the RDP totalling £175,000 would also have to be repaid if the Manor was sold to a third party.</li> <li>• The Manor is becoming more popular as a wedding/conference venue. Cancellation of pre-booked weddings will generate adverse publicity.</li> <li>• Countryside Service use the adjacent field for grazing – alternative provision would be required.</li> <li>• The facility has greatly reduced its operational costs in recent years via restructuring and income generation. On current trends, additional income of £14,000 is achievable for 15/16 – see appendix A. Additionally it is believed that this improvement can be sustained with income, reaching £500,000 by 17/18. This would reduce the net operating cost of the Manor to £325,000.</li> <li>• Llancaiach is already closed on a Monday. Closing on a Tuesday would lead to a net loss of £44,975 because of lost income. This would also have a detrimental effect on educational visits.</li> </ul>

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Country Parks + Ranger Services</b>
Savings (£):	<p>Saving £311,623: from Full closure of the 5 country parks. In reality this is not a feasible option. The cost is made available because Country Parks are a 'discretionary' service.</p> <p>This includes 5 Country Parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parc Cwm Darren                    £95,818</li> <li>• Pen y Fan Pond                    - £13,416</li> <li>• Parc Penallta                    £105,739</li> <li>• Bargoed Country Park            £32,838</li> <li>• Sirhowy Country Park            £90,644</li> </ul> <p>And will include 14 fte staff (wardens &amp; rangers) plus 2 centrally funded trainees and 2 seasonal staff plus general running costs.</p>
Financial Year:	2015/2016
Comment:	<p>This is the net budget of operating the Country Parks after income generation of £109,004 which primarily relates to car park charging (£85,000) introduced as part of the 2014/2015 MTFP savings, but also includes camp site fees &amp; hires etc. Pen Y Fan Pond, including £21,250 car park charging income generates a net profit to the Council, so there is no saving to be generated.</p> <p>Option I, £15,000 of savings are proposed in Appendix 1 proforma 7 via budget realignment.</p> <p>As explained in proforma 7 above (Cwmcarn) – although the Country Parks are “discretionary” the fact that we operate them makes us liable under a whole raft of legislation for maintaining sites, buildings, reservoirs and wildlife habitats within them. In reality our only option is to reduce costs and maintenance, including educational, health and community schemes and raise income e.g. from car parking – we cannot “close” the Country Parks.</p>
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs as a Consequence:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:  Statutory Process:	Consultation periods with affected staff and relevant notice periods will require to be factored in.
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.

**Other Issues:**

As well as land management, the Ranger Service deal with:-

- Habitats and species management.
- Education and training – including managing volunteers, many of which go on to secure permanent employment
- Invasive species (recent outbreaks of Phytophthora – Larch Disease and Chalara – Ash Die Back).

Numerous partnerships exist with Natural Resources Wales, Coleg Gwent etc. (The Council's) Passport Scheme helps secure additional funding for educational and environmental projects. Partnerships with the Police, Community Safety Wardens and Fire Brigade tackle anti social behaviour. Staff reductions which impact on partnerships could actually lose more money than they save because of loss of external funding.

The beauty of the parks helps promote Caerphilly as a place to live, work and visit as well as contributing to the health agenda by providing safe and accessible spaces to walk and cycle. The Ranger Service supports other Council activities including Emergency Planning, Social Services, Events, Environmental Health, Engineers, Education etc.

There are a raft of legal constraints which would affect any cuts/closures in the Country Parks. These include:-

- The Countryside Act 1968;
- Occupiers Liabilities Act 1957;
- Occupiers Liabilities Act 1984;
- The Reservoirs Act 1975;
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990;
- Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010;
- Wildlife and Countryside Act;
- EU Habitat and Species Directive.

Therefore any proposal to reduce service would need careful consideration. "Closure of the parks is not a realistic possibility. Another option would be to seek to make further savings in staff and maintenance/equipment budgets from 16/17 onwards. For example reducing by two staff could save £60,000 - £80,000 depending on grades (excluding redundancy costs).

**Proforma 11**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Countryside &amp; Landscape (Support) Service</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £331,228: from deletion of the Countryside & landscape technical support and Biodiversity team.  This includes 9 fte staff.
Financial Year:	2015/2016
Comment:	This is the net budget after including income of £159,000 from providing landscape services to other departments & capital projects and Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) grant funding for various countryside initiatives.  The support services, whilst technically “discretionary”, support the statutory service of planning. Costs of ‘buying in’ Landscape Architects, Ecologists etc. via consultancy could easily exceed the cost of in-house staff.  The Team delivered £108,000 of savings in the 14/15 MTFP due to vacancy management.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation periods with affected staff and relevant notice periods will require to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Significant redeployment/redundancy costs to be calculated.
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	

<b>Other Issues:</b>	
----------------------	--

The team consists of:

- Landscape Architects (2);
- Ecologists (3);
- Visitor Service Officer (1);
- Planners (2);
- Group Manager (1)

The teams provide a support service and specialist knowledge to other parts of the Council including statutory services such as Planning and WHQS.

The team administer other external grant funded initiatives in relation to Public Rights of Way (ROWIP) and other Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) funded initiatives.

The team also manage and support other Countryside services such as Public Rights of Way and the RDP Countryside RDP funded initiatives.

The team bid for a range of external funds which help support a range of projects and regional collaboration – including the Valleys Regional Park which is a key capital City Region Project moving forward. They also work in partnership with a range of outside bodies and volunteers on shared initiatives.

The team also support a range of statutory function which would have to continue if personnel were cut e.g. the Environment Bill, Planning Acts, Reservoirs Legislation. They support Development Management and the Local Development Plan (both statutory functions).

There are on-going contractual obligations towards infrastructure projects and site management. These also contribute towards income.

If Members may wish to look at staff reductions in this service that can be considered subject to the Legal/Operational constraints mentioned above. For example reducing by two staff could save £60,000 - £80,000 depending on grades (excluding redundancy costs).



**Proforma 12**

<b>Budget Title / Ref:</b>	<b>Sustainable Development &amp; Living Environment</b>
Savings (£):	Saving £130,620: from deletion of the Sustainable Development team. (2 staff plus projects budget).
Financial Year:	2015/2016
Comment:	Team includes 4 fte staff (Team Leader and Education for Sustainable Development Officer. (2 externally funded via the RDP Programme currently till Dec. 2014 (Sustainable Energy officers)). The team contributed £38,983 to the 14/15 MTFP via vacancy management. Option 1 - In appendix 1 proforma 9 £13,000 from budget realignment is offered to the 15/16 MTFP.
<b>Cost to Implement</b>	
Staff Costs:	Costs of implementing redeployment/redundancies etc. to be explored.
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs as a Consequence:	
<b>Estimated Timeframe to Implement</b>	
Consultation:	Consultation and notice periods for affected staff will have to be factored in.
Statutory Process:	
<b>Estimated Risks of Implementation</b>	
Not Achieving Cost Savings:	
Not Achieving Timeframe:	
<b>Estimated Employment Effects</b>	
Redundancy:	Redeployment/redundancy costs to be explored.
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	

<b>Other Issues:</b>	
----------------------	--

The team supports sustainability projects throughout CCBC and with partner organisations, including raising substantial external funding support – e.g. the £315,000 cost of solar schools work was delivered at no cost to the authority or schools.

The RDP Sustainable Energy work has generated income and provided support for farms and rural businesses. The Maes yr Onn off-grid Farm won the Wales RTP1 award for 2013, raising awareness of the issues of sustainable energy and accolades for Planning and the SD Team.

The forthcoming Future Generations Bill will require local authorities to embed sustainable development as a corporate principle. A removal/reduction of the team will impact on positive achievements to date and remove the expertise from the authority when it is arguably most needed.

Sustainable energy offers substantial cost savings to CCBC and its partners as well as the obvious environmental issues. The Team is able to save money for the authority by supporting sustainable energy projects more than covering the cost of retention and promoting them within and outside the Council.

A possibility exists to deliver more income in future to contribute to the MTFP moving forward and limited options for reducing the Team can be explored.