MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN SAVING - INTRODUCTION OF BUS STATION DEPARTURE CHARGES

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Introduction of bus station departure cha | rges | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | ITU | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £0 at present – will generate a new income stream. Current budget for bus stops and bus station maintenance and cleansing is £114,100 (including business rates and rental from café at Blackwood). Reduced from £172,200 in 2013/14. | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £100k | Saving as a % of total budget: Income generated would cover 87.6% of the current maintenance, cleansing | |

and operational costs.

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Introduce departure charges for bus operators at Bus Stations at Blackwood, Bargoed and Caerphilly. Revenue raised based on nominal 35p per departure at each location.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Operators may seek to recover this through termination of contracts / changes to services / increased bus fares for passengers.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Income generated could be used to offset cuts to bus services / support the maintenance and running costs of the facilities.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| √ | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | √ | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | elow | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFI WITH DELOW: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | |
| ORGANISATIONAL INITACI ANALISIS | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION : | | | |
| This area has already implemented budget cuts of | 33.7% and any further cuts to | the operational | |
| maintenance and cleansing regimes to ensure the | • | • | |
| could compromise this. A large element of the av | ailable budget (£44.9k) is comr | mitted to business rates | |
| and cannot form part of any future savings. | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | aic: | |
| Also, please identity the initigating actions th | at will assist ill illallagilig ti | 113. | |
| The proposal would raise revenue as an alternative to reducing support for local bus services and / or | | | |
| maintaining bus stop and bus station facilities, so w | | - | |
| offset cuts to bus services / support the maintenance and running costs of the facilities. | | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF : | | | |
| No impact on staff | | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) 0.75 | | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | |
| ANNADED OF POSTS IN DUDGET ADEA ASSESSED | Net . | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | Nil | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | Nil | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS ? | |
| DOCT/C\ ALDEADY \/A CANIT. | | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | |
| VOLONIANI SEVENANCE. | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | |
| | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | |
| | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 (assuming this relates to the charges being introduced – not changes to staffing) | | |
|--|--|----------|--|
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | ✓ | | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL: (FEEASE HCK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| Bus Shelter cleansing is currently undertaken by NCS. Over the past 4 financial years, this has been reduced | | | |
| from £48k to £20.9k, with a consequent reduction in frequency of cleansing. Bus Station cleansing at | | | |
| Blackwood and Bargoed is undertaken by Building Cleansing Services and has similarly been reduced from | | | |
| £12.2k to £7.3k, with consequent reductions in frequency of cleansing. Having an income stream will help | | | |
| protect these areas from further budget reductions. | | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | √ | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | · | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| | HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|---|----------|----|
| | CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | <u> </u> | |
| | (PLEASE TICK) | , | |
| ı | IF VEC. DI FACE CDECIEV DEI OVV. | | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Operators may seek to recover this through termination of contracts / changes to services / increased bus fares for passengers.

Risk of destabilising more marginal services – particularly existing subsidised services where there is little opportunity to recover growth from increased patronage – may lead to early termination of most marginal contracts and in longer term, costs likely to be passed on through increased tender prices.

Risk of operators cancelling marginal commercial services, which could isolate local communities.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Setting the departure charge at 35p will generate approximately £100k income for the Council. This is a direct additional cost to the operators providing bus services in the county borough and will have an adverse impact on their operational costs and there is little mitigation for this. Operators will seek to cover these costs – potentially through fares increases, increased contract costs in the long term, or the termination of contracts or withdrawal of commercial services in the short term.

DATE OF COMPLETION:1 November 2018.....

5.

CONSULTATION

<u>MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN SAVING –</u> 32% REDUCTION IN CARRIAGEWAY RESURFACING RCCO (CAPITAL BUDGET = £750) AND 7% REDUCTION IN CARRIAGEWAY SURFACE DRESSING BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway operations | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFORMATION | | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the Budget for Carriageway resurfacing treatments | | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Carriageway Surface dressing / Carriageway Resurfacing | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR Surface dressing £860,000/ Carriageway resurfacing £163,000 (Total £1,023,000) THIS AREA: | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £113,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 11% | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | | |
| Reduce the programme of surface preservation and resurfacing treatments to our carriageways. | | | |

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

A noticeable reduction in annual resurfacing schemes being undertaken

Increased waiting times for roads to be resurfaced

A deterioration in road condition

An increase in potholes

An increase in claims

Increase in customer dissatisfaction

Increase and closer inspection of deterioration required

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

There are proposals for additional grant funding from Welsh Government which would temporarily limit the impact of the savings. However, the longer term maintenance will be compromised if grant funding cannot be secured or is removed.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| | X | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | |
|---|-----------|------|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | Х | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | alow | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | See below | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Increase and closer inspection of deterioration required

Increase in Service requests

Large increase in repair costs (for future treatments)

Increased maintenance costs (Patching / Pothole repairs)

Increased insurance claims

PROPOSED SAVING:

Increase insurance premiums

Damage to reputation of Caerphilly

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

No mitigation, future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required meaning we will be undertaking less work for higher costs.

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: Increase workload dealing with complaints claims and service requests.

| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | none |
|---|------|
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | |
| | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 3 |
| | |
| | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None |

| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MA | NY POSTS ? |
|--|------------|-------------------|
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | Х | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | ^ | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |

Engineering Projects Group - Reduced workload for staff managing contractors CRM will have more complaints (SR's) to deal with.

Insurance / Risk management will have more claims to deal with

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | Y | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | ^ | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

The road deterioration will impact on all road users, pedestrians and cyclists with an increased risk travelling on network if not properly maintained.

People will have negative perception of "Caerphilly" as road condition is a key area and this may tarnish their perception of our Service delivery as an Authority.

4. **RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES**

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | X | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | Λ | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required to deal with the rapid deterioration of the carriageways.

Insurance claims costs are likely to increase as the carriageway deteriorates

Changes to cheaper surfacing techniques will become limited as carriageway deteriorates?

The "appearance" and perception of Caerphilly will be tarnished as stakeholders compare the state of the roads with other areas.

| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? |
|---|
| Limited mitigation although maintaining a targeted approach and utilisation of HAMP principles may reduce some impacts. |
| Additional Grant funding needs to be proactively targeted to maintain minimum budget requirements to try and achieve a "steady state" within the Highway. |
| 5. CONSULTATION |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
| None |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |

HEAD OF SERVICE:

DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/18.....

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN SAVING – 4% REDUCTION IN HIGHWAYS REACTIVE MAINTENANCE BUDGET THROUGH USE OF TECHNOLOGY (JETPATCHER)

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|--------------------|
| | |
| | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway operations |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the Budget for Highway Reactive Maintenance | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Safety defect repairs and Emergency responses (Including standby out of hours) | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | Safety defect repairs (£936,000) / Emerge | ency responses (£196,000) / Out of Hours | |
| THIS AREA: | (£224,000) – Total budget £1,356,500 | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £55,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: | |
| | | 4% | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Need to closely monitor usage of the budget and adhere to defect criteria for repairs and maximise the use of the new jetpatcher to utilise the efficiency savings in the planned maintenance approach as opposed to the reactive more costly patching repairs.

Only respond to emergencies out of hours and make better use of Highway Inspectors.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

A noticeable reduction in response to pothole intervention as only those that meet defect criteria will be repaired

Increased waiting times for roads to be resurfaced as more roads will require resurfacing A deterioration in road condition leading to an increased deterioration rate An increase in visible potholes as only those that meet defect criteria will be repaired An increase in claims as challenges will increase together with an increase in customer dissatisfaction

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

The new jetpatcher will produce some efficiency savings in the planned maintenance approach which will go some way to limit the impact on the public, however, the jet patcher has limitations on where it can be used.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| X | | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|--|-----------|----|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | X |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: | See below | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents and visitors to Caerphilly equally and does not directly impact on a particular group or organisation | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Increased inspection regimes with closer monitoring of defects

Increase in Service requests / complaints

Large increase in repair costs (for future treatments)

Increased maintenance costs due to accelerated deterioration of the Highway

Increased insurance claims leading to Increase insurance premiums

Damage to reputation of Caerphilly and people perception of us

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

The jetpatcher will provide some mitigation, however, future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required meaning we will be undertaking less work for higher costs.

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: Increase workload dealing with complaints claims and service requests. NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) 8 STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: 8

| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None |
|--|------|
| PROPOSED SAVING: | |

| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MA | NY POSTS? |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | X | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| Network Contracting Services – Will lead to a chan available to the workforce. CRM will have more complaints (SR's) to deal with Insurance / Risk management will have more claim | • | the amount of work |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| The road deterioration will impact on all road user | s, pedestrians and cyclists ali | ke. |
| People will have negative perception of "Caerphilly their perception of our Service delivery as an Author | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | area and this may tarnish |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | Х | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required to deal with the rapid deterioration of the carriageways.

Insurance claims costs are likely to increase as the carriageway deteriorates

The "appearance" and perception of Caerphilly will be tarnished as stakeholders compare the state of the roads with other Boroughs or areas.

Limited mitigation although maintaining a targeted approach and utilisation of HAMP principles may reduce some impacts. Additional Grant funding needs to be proactively targeted to maintain minimum budget requirements to achieve a "steady state" within the Highway. 5. CONSULTATION PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: None OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED.

HEAD OF SERVICE:

DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/18.....

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - 7% REDUCTION IN HIGHWAYS STRUCTURES BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations | |
| 1. GENERAL INFO | DRMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce spend on Service Level Agreemen | nt for Structural inspections |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Highway Structures | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £490,607 | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £36,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 7% |
| | | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Revise programme of inspections based upon a "Risk based approach" and in accordance with the new Code of Practice and Highway Maintenance Plan. Also co-ordinate and plan inspection regimes to maximise efficiencies and introduce specialist structures management software.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Any reduction in inspection regime could result in delays in noticing defects and undertaking works, resulting in more costly future repairs. This could result in longer periods of rectification work which would cause increased delays to the travelling public due to roadworks and closures.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

The risk based approach could allow for increased frequency of inspections on failing structures, however, this would be counter-productive to the approach being adopted due to the condition and age of our assets.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| X | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | X | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | See below | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents | and visitors to Caerphilly equa | lly and does not directly | |
| impact on a particular group or organisation | . , , | , | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: | |
| Early recognition and regular maintenance is the key to cost saving. Reduced frequency of inspection could result in more costly repairs in the future. | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions the | at will assist in managing th | iis: | |
| Experienced staff trained to report early signs | of structural failure and spe | cialist software that | |
| assists in scheme prioritisation will assist in tar | | | |
| costs and maximise efficiencies. | | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS (| OF STAFF: | |
| No direct impact on staff, although budget dec | crease will put more pressur | es on staff to find | |
| alternate work. | | | |
| | 0.00 | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 0.25FTE | | |
| STAFF IN BODGET AREA AFFECTED. | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 7 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | none | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? | |
| | | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | |
|--|------------|----|
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | X | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | * | |
| | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| Engineering Projects Group | | |
| Reduced workload for staff managing contractors and designing projects | | |
| | | |
| Network Contracting Services | | |
| Reduced budget to undertake maintenance works | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK)

Reduction in maintenance can lead to more costly future repairs and an increased deterioration rate leading to major maintenance which could affect adjacent land owners or service providers such as the Rail service over which our structures may span.

Χ

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO | |
|---|-----|----|--|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | | |
| Early inspection and regular maintenance is the key to cost saving. Reduced frequency of inspection could result in more costly repairs in the future or potential closure of roads due to potential early asset failure. | | | |

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Experienced staff trained to report early signs of structural failure and specialist software that assists in scheme prioritisation will assist in targeting the highest priority schemes first to minimise costs and maximise efficiencies.

5. CONSULTATION

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
|---|
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
| |
| None |
| |
| |

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/2018 |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - 14% REDUCTION IN TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MAINTENANCE BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) |
| | |
| L. GENERAL INFO | DRMATION |

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Traffic Management minor works budget reduction. | | |
|------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | REA: Highway Maintenance – Traffic Management | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | £35,820 | | |
| THIS AREA: | , in the second | | |
| THIS AREA. | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £5,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 14% | |
| | , | | |
| | | | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

The budget apportioned to Traffic Management from the main Highway Maintenance budget will be reduced by £5,000.

2. **PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Fewer Traffic Regulation Orders and minor traffic management schemes/works will be able to be progressed in response to public requests for changes to parking and other traffic management restrictions/schemes. This will have a negative impact upon traffic flow and road safety throughout the County Borough.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Where possible requests will be progressed via alternative grant funding or developer funding opportunities.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
|---|--|--|
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | |
| √ | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | ✓ | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | · | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | elow |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: |] | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | DULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | SANISATION: |
| A reduced capacity to respond to public reque | sts leading to longer respon | se times. |
| | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | nis: |
| | | |
| MTFP consultations to explain the impact of fi | nancial pressures and utilisir | ng alternative sources of |
| funding where possible. | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS | OF STAFF: |
| Nil impact. | | |
| ivii iiripact. | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 4 | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 4 | |
| | | |
| AND ADED OF DOCTE AFFECTED DATE. | Net . | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | Nil | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | V POSTS? |
| TELASE SI EGII I HOW HIIS WILL BE WANAGED. | TIOW WAN | 110313; |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| DEDLINDANCY. | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | <u> </u> | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | ✓ | |
| TEAST WITHIN THE COUNCIL: (FLEASE HOR) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT May lead to reduced workload for the design and of | constructing arms of the Infra | estructure Division (namely |
| EPG & NCS). | onstructing arms of the inite | istructure Division (namely, |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | 123 | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | ✓ |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | N YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | √ | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| Potential for increased dissatisfaction from Membe | ers and the public from the d | elays in responding to |
| Traffic Management requests. | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 5. CONSULTATION | | |
| S. CONSCIATION | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU | LTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN | I UNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | |
| None. | | |
| Tronc. | | |
| | | |

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

| BEEN CAPTURED. | PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEE | L HAS NOT |
|----------------|---|-----------|
| | BEEN CAPTURED. | |

N/A

| HEAD OF SERVICE: | Marcus Lloyd |
|---------------------|----------------|
| | • |
| DATE OF COMPLETION: | 9 October 2018 |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN -2% REDUCTION IN STREET LIGHTING NON-ROUTINE MAINTENANCE BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFO | DRMATION | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduced spend on non- routine maintena | ance | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Street lighting maintenance | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £480,480.00 | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £9,000.00 | Saving as a % of total budget: 2% | |
| | | | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Reducing the maintenance costs by no longer replacing life expired street lighting equipment with new, by extending the service life of the existing equipment beyond that would normally be expected i.e. undertake a reactive response to outages rather than a proactive replacement strategy.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

- 1: Street lights not working as planned
- 2: Increase in service requests.
- 3: Fear of crime from street light outages.
- 4: Increase in insurance claims.
- 5. Risk of accidents as inconsistency in lighting i.e. going from light to dark back to light.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT | |
| Х | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | Х | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | ^ | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents | and visitors to Caerphilly equa | ally and does not directly | |
| impact on a particular group or organisation | | | |
| | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | GANISATION: | |
| P.I.s may increase as the equipment is left in a | non-operating condition fo | or longer periods due to | |
| increased street lighting failures. | | | |
| | | | |
| Faults arising with this older equipment may b | ecome more frequent and | requiring more routine | |
| maintenance visits for which we are charged v | vhich will impact the budge | ts further. | |
| <u> </u> | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | TILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS | OF STAFF: | |
| Additional calls and complaints regarding the | service delivery and lights n | ot working. | |
| . 5 | , | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) None | | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 3 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | NY POSTS? | |
| DOCT/C) ALDEADY/// CONT | | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | |
| VOLUNTART SEVERANCE. | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | |
| TE THE TENTE OF TH | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | |
| | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | |
| | | | |
| DI FACE DROVIDE DETAILS OF MUSEN THIS MUSIC | Amril 2010 | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | | |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | VEC | NO | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COLINCIL 2 (PLEASE TICK) | Х | | |
| TEANU WITHIN THE COUNTY OF FASE TICKS | | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Customer Service

Increase in service requests from the public

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT |
|---|
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) |

| YES | NO |
|-----|----|
| Х | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Other users of the network may experience attending areas where there are street light failures which may impact on how they deliver their services.

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | Y | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | ^ | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Reputational damage as poor service may be recognised and potential increase risk of accident, trip and fall claims if areas are insufficiently lit.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Reducing the maintenance costs by no longer replacing life expired street lighting equipment with new equipment just due to age, thus extending the service life of the existing equipment beyond that would normally be expected. i.e. undertake a reactive response to outages rather than a proactive replacement strategy.

5. CONSULTATION

PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED:

No consultations undertaken

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED.

| HEAD OF SERVICE: | •• |
|-------------------------------|----|
| DATE OF COMPLETION: 7/11/2018 | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – 13% REDUCTION IN OTHER HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE BUDGETS

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|--------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | A number of minor savings spread across various Highways Budget expenditure | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | areas | |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | 1. Road Closures for special events - £250 – 100% | |
| | 2. Tree Maintenance - £2500 – 8% | |
| | 3. Fence railing repairs - £1000 –8% | |
| | 4. Safety Fencing - £30,000 – 26% | |
| | 5. Cattle Grids - £1,000 – 20% | |
| | 6. Footway surfacing treatments - £16,000 – 7% | |
| | 7. Maintenance of Roundabouts - £1000 – 22% | |
| | 8. Maintenance of cycleways - £1000 – 24% | |
| | 9. Traffic sign maintenance - £1000 – 22% | |
| | 10. Road marking maintenance - £1000 – 5% | |
| | 11. Street name plates - £1000 – 22% | |
| | 12. Land Reclamation - £8000 – 13% | |
| | 13. Design costs revenue schemes - £250 – 100% | |
| | 14. Improved / Dropped access - £2000 - 21% | |

| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | £490,523 |
|------------------|----------|
| THIS AREA: | |

| TOTAL SAVING | 6: £6 | 66,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: |
|--------------|-------|--------|--------------------------------|
| | | | 13% |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Some areas removed completely and will require funding from organisations / departments requesting these services

Some areas managed through engineering principles and efficiencies

Some areas will receive a reduced service or programme of works.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Public will notice a reduced level of service and increased waiting times for requests. Public could perceive a deterioration in the environment they live in.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Good engineering principles and difficult decisions will mitigate some effects but not all effects can be mitigated

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT | | |
| | X | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | | V |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | ^ |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IE NO DI EACE CDECIEV WILLY DEL OWA | | |

IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW?

The change in service delivery affects all residents and visitors to Caerphilly equally and does not directly impact on a particular group or organisation

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Increase in Service requests

Large increase in repair costs (for future treatments as they are more expensive than regular maintenance)

Increased reactive maintenance costs due to lack of planned maintenance

Increased insurance claims

Increase insurance premiums

Damage to reputation of Caerphilly

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Limited mitigation, future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required due to the reduced maintenance regimes

Areas will require closer inspection to monitor deterioration

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: Increased Monitoring / Inspection Increase workload dealing with complaints claims and service requests.

| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | None |
|---|----------------|
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | |
| | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 30 (NCS staff) |
| | |
| | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 0 |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | |

| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MA | NY POSTS? |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | YES | NO |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: • THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| Network Contracting Services | | |
| Reduced workload for frontline Highway staff. The | reduction in workload will m | nake profitable trading more |
| difficult which further impact on Budgets if losses a | are made. | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | Х |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| A DICK/C) AND CENCITIVITIES | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | Х | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| | | |
| Future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be | | |
| required | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | | |
| | | |
| Cannot mitigate all risks however closer inspections on assets and their deterioration rates will provide | | |
| data to allow a targeted approach to be applied. | | |

5. CONSULTATION

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
|---|
| None |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/2018 |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – REDUCTION IN OTHER MISCELLANEOUS HIGHWAY/LAND DRAINAGE BUDGETS

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|--------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduction in the Highway and Land Drainage Budgets | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Severe weather Culvert inspection and cleansing together with replacement of pipework, culverts and gully covers & frames | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | £434,509 | |
| THIS AREA: | | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £21,300 | Saving as a % of total budget: |
| | | 5% |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Some areas managed through engineering principles and efficiencies Some areas will receive a reduced service and / or programme of works.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Public will notice a reduced level of service and increased waiting times for requests. Public could perceive a deterioration in the environment they live in.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Good engineering principles and difficult decisions will mitigate some effects but not all effects can be mitigated.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| X | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|--------|------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | X | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | ^ | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | olow |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | See De | elow |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents and visitors to Caerphilly equally and does not directly | | |
| impact on a particular group or organisation | | |
| | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Increase in Service requests

Large increase in repair costs (for future treatments)

Increased reactive maintenance costs compared to planned maintenance costs

Increased insurance claims following potential flood damage

Increase insurance premiums

Damage to reputation of Caerphilly especially our perceived response to severe weather incidents and emergencies.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Limited mitigation, future repair costs will be significantly higher with more flooding instances and an increase in reactive maintenance is expected due to the reduced maintenance regime.

A proactive approach to grant funding applications may create additional budget to assist with specific drainage issues / repairs.

Promoting residents via website links to undertake "self-help" and protect themselves from flooding rather

| than relying on Council services. | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: | | |
| Increase workload dealing with complaints, cla | ims and service requests. | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 5 | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 5 | | |
| | | | |
| AULIMADED OF BOSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 0 | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | O | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING. | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | | |
| TELFISE STEER FIRST THIS WILL BE WINTER | 110 11 11/11/11 1 0010. | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | |
| VOLUMETA DV CEVEDANIOE | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | |
| | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | |
| DEDUNDANCY. | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | |
| | | | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
|---|------------------------|----|
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | Х | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| Engineering Projects Group | | |
| Reduced workload for staff managing contractors a | and designing projects | |
| | | |
| Network Contracting Services | | |
| Reduced budget to undertake maintenance works | VEC | NO |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | YES | NO |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |
| VOLONTANT SECTOR FARTNER: (FEEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| All areas may be at risk of flooding | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| Future repair costs will be significantly higher with mo | re flooding instances and ar | n increase in reactive |
| maintenance is expected due to the reduced maintenance regime. | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | | |
| Cannot mitigate all risks, although proactively applying for Government funding may produce some additional budget to address priority schemes. | | |
| Promoting residents via website links to undertake "self-help" and protect themselves from flooding rather than relying on Council services. | | |

5.

CONSULTATION

DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/2018.....

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - REDUCTION IN RISCA CANAL BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Engineering Projects Group | |
| 1. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the Budget for maintenance on the Monmouth and Brecon Canal | |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Safety inspections, general maintenance such as grass/tree cutting, towpath surface repair, channel weed control, water control and dredging. | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | Total budget £102,100 | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £10,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 10% |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | |
| A reduction in general maintenance relating to street furniture and towpath surface patching | | |
| | | |

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Should have minimal impact

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Closer control on spend and programming of general maintenance.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| X | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |

| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: | See below |
|--|---|
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | |
| DIEACE DESCRIPE HOWELLE DRODGED CAVING OF | DUIL DIADACT LIDON THE ODGANICATION |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | DULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION: |
| Possible increase in Service requests / complai | |
| Possible increase in costs (for future treatment | • |
| | due to the doubling up of operations i.e. several |
| rounds of dredging, partial and full to treat the | |
| Possible damage to reputation of Caerphilly ar | nd people perception of us |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing this: |
| Also, prease racinary the margaring actions the | at will assist in managing tims. |
| Closer control on spend and programming of g | general maintenance. |
| | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: |
| Increase workload dealing with complaints cla | ims and service requests. |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 0.05 FTE |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | none |
| NOWIDER OF POSTS IN BODGET AREA AFFECTED. | none |
| | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MANY POSTS ? |
| | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | |
| | |
| RETIREMENT: | |
| DEDEDI OVMENT. | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | |
| REDUNDANCY: | |
| | |
| DIEACE DROVIDE DETAILS OF WILEY THIS WILL | 1 |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 |
| DE HVIPLEIVIENTEU: | April 2019 |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|--|-----|----|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Engineering Projects Group

Reduced workload for staff managing contractors and designing projects

Network Contracting Services

Reduced budget to undertake maintenance works

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Torfaen, Newport and Monmouth Councils have a responsibility along the Canal together with Monmouth and Brecon Canal Association and Islwyn Canal association.

Users of the canal are the Risca angling club

Any deterioration of the canal or resultant major works can close the canal which affects all users and visitors enjoyment of the facility. Closures also have environmental impacts in water quality and control which in-turn can affect wildlife and fisheries.

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | X | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | Λ | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future maintenance costs will be higher and an increase in reactive maintenance will be required to deal with potential water flow /supply issues.

Potential water supply issues to lower reaches of canal which in times of prolonged dry weather can lead to fish distress and possible kills.

The "appearance" and perception of Caerphilly will be tarnished as stakeholders compare the state of the canal with other Boroughs or areas.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Limited mitigation, however, engagement with associated partners and users try and secure alternate funding sources would be an option.

We could also engage with "Self-appointed guardians" and the local community who voluntarily undertake minor maintenance and litter picking to "formalise" what they do and provide them with the tools to undertake this work to enable them to widen the scope and area of work they do.

DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/18.....

5.

CONSULTATION

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – GULLY CLEANSING

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations | | |
| | | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFORMATION | | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the frequency and numbers of Gullies cleansed within Caerphilly | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Scheduled Gully Cleansing | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £261,000 | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £64,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Cyclic Gully scheduling will be reduced. There is also the potential loss of one of three Gully machines currently operated by Caerphilly if additional works being sourced from neighbouring authorities is not able to fund the budget gap.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Gullies not cleansed as frequently

Gullies not working as planned

Increased service costs through lack of maintenance

Increased Service Requests

Increased Insurance Claims

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Gully schedule to be reviewed taking on a targeted approach to cleanse known problem areas and reduce scheduled cleansing in other areas.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | |
|---|--------|--------|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT |
| | X | |
| | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See below | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents | and visitors to Caerphilly equa | lly and does not directly |
| impact on a particular group or organisation | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: |
| Increased service requests | | |
| Increase repair costs | | |
| Reputational damage to the Authority Increased insurance claims, resulting in increased | nsurance nremiums | |
| The authority will have reduced resilience in its ab | • | conditions, the reduction |
| in fleet will leave the service exposed during break | | - |
| road covering the whole Authority as one Gully co | uld be working in another Auth | iority?) |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions that w | rill assist in managing this: | |
| Gully schedule to be reviewed taking on a targeted | l approach to cleanse known p | roblem areas and reduce |
| scheduled cleansing in other areas. | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | III IMDACT LIDON MEMBERS (| OE STAEE: |
| | | |
| Increase workload dealing with complaints and ser on planned cleansing which then continually adds | • | |
| attending to the schedule. | to the problem as we are react | ing to six s and not |
| | F | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 2FTE | |
| STATE IN DOUGLET, INC. ATTECTED. | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 6 | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None – Redeployed within NO | CS |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? |
| TELAGE STEEN THOW THIS WILE BE WANGED. | 110 00 1017 110 | 110010 |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPI OYMENT: | | |

REDUNDANCY:

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | |
|--|------------|----|
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Flooding could increase calls to contact centre and generate unnecessary workload on staff attending calls. Potential for an increase in insurance claims also and gully working on non-scheduled work while attending service requests.

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Flooding to Carriageway could potentially affect any road users and can also be a cause of flood damage to properties, strict approach to attending service requests (emergencies only) may be needed to ensure schedules are adhered to.

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |
| IE VEC DI EACE CDECIEV DELOVA. | | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Increased risk of flooding to carriageways and properties plus increased maintenance liabilities through lack of scheduled maintenance. Reduction in maintenance can also accelerate the deterioration of the Highway asset through water infiltration.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Gully schedule to be reviewed taking on a targeted approach to cleanse known problem areas and reduce scheduled cleansing in other areas and Gullies only targeting Emergency responses to enable scheduled maintenance targets to be met.

PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: None 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. HEAD OF SERVICE:

5.

CONSULTATION

DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/2018.....

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - DELETION OF COMMUNITY RESPONSE TEAM BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|--------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Removal of the Community Response Team | |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| BUDGET AREA: | Community Response Team | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £100,000 | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £100,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 100% |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

The service will be removed.

Workload will be categorised as low priority and areas will receive a greatly reduced service and programme of works.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Public will notice a reduced level of service and increased waiting times for requests. Public will perceive a deterioration in the environment they live in.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Limited mitigation, however, the majority of the work undertaken by the CRT is cosmetic and helps to make the local community look better. Possibly engage with Community Groups to assist going forward.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| X | | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | Х | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See below | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents impact on a particular group or organisation | and visitors to Caerphilly equa | lly and does not directly | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | DULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: | | |
| Increase in Service requests | | | | |
| Large increase in future repair costs Increased maintenance costs due to lack of re | zular maintonanco | | | |
| Increased insurance claims | guiai illalliterialite | | | |
| Increase insurance premiums | | | | |
| Damage to reputation of Caerphilly as areas w | ill no longer be aesthetically | pleasing to look at. | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | iis: | | |
| | | | | |
| Limited mitigation, future repair costs will be s | significantly higher and an in | crease in reactive | | |
| maintenance budget will be required. | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS (| OF STAFF: | | |
| Increase workload dealing with complaints cla | ims and service requests. | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 2 | | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | none | | | |
| | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 2 | | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | 1 | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: 1 Redeployed within current service area | | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | | |
| | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| Tourism as areas will not be aesthetically pleasing | resulting in less visitors to Cae | erphilly | |
| CRM – Increased service requests | | | |
| | | | |
| | VE0 | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | X | | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| May affect businesses and employers in Caerphilly | who may not wish to invest of | or stay here due to the | |
| unmaintained environment | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| I. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | | |
| | | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | N YES | NO | |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | X | | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Cannot mitigate all risks, however, the majority of the work undertaken by the CRT is cosmetic and helps to make the local community look better. Possibly engage with Community Groups to assist going forward.

5. CONSULTATION

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
|---|
| None |

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/2018 |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – PUBLIC TRANSPORT – REVIEW OF CONTRACTS WITH HIGHEST SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFO | RMATION | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce public bus service funding | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | ITU | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | SAVING: £68k Saving as a % of total budget: 12% of CCBC funding; 7% of total budget | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESC | CRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL | BE ACHIEVED: | |
| Termination of contracts with the highest subsidy per passenger. Requires a minimum of 12 weeks' notice to be served. | | | |
| 2. PUBLIC IMPACT | ANALYSIS | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW | THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMP | ACT UPON THE PUE | BLIC: |
| CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION. | | | |
| The proposed service cuts would impact on communities in the county borough and in particular, restrict access to employment, health care and other services and facilities. Most of the communities affected by the cuts are isolated and have no alternative public transport links. The cuts will impact most on the elderly and on those who have no access to a car and no other affordable or accessible means of transport. The MTFP proposals consider contracts that incur a subsidy per passenger of over £5 per passenger. These | | | |
| are summarised below: | | | |
| Contracts with subsidy over £5 per passenger | | | |
| Contract Route / jour | neys affected | Subsidy per Passenger / Annual Passenger total | CCBC Cost Impact Per Year |
| 00J-71D 1800 return i | ourney Caerphilly to Rudry (M-S) & | f8 57 / 759 | f6.120 Curtailed |

service

0725 journey Rudry to Caerphilly (Sat only)

| 019-71D | Afternoon return journey Manmoel to Blackwood (Tue and Fri only) | £6.87 / 459 | £3,152 | Service withdrawn |
|---------|--|--------------|---------|---|
| 004-710 | 1820 return journey Tredegar to Pontlottyn (M-S) 1915 return journey Tredegar to YYF, Ystrad Mynach (M-S) 2125 return journey Tredegar to YYF, Ystrad Mynach (M-S) | £6.68 / 8670 | £50,929 | No evening service via Abertysswg Brithdir and Cefn Hengoed |
| X38-71D | 0620 return journey Pontypridd to Nelson (M-F) | £5.43 / 1173 | £6,375 | Journeys withdrawn |

Total cumulative cost of contracts with subsidy greater than £5 per passenger: £66,576 – Target saving: £68,000 – the balance will be met from reallocation of funding from the external BSSG budget.

The withdrawal of financial support on the services to Rudry (route J), between Nelson and Pontypridd (X38) and the evening service between Tredegar and Ysbyty Ystrad Fawr, Ystrad Mynach (service 4 / C9 via Rhymney / Abertysswg / Brithdir / Bargoed and Cefn Hengoed) will potentially impact on the core timetables for these routes, as for some passengers, the loss of early morning or evening journeys may result in them abandoning the bus service altogether.

The service linking Manmoel village to Blackwood, though infrequent, is used regularly by a small number of residents and is their only public transport link. It is exclusively used by elderly residents who have no access to a car.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Across Wales, this Council has consistently recorded the lowest average subsidy per passenger level across all its subsidised local bus (based on annual benchmarking returns collated by the Wales data unit on behalf of CSS Wales) – this has been achieved by reviewing contracts regularly and adapting to network changes and packaging contracts efficiently to ensure resource requirements are kept to a minimum. The average subsidy per passenger cost in 2017/18 was 84p. This will continue to be the case in order to identify actions to mitigate the impact as far as reasonably possible.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO THIS | | |
|--|--------|--------|
| SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT |
| | ✓ | |
| | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|-----------|----|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | ✓ | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | See below | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Further cuts in service would have a medium to high impact on passengers and communities by eroding the commercial and supported bus network in the county borough and impact on all sectors of the community – particularly for younger and older residents. The consequences will affect access to employment, healthcare and to schools and colleges and access to services and facilities and the wider economy.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Every option to mitigate the impact and reduction is services will be explored along with any opportunities to identify provision by alternative providers (e.g. voluntary or third sector).

| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: | | |
|---|--|--|
| No impact on staff | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 1.5 | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| NUMBER OF BOSTS IN BURCET AREA ASSESSED. | Nii | |
| NOMBER OF POSTS IN BODGET AREA AFFECTED. | INII | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | Nil | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | |
| DOST(S) ALDEADY WACANT. | | |
| FOST(S) ALREADT VACANT. | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDI INDANCY: | | |
| REDONDANCI. | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | Once proposals have been accepted, there is a | |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | · | |
| | , | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | · · | |
| | notice to be given to the providers. | |
| | Changes anticipated to be implemented during Q1 of | |
| | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDUNDANCY: PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | HOW MANY POSTS? | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | YES | NO |
|---|----------|----------|
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | √ | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| Reduced access to employment for residents and potentially Council employees and reduced access to Council services and facilities – may impact on staff getting to work and residents accessing facilities and healthcare with indirect consequences to other services the Council provides. | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | YES | NO |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | √ |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

The withdrawal of financial support on the services will potentially impact on the core timetables for these routes, as for some passengers, the loss of early morning or evening journeys may result in them abandoning the bus service altogether. The twice weekly daytime service from Manmoel to Blackwood is regularly used by a small number of elderly residents who have no other transport alternatives and the loss of this service will leave these residents particularly isolated.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Consider whether the service to Manmoel can be maintained through alternative means (such as external BSSG funding).

5. CONSULTATION

PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED:

None as yet but extensive consultation is required with town and community councils, community partnerships, members and other key stakeholders (e.g. equality groups) within the MTFP timeline and in accordance with the Council's constitution.

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:7 November 2018 |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – VACANCY MANAGEMENT

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure Division |
| | |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Vacancy management and staff restructure in Infrastructure Division. A vacancy management saving of £34,000 is proposed along with £166,000 restructure | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | proposal saving. | |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Resources to undertake management of Infrastructure services within | |
| | transportation, highways and engineering. | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | Total budget £1,639,024 (Highways Operations, Infrastructure General and | |
| THIS AREA: | Transportation (Exc ITU, Car Park Attendants & School Crossing Patrols) | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £200,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: |
| | | 12.20% |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Infrastructure will be restructured to better align staff resources to service provision maximising efficiency opportunities in service delivery.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

There should be no direct impact on front line service delivery.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Regular management meetings and service reviews will closely monitor performance and outputs to ensure front line service provision is not compromised.

| TACKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | |
|--|--------|--------|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT |
| | | |
| | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| | | Х |
| | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Possible delays in responding to Service requests / complaints Increased pressure on remaining staff to undertake all tasks efficiently Possible damage to reputation of Caerphilly and people's perception of authority

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Regular management meetings and service reviews will closely monitor performance and outputs to ensure front line service provision is not compromised.

| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| Increase workload dealing with complaints, cla | aims and service requests. | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 8.85 FTE | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 50 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 18 | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| | | |
| DI EASE SDECIEV HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED. | SALSON MUNDH | |

| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MANY POSTS? |
|--|--|
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | |
| | 1 |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | |
| | 1 |
| RETIREMENT: | |
| | 1 |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | 15 (This equates to 5.85 fte's) |
| | 5 of these posts (1.25 fte's) are being funded via income from the new SAB function they are transferring into. This equates to 25% of each post affected by savings as 75% core budget will remain to fund rest of the posts. |

| REDUNDANCY: | 10 of these posts (4.6 fte's) are affected by realignment of the their existing split between Highways Operations & NCS. In the main this is to improve transparency of NCS costs, but may include small elements of changes to officers roles. Again the balance of any post funding is to continue as in previous years, the so the 4.6 fte's is the change in funding of these posts. | |
|---|--|----|
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | Х |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | Α. |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | Х |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; ANDHOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN

| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | X | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| (PLEASE TICK) | Α | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Possible delays in responding to Service requests / complaints | | | | |
| Increased pressure on remaining staff to undertake all tasks efficiently | | | | |
| Possible damage to reputation of Caerphilly and people's perception of authority | | | | |
| Reliance on new income stream (SAB) to fund £40k of existing staff costs and for NCS to fund extra | | | | |
| £14k of staff costs | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | | | | |
| | | | | |

YES

NO

Regular management meetings and service reviews will closely monitor performance and outputs to ensure front line service provision is not compromised.

PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG

5.

CONSULTATION

| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
|---|
| Staff have been informed that a restructure is being progressed. |
| 5. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/18 |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – HIGHWAYS OPERATIONS ADDITIONAL INCOME

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|---|---|-------------------|
| | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway operations | |
| L. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Increase income generation within Infrast | ructure services |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Street lighting design / NRSWA / Fixed penalty income | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | Budget not applicable as relates to income | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £6000 | Additional income |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | |
| Additional design services to be provided and more focussed management of utilities undertaking work for the authority. | | |
| | | |

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

CCBC designed street lighting will ensure correct standards are applied to all new developments. Increased inspections of utilities will ensure works are delivered on time and to specification

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Re-alignment of staff duties and inspections will give more control over locations and increase awareness of ongoing schemes and priorities

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| X | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | Х | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | • | |
| IF VEC DI FACE COMPLETE THE FOLIALITY IMPACT | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| ii ivo, i eenoe si een i viiii below. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE OR | GANISATION: |
| Increase and closer inspection of works required | | |
| | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions that w | ill assist in managing this: | |
| Ctoff too in ad as the consequence different and | | |
| Staff trained so they can cover different areas and | maintain inspection regimes | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | III IMPACT LIPON MEMBERS | S OF STAFE. |
| TELASE DESCRIBE HOW THE TROTOSED SAVING W | THE HALL OF ON WILLIAM | OI SIAIT. |
| Increase workload dealing with complaints cla | ims and service requests. | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 12 | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 9 | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 9 | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 9 None | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDEPLOYMENT: | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDUNDANCY: | None HOW MA | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDUNDANCY: PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | None | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDUNDANCY: PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | None HOW MA April 2019 | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDUNDANCY: PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | None HOW MA | NY POSTS? |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDUNDANCY: PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | None HOW MA April 2019 | |

| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | Х |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | , |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| I. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| | | 1 |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | X | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| Design workload is no guaranteed and developers of | could choose to use external | concultants |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | | consultants. |
| TELASE SI ECII I DELOW HOW HIESE MISKS/SENSITI | VITIES WILL BE WITHOATED: | |
| Limited by liaising with market users and promoting | g our good reputation for sch | eme delivery. |
| , , | , | · |
| . CONSULTATION | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSUL | TATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN | UNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | |
| | | |
| None | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| C OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER | DELEVANT INICODATATION VA | ULICH VOLLEEEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. | RELEVANT INFORMATION W | THICH TOU FEEL HAS NOT |
| DELIT GALTONED. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | I |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: | ••••• | |
| | | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:26/11/18 | | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – LUNCHTIME SCHOOL CROSSING PATROLS

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|----------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | School Crossing Patrol budget reduction – Withdraw Lunchtime SCPs | | |
|------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Strategic Transport & Road Safety | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | £290,368 | | |
| THIS AREA: | 1250,500 | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £36,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 12% | |
| | | | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

Remove lunchtime provision of 10 sites. All lunchtime shifts have been reviewed based on national criteria for provision. All staff also have am/pm shifts so this would result in reduced hours.

As part of the implementation consultations with staff and unions will need to be undertaken so only a partial saving could be realised from Q2 of 2019/20 (estimated at two thirds of the savings target i.e. £24,000). Note also this proposal will not result in redundancies and consequent costs.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

The lunchtime School Crossing Patrol (SCP) sites at primary schools do not meet the national assessment criteria Withdrawal would mean a reduction in service. However the majority of children do not leave school at lunchtime.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

The Road Safety team will continue to work with Schools and parents to provide advice and guidance on road safety concerns and remind all of parental responsibility for the journey to/from schools.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| ✓ | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | TICK): MEDIUM | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | √ | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | • | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | alow |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| B. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: |
| Public perception of road safety dangers could incr | ease. | |
| | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions that w | ill assist in managing this: | |
| Utilizing alternative read safety advection, training | and publicity magazines whore | a nassibla |
| Utilising alternative road safety education, training | and publicity measures where | : possible. |
| | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS (| OF STAFF: |
| | | |
| No SCP redundancies anticipated but it could mean | | o stay in work because of |
| the impact on their benefits. HR to advise on any o | ther employment issues. | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 4.4 | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 10 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 10 | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | V DOCTC2 |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE WANAGED: | HOW MAN | 1 PUSIS! |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | 1 | |
| 1 031(3) MERENDI VIOLITI | - | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | From August/September 201 | 9/20 (allowing for staff and |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | union consultations). | 5/ 25 (anowing for stail and |

| | _ | | |
|--|-------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | YES | NO |
| | | ✓ | |
| TEAST TICK | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| The Primary Schools with split sites in St Gwladys P | | • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| required to manage pupil movements at lunchtime | es th | nemselves without any assi | stance from the SCP. |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | | ✓ |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | | |
| HAVE ANY DICKS CONCINUITIES DEEN IDENTIFIED IN | . 1 | VEC | NO |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | ١ | YES | NO |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | \checkmark | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | | |
| | | | |
| Sensitivity: perception of increased road safety dar | nger | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | VIT | IES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| The Road Safety team will continue to work with So | cho | ols and parents to provide | advice and guidance on |
| road safety concerns and remind all of parental res | | • | • |
| · | - | | |
| . CONSULTATION | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU | I T A | TIONI(S) THAT HAVE DEEN I | INDERTAKEN ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | LIA | HON(S) THAT HAVE BEEN O | JINDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITT LEBBACK RECEIVED. | | | |
| None. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| . OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER |) DE | LEVANT INCODMATION VAL | HICH VOLLEGEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. | N KE | LEVAINT INFORMATION WI | TICH TOO FEEL HAS NOT |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd | ••••• | | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION: 20 October 201 | 10 | | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:30 October 201 | LO | | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – 29% REDUCTION IN TRAFFIC SIGNAL ROUTINE MAINTENANCE <u>BUDGET</u>

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | |
| 4 05115041 111505 | | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFOF | RMATION | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Traffic signal refurbishment budget reduc | tion. | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Traffic Management | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | £37,750 | | |
| THIS AREA: | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £11,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 29% | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | | |
| Reduction in planned works/replacement. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

The budget reduction will have a direct impact on the ongoing maintenance/condition of the traffic signal equipment which could ultimately lead to installations becoming unsafe/having to be switched off/decommissioned.

The ability to replace life expired equipment will be affected so replacement for more modern equipment will take longer (e.g. controlled pedestrian crossing with detection equipment).

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Where possible equipment replacement will be funded through external sources of funding and infrastructure schemes.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | |
| Nil | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | | ✓ | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | | |
| Nil impact saving. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: | | |
| Any deterioration in the condition/switching of will lead to an increased number of faults being | _ | | | |
| Replacing life expired equipment for up to dat benefit. | e technology will take longe | r before road users will | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | iis: | | |
| NATED consultations to could be the impost of fi | | altawaatii aaaa af | | |
| MTFP consultations to explain the impact of fi funding where possible. | nanciai pressures and utilisir | ig alternative sources of | | |
| Turiumg where possible. | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: | | | |
| Nil impact. | | | | |
| , | | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 1 | | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | | | |
| THE MISSING TO SEE THE SEE SEE THE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE SEE S | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | Nil | | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? | | |
| TELASE SI EGII I HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED. | TIOW WAN | 110313: | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | | |
| NOUNTABLE STATE | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | | | | |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | | | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | | YES | NO |
|--|-------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | ✓ | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL! (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| If traffic signals are not operational for an extended | | · | _ |
| them through temporary traffic management arraincreased calls. | igei | ments, and possibly the co | ustomer care team taking |
| mercuscu cuiis. | | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | | V |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| . RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | | |
| MISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | V | YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | | ✓ | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | | |
| Detential for increased complaints from Members | and | the public if there is a sig | nificant increase in the |
| Potential for increased complaints from Members number and duration of un-operational traffic sign | | | illicant increase in the |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | | | |
| 7 EE7 SE ST EST T SEES WITHOUT THE SE THIS 137 SE THIS 137 | | | |
| Maintain an accurate register of assets and conditi | on s | surveys. Where possible | equipment replacement |
| will be funded through external sources of fun | | • | |
| <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | |
| CONSULTATION | | | |
| DUE ACE DE OVUDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSUL | . – . | TION(C) THAT HAVE BEEN | LINDEDTAKEN ALONG |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | LIA | TION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN | UNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED. | | | |
| None. | | | |
| | | | |
| . OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | | |
| . OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER | R RE | LEVANT INFORMATION W | /HICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. | | | |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd | ••••• | •••••• | |
| DATE OF COMPLETIONS 4 No. 1 | ~ | 04.0 | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION: 1 November | r 🖊 | U I X | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - REDUCTION IN ACCIDENT STUDIES DUE TO CONTRACT REVIEW

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | |
| 1. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Transportation – accident studies budget | reduction. |
| BUDGET AREA: | Transport Strategy & Road Safety | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | £19,239 | |
| THIS AREA: | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £10,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 52% |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

A new contract is in place with an external provider that reduces the minimum fixed contract element and gives more flexibility to use as and when required. This does reduce the detailed information available across the whole borough but enables a focus on target/risk areas.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

There will be minimal impact on the public but the focus of casualty reduction will be prioritised on the higher risk areas.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

More analysis will be undertaken in house to develop the information required when bidding for external grant funding.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| NIL | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | | √ |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFT WITH BELOW! | | |
| Nil impact | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: |
| | | |
| It requires a greater reliance on staff knowled, becomes more prominent. | ge so staff retention/success | sion planning in this area |
| becomes more prominent. | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | nis: |
| | | |
| Greater utilisation of external grant funding w | here possible/necessary to s | supplement resources. |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS | OF STAFF: |
| | | |
| Nil impact. | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 1 | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | |
| NOWBER OF POSTS IN BODGET AREA AFFECTED. | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | Nil | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? |
| | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDEI EOTWENT. | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | ✓ |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | ✓ |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| DICK/C) AND CENCITIVITIES | | |
| 1. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | N YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | . 125 | √ · |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | v |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| 11 123, 122, 132 31 231 1 3223 11. | | |
| | | |
| | _ | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 5. CONSULTATION | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU | LTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN | UNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | |
| None. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 5. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER | R RELEVANT INFORMATION W | /HICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. | | |
| N/A | | |
| | | |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd | | |
| The second services in the services and services are services and services are services and services are services and services are services are services. | •••••• | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:30 October 2018 | | |
| = | *** | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – INCREASE IN ROAD CLOSURE FEE INCOME

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | | | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Increase Road Closure fee income | | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Traffic Management | | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £22,105 | | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £30,000 | Increase in income (136%) | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESC | PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | | | |
| Increase the road closure fee to third party commercial organisations from £500 to £1,500. | | | | | |
| 2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC: | | | | | |
| CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION. | | | | | |
| There would be no impact on the public. | | | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this: | | | | | |
| N/A. | | | | | |
| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | | |
| LOW IMPACT | MEDIUM IMPACT | HIGH IMPACT | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | √ |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| | | |

Nil

| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| There is no impact on the public. | | |
| | | |
| ODCANICATIONAL INADACT ANALYCIC | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE OR | GANISATION: |
| There is no adverse impact. | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions the | at will assist in managing t | this: |
| MTFP consultations to explain the impact of fir | nancial pressures and utilis | sing alternative sources of |
| funding where possible. | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS | S OF STAFF: |
| Nil impact. | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | Nil | |
| PROPOSED SAVING. | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MA | NY POSTS ? |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| VOLUNTANT SEVERANCE. | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| REDUNDANCI. | | |
| DIFACE DROWING DETAILS OF MUSIC THIS WAY | April 2010 | 7 |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | ✓ | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |

| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT Other and the control of | h | |
| Other service areas will have to pay the increased of | narge. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | √ |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | · |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| 11151(0) 71112 02110111111120 | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | √ | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | , | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| Developed the developed of the back of | Construction to the land | a a Callada a alba a ca |
| Possibility of unauthorised activities on the highway | | avoid the charge. |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | VILLES WILL BE WILLIGATED! | |
| Closer engagement with contractors and utilities to | gether with more proactive TI | MA enforcement. |
| 0.00 | <u> </u> | |
| S. CONSULTATION | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSUL | TATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN U | JNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | |
| None. | | |
| None. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT | | |
| BEEN CAPTURED. N/A | | |
| IV C | | |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd | ••••• | |
| | | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:2 November | r 2018 | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN -PASSENGER TRANSPORT - INCREASE IN INCOME

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFORMATION | | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Increase fee for replacement of Concessionary Fare pass | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Integrated Transport Unit | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £7,000 | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £3,000 (new income) | Increase in income (43%) | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESC | CRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE AC | CHIEVED: | |
| The current replacement fee of £5 for the first replacement and £10 thereafter will be changed to a flat rate of £10 for all pass replacements. | | | |
| 2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC: | | | |
| CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION. | | | |
| The small increase in fee represents only a minor impact on the public. | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this: | | | |
| N/a | | | |

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | |
|---|--------|--------|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT |
| ✓ | | |
| | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | |
|---|---|------------|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | √ | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | · | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | Now | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | 366.56 | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: | |
| There would be no impact on the organisation | There would be no impact on the organisation. | | |
| Also place identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | ia. | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | is: | |
| N/a | | | |
| N/a | | | |
| DI FASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | III IMDACT LIDON MEMBERS (| DE STAEE: | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF : | | | |
| There would be no impact on staff | | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 1 | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 0 | | |
| | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: | 0 | Y POSTS? | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------|
| | April 2019 | |
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | V50 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | ✓ |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | · |
| IF VEC. DI FACE DECCDIDE DELOW. | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | √ |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | · |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| | VES. | NO |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | N YES | NO |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | N YES | NO ✓ |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | N YES | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | N YES | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | N YES | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | YES YES | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | N YES | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION. | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION 5. CONSULTATION | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION 5. CONSULTATION | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITION PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | IVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED.

N/A

HEAD OF SERVICE: Marcus Lloyd

DATE OF COMPLETION: 1 November 2018

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – INCREASE IN CAR PARK CHARGES

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | |
| L. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Increase off-street car parking charges | |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Traffic Management | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £626,874 | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £40,000 | Additional income: 6.4% |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | |

Increase car parking charges by 20p for each tariff. Implementation will take approximately 2 months (via legal notice) with a cost of approximately £15k to change the Pay & Display signs, thereby reducing the first year budget saving in 2019/20.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Despite the increase there would be no less availability of spaces.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Improved enforcement after the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement to increase availability of parking spaces.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | |
|---|--------|--------|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT |
| ✓ | | |
| | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | ✓ | | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | elow | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | DUILD IMPACT LIDON THE ODG | ANICATION | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | JULD IMPACT UPON THE UKG | ANISATION: | | |
| The majority of tickets sold are for 1-2 hrs in the sh | | _ , | | |
| parks. Large increases in charges over a short period | | ease car park usage to an | | |
| extent that limited/no additional income might be | gained. | | | |
| | | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | is: | | |
| | | | | |
| MTFP consultations to explain the impact of fi | nancial pressures and utilisir | ng alternative sources of | | |
| funding where possible. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF : | | | | |
| Nil impact. | | | | |
| • | | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 4 | | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 4 | | | |
| | | | | |
| ANNADED OF BOCTC AFFECTED DV THE | Net . | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | Nil | | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING. | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? | | |
| TELTISE STEER FILOW THIS WILL BE WING NOTE. | 11000 1000 10 | 110313. | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | | |
| | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | | | |
|--|------------|----------|--|--|
| BE IMPLEMENTED: WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | | |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | ✓ | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | | |
| | | | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | | |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | ✓ | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | | |
| 4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED II | N YES | NO | | |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | ✓ | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 5. CONSULTATION | | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | | | |
| None. | | | | |

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE | ANY OTHER RELEVANT | INFORMATION WHICH | YOU FEEL HAS NOT |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| BEEN CAPTURED. | | | |
| | | | |

N/A

| HEAD OF SERVICE: | Marcus Lloyd | |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| DATE OF COMPLETION: | 2 November 2018 | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - INTRODUCTION OF A CHARGE FOR RESIDENTIAL PARKING PERMITS

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|---|--|------------|--|
| | | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | |
| L. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Introduce annual fee for resident permit p | parking | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Traffic Management | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £0 (new income) | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £30,000 | New income | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED: | | | |
| Introduce a charge of £15 per permit per annum (allowing up to 2 permits per eligible property) in accordance with the Council's adopted Resident Permit Parking policy (2012). Implementation will be included alongside the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement | | | |

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

The proposal will introduce a more balanced, equal and consistent approach across the county borough for eligible residents.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Improved enforcement and information after the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) to maximise compliance.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | |
| IMPACT | IMPACT IMPACT | | |
| ✓ | | | |
| | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | | |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | ✓ | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | See be | elow | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: | | |
| The proposal will introduce a more balanced, equal and consistent approach across the county borough for eligible residents, recognising an element of compromise given the finite parking spaces available on street. | | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | iis: | | |
| | | | | |
| Parking restrictions can be reviewed post CPE | implementation to address a | any issues of concerns | | |
| from residents/the general public. | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: | | | | |
| Nil impact. | | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) 1 | | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: 1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | Nil | | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING. | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | | | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | ✓ |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE DRODGED CAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | VEC | No |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | YES | NO |
| | | ✓ |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| DIGINAL AND CENCITIVITIES | | |
| I. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | N YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | | √ |
| (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | VITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 5. CONSULTATION | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSU | LTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN | N UNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | |
| Nega | | |
| None. | | |
| | | |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER | R RELEVANT INFORMATION V | VHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. | | |
| N/A | | |
| | | |
| HEAD OF SERVICE:Marcus Lloyd | | |
| DATE OF COMPLETIONS | 2019 | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:2 November | r zu18 | ••• |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – INTEGRATED TRANSPORT UNIT

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| SERVICE AREA: | Infrastructure (TEG) | | |
| 1. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | £50k saving for improved | I fleet utilisation | within the ITU |
| BUDGET AREA: | Integrated Transport Uni | t | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £461,040 | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £50,000 | | Saving as a % of total budget: 11% |
| Review of transport req for renewal in April 201 | 9 and service requirement the number of external co | es – contracts w s will be reviewe | ith external transport providers are due ed with a view to improving vehicle rtaking more work with the internal fleet |
| 2. PUBLIC IMPACT | ANALYSIS | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW | THE PROPOSED SAVING C | OULD IMPACT U | JPON THE PUBLIC: |
| | OF WORKING, IN PARTICU S NOW MAY ALSO SECURE | • | /I IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE E PROVISION. |
| No impact on the Pub | lic. | | |
| Also, please identify t | the mitigating actions th | at will assist ir | n managing this: |
| N/a | | | |
| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE THIS SAVING PROPOSAL | | TE THE PUBLIC II | MPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO |
| LOW | | DIUM | HIGH |

IMPACT

IMPACT

IMPACT

Nil

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | | ✓ | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | | |
| No impact on the public. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: | | |
| There would be no impact on the organisation | savings anticipated by mo | ore effective utilisation of | | |
| internal drivers and internal fleet. | | | | |
| Also please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | aic. | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this: | | | | |
| N/a | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF: | | | | |
| There would be no impact on staff. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 18.6 | | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 18.6 | | | |
| | | | | |
| AND ADED OF DOCTO AFFECTED DV THE | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | 0 | | | |
| THOI COLD SAVING. | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? | | |
| DOCT/C\ ALDEADVAVACANT | | | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | | |
| DI FACE DROVIDE DETAILS OF MULTINITIES MULT | April 2010 | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | | | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | | |
|---|----------|----------|--|--|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | √ | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; ANDHOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | | |
| Budget held by Social Services Directorate, so savings will benefit Adult Services. | | | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | | |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | √ | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | YES | NO | | |
|---|-----|----|--|--|
| | | • | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | | | | |
| TELASE SI EGIL I BELOW HOW THESE MISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE WITHOUTED: | | | | |
| | | | | |

5. CONSULTATION

PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED:

N/A

6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED.

N/A

HEAD OF SERVICE: Marcus Lloyd

DATE OF COMPLETION: 1 November 2018

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (ONE YEAR) - WINTER MAINTENANCE - 54% REDUCTION

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|--------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Remove the ring-fenced budget for winter maintenance resilience / snow clearance. | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| BUDGET AREA: | Winter Maintenance (One year saving) | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £500,000 | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £500,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 100% | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

The Winter Maintenance Ring fenced budget will be removed. This is a reserve fund that is accrued following underspend on Winter Maintenance budget. The in- year under spend tops up the fund to a maximum of £500k that can be called upon should we have a bad winter or snow event. (Risk Mitigation).

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

There should be no impact on the public as Council reserves will fund and severe Winter maintenance actions.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

There should be no impact on the public as Council reserves will fund and severe Winter maintenance actions.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| X | | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | | X |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | ^ |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| There should be no impact as Council reserves will | fund any severe Winter maint | enance actions. |
| | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | ANISATION: |
| A large snowfall event will mean Council reser | ves are required to fund the | clearance. |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | is: |
| There should be no impact as Council reserves | will fund any severe Winter | maintenance actions. |
| · | , | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | ILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS (| OF STAFF: |
| There should be no impact as Council reserves | will fund any severe Winter | maintenance actions. |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | None | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 54 | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED SAVING: | 0 | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y POSTS? |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| NEDEPLOTIVIENT. | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| DE HVIF LEIVILIVI ED. | | |

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | X |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL! (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | 123 | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | | X |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES | | |
| | | |
| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | I YES | NO |
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | X |
| IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITI | VITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 5. CONSULTATION | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSUL | LTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN U | JNDERTAKEN, ALONG |
| WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: | | |
| None | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION | | |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER | RELEVANT INFORMATION WE | HICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. | THE ELEVATION ON THE OWN THE OWN | |
| | | |
| | | |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: | | |
| TIEND OF SERVICE. | •••••• | |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:5/11/2018 | ••••• | |

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (ONE YEAR) – TEMPORARY REDUCTIONS IN CARRIAGEWAY RESURFACING RCCO AND CARRIAGEWAY SURFACE DRESSING

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|------------------|--------------------|
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway operations |
| 1. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION |

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the Budget for Carriageway resurfacing treatments | | |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| BUDGET AREA: | Carriageway Surface dressing / Carriagew | av Resurfacing | |
| BODGET AREA. | Carriageway Surface dressing / Carriageway Resurfacing | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | Surface dressing £800,000 / Carriageway | resurfacing £110,000 (Total £1,023,000) | |
| THIS AREA: | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £910,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: | |
| | | 100% | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

For one year we will reduce the programme of surface and preservation and resurfacing treatments to our carriageways to rely on Capital Budget and Grant funding only.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

A noticeable reduction in annual resurfacing schemes being undertaken

Increased waiting times for roads to be resurfaced

A deterioration in road condition

An increase in potholes

An increase in claims

Increase in customer dissatisfaction

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

There are proposals for additional grant funding from Welsh Government which would temporarily limit the impact of the savings. However, the longer term maintenance will be compromised if grant funding cannot be secured or is removed.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| | X | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|--|--------|------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM: | See be | elow |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Increase and closer inspection of deterioration required

Increase in Service requests

Large increase in repair costs (for future treatments)

Increased maintenance costs (Patching / Pothole repairs)

Increased insurance claims

Increase insurance premiums

Damage to reputation of Caerphilly

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

No mitigation, future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required.

| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF : | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| Increase workload dealing with complaints cla | ims and service requests. | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) none | | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 3 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| | | |

| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MA | NY POSTS ? |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | YES | NO |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: • THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| Engineering Projects Group - Reduced workload fo CRM will have more complaints (SR's) to deal with. | | |
| Insurance / Risk management will have more claim | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | |
| • • | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | |
| The road deterioration will impact on all road users | s, pedestrians and cyclists wit | th an increased risk |
| travelling on network if not properly maintained. | | |
| People will have negative perception of "Caerphilly" as road condition is a key area and this may tarnish | | |
| their perception of our Service delivery as an Author | ority. | |
| | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | Y | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | Λ | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required to deal with the rapid deterioration of the carriageways.

Insurance claims costs are likely to increase as the carriageway deteriorates

Changes to cheaper surfacing techniques will become limited as carriageway deteriorates? The "appearance" and perception of Caerphilly will be tarnished as stakeholders compare the state of the roads with other areas.

| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? |
|---|
| Limited mitigation although maintaining a targeted approach and utilisation of HAMP principles may reduce some impacts. |
| Additional Grant funding needs to be proactively targeted to maintain minimum budget requirements to try and achieve a "steady state" within the Highway. |
| . CONSULTATION |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
| None |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |
| |

HEAD OF SERVICE:

DATE OF COMPLETION:5/11/18.....

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN STRUCTURES MAINTENANCE BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway Operations | |
| L. GENERAL INFOR | RMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce spend on Service Level Agreemen | t for Structural maintenance |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Highway Structures | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | £490,607 | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £40,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 8% |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

This is an additional budget reduction on top of the £36,000 already taken in 2019/20. Efficiencies in coordination and inspection regimes to maximise efficiencies and introduce specialist structures management software will already be in place and the one year savings will mean we will become more reliant on the Capital budget to deliver projects.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Any reduction could result in delays in undertaking works resulting in more costly repairs. This could result in longer periods of work which would cause increased delays to the travelling public due to roadworks and closures.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

A risk based approach could allow for increased frequency of inspections on failing structures, however, this would be counter-productive to the approach being adopted due to the condition and age of our assets.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | | | |
|---|--------|------|--|--|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | | | |
| LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH | | |
| IMPACT IMPACT IMPACT | | | | |
| X | | | | |
| | | | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | √ | | | | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | See be | elow | | | |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | | | | | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS | | | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING CO | OULD IMPACT UPON THE ORG | SANISATION: | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Early recognition and maintenance or repair is | _ | uced frequency of works | | | |
| could result in more costly repairs in the future | e. | | | | |
| | | _ | | | |
| Also, please identify the mitigating actions th | at will assist in managing th | nis: | | | |
| Function and staff trained to report apply since | of atmost and failure and ano | sialist saftuusus that | | | |
| Experienced staff trained to report early signs | • | | | | |
| assists in scheme prioritisation will assist in tar | geting the highest priority's | chemes first. | | | |
| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING W | III IMPACT LIPON MEMBERS | OE STΔEE· | | | |
| TELASE DESCRIBE NOW THE TROPOSED SAVING W | TEL IIVII ACT OF ON MEMBERS | or starr. | | | |
| No direct impact on staff, although budget ded | crease will put more pressur | es on staff to find | | | |
| alternate work. | | | | | |
| AND ADED OF FULL TIME FOLLOWING FAIT (FTF) | 0.25555 | 1 | | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 0.25FTE | | | | |
| STAFF IN BODGET AREA AFFECTED. | | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | none | | | | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | | | | |
| DIFACE CDECIEVILOW THIC WILL DE MANACED. | HOMANA | V POCTC? | | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MAN | Y PUSIS! | | | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | | | |
| 1 33 1(3) / 12/12/13 / 17/13/11(1) | | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY CEVERANCE. | | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE. | | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: REDEPLOYMENT: | | | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | | | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | |
|--|------------|----|
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Engineering Projects Group

Reduced workload for staff managing contractors and designing projects

Network Contracting Services

Reduced budget to undertake maintenance works

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Reduction in maintenance can lead to more costly future repairs and an increased deterioration rate leading to major maintenance which could affect adjacent land owners or service providers such as the Rail service over which our structures may span.

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | |
| IE VEC DI EVCE CDECIEN BELOWY. | | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Early recognition and repair is the key to cost saving. Reduced frequency of inspection could result in more costly repairs in the future.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Experienced staff trained to report early signs of structural failure and specialist software that assists in scheme prioritisation will assist in targeting the highest priority schemes first to minimise costs and maximise efficiencies.

5. CONSULTATION

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULTATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
|---|
| None |
| |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:5/11/2018 |

MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (ONE YEAR) – TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN HIGHWAYS REACTIVE MAINTENANCE

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities |
|---------------|--------------------|
| | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Highway operations |

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the Budget for Highway Reactive Maintenance | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Safety defect repairs and Emergency resp | oonses (Including standby out of hours) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR | Safety defect repairs (£931,000) / Emerge | ency responses (£156,000) / Out of Hours | |
| THIS AREA: | (£214,000) – Total budget £1,301,500 | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £43,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: | |
| | | 4% | |

PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE ACHIEVED:

An additional one off saving on top of the £55,000saving already taken in 2019/20 means we need to closely monitor usage of the budget and adhere to defect criteria for repairs and maximise the use of the new jetpatcher to utilise the efficiency savings in the planned maintenance approach as opposed to the reactive more costly patching repairs.

Only respond to "emergencies" out of hours and make better use of Highway Inspectors.

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

A noticeable reduction in response to pothole intervention as only those that meet defect criteria will be repaired

Increased waiting times for roads to be resurfaced as more roads will require resurfacing

A deterioration in road condition leading to an increased deterioration rate and early failure.

An increase in visible potholes as only those that meet defect criteria will be repaired

An increase in claims, challenges in court will also increase together with an increase in customer dissatisfaction

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

The new jetpatcher will produce some efficiency savings in the planned maintenance approach which will go some way to limit the impact on the public, however, the jet patcher has limitations on where it can be used.

| LOW IMPACT | MEDIUN IMPAC | | HIGH IMPACT | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | X | | | |
| S AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESS | SMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO | |
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAPROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | AVING | X | | |
| F YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE I | EQUALITY IMPACT | So | ee below | |
| F NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BE | LOW? | | | |
| LEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PRocessed inspection regimes | s with closer monitor | | ORGANISATION: | |
| | | | | |
| arge increase in repair costs | for future treatmer | • | | |
| Large increase in repair costs ncreased maintenance costs | s (for future treatmer s due to accelerated o | deterioration of the H | Highway | |
| arge increase in repair costs ncreased maintenance costs ncreased insurance claims le | s (for future treatmer s due to accelerated o eading to Increase ins | deterioration of the Fourance premiums | Highway | |
| Large increase in repair costs ncreased maintenance costs ncreased insurance claims le Damage to reputation of Cae | s (for future treatmer s due to accelerated of eading to Increase ins erphilly and people's | deterioration of the Hourance premiums perception of us | | |
| Large increase in repair costs ncreased maintenance costs ncreased insurance claims less amage to reputation of Caes Also, please identify the mit The jetpatcher will provide so nigher and an increase in rea | s (for future treatmers due to accelerated of eading to Increase inserphilly and people's sigating actions that wome mitigation, howelective maintenance be | deterioration of the Hourance premiums perception of us will assist in managir ever, future repair co | ng this: osts will be significantly | |
| Increase in Service requests , Large increase in repair costs Increased maintenance costs Increased insurance claims le Damage to reputation of Cae Also, please identify the mit The jetpatcher will provide so higher and an increase in reaundertaking less work for higher and an increase in reaundertaking less work for higher | s (for future treatmers due to accelerated of eading to Increase inserphilly and people's ligating actions that wome mitigation, howelective maintenance beginner costs. | deterioration of the Hourance premiums perception of us will assist in managir ever, future repair coudget will be require | ng this: osts will be significantly d meaning we will be | |

None

STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED:

NUMBER OF **POSTS** AFFECTED BY THE

PROPOSED SAVING:

NUMBER OF **POSTS** IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED:

| PLEASE SPECIFY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MA | NY POSTS? | |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | | | |
| VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | | | |
| RETIREMENT: | | | |
| REDEPLOYMENT: | | | |
| REDUNDANCY: | | | |
| | | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL BE IMPLEMENTED: | April 2019 | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | X | | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | <u> </u> | | |
| Network Contracting Services – Will lead to a chan | | | |
| CRM will have more complaints (SR's) to deal with Insurance / Risk management will have more claim | | | |
| insurance / Kisk management will have more claim | is to dear with | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO | |
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | Х | | |
| VOLONTANT SECTOR FARTNER: (FLEASE FICK) | | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW: | | | |
| THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND | | | |
| HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT | | | |
| The road deterioration will impact on all road users, pedestrians and cyclists alike. | | | |
| People will have negative perception of "Caerphilly" as road condition is a key area and this may tarnish | | | |
| their perception of our Service delivery as an Author | • | area and tino may tarmon | |
| | • | | |

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | X | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | ^ | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future repair costs will be significantly higher and an increase in reactive maintenance budget will be required to deal with the rapid deterioration of the carriageways.

Insurance claims costs are likely to increase as the carriageway deteriorates

The "appearance" and perception of Caerphilly will be tarnished as stakeholders compare the state of the roads with other Boroughs or areas.

| PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED? |
|---|
| Limited mitigation although maintaining a targeted approach and utilisation of HAMP principles may reduce some impacts. |
| Additional Grant funding needs to be proactively targeted to maintain minimum budget requirements to achieve a "steady state" within the Highway. |
| 5. CONSULTATION |
| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
| None |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |
| |

HEAD OF SERVICE:

DATE OF COMPLETION:5/11/18.....

MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN – TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN RISCA CANAL MAINTENANCE BUDGET

| DIRECTORATE: | Communities | |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | |
| SERVICE AREA: | Engineering Projects Group | |
| 1. GENERAL INFO | RMATION | |
| SAVING PROPOSAL: | Reduce the Budget for maintenance on the Monmouth and Brecon Canal | |
| | | |
| BUDGET AREA: | Safety inspections, general maintenance such as grass/tree cutting, towpath surface repair, channel weed control, water control and dredging. | |
| | | |
| TOTAL BUDGET FOR THIS AREA: | Total budget £92,100 | |
| | | |
| TOTAL SAVING: | £40,000 | Saving as a % of total budget: 43% |
| | | |
| PLEASE PROVIDE A DES | CRIPTION OF HOW THE SAVING WILL BE AC | CHIEVED: |
| No planned channel dre | edging | |

2. PUBLIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE PUBLIC:

CONSIDER THE 5 WAYS OF WORKING, IN PARTICULAR, LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. SAVINGS NOW MAY ALSO SECURE FUTURE SERVICE PROVISION.

Problematic areas along the length of the canal that require routine dredging due to the ingress of silts from feed streams would not be dealt with. Over certain lengths of the canal this will prevent the use of trip boats and can in dry periods where water levels can become critical impede the passage of water along the channel.

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Spot dredging which just moves silt to the edges/banks of the canal channel to allow water through flow, no silts are taken off site.

| TAKING ACCOUNT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE INDICATE THE PUBLIC IMPACT RATING APPLICABLE TO | | |
|---|--------|--------|
| THIS SAVING PROPOSAL (PLEASE TICK): | | |
| LOW MEDIUM HIGH | | HIGH |
| IMPACT | IMPACT | IMPACT |
| | X | |
| | | |

| IS AN EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED | YES | NO |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| TO BE COMPLETED FOR THIS SAVING | Х | |
| PROPOSAL? (PLEASE TICK) | | |
| IF YES, PLEASE COMPLETE THE EQUALITY IMPACT | Can balan | alow |
| ASSESSMENT FORM: | See below | |
| IF NO, PLEASE SPECIFY WHY BELOW? | | |
| | | |
| The change in service delivery affects all residents | and visitors to Caerphilly equa | lly and does not directly |
| impact on a particular group or organisation | | |
| | | |

3. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING COULD IMPACT UPON THE ORGANISATION:

Increase in Service requests / complaints

Increase in costs (for future treatments)

Increased over all maintenance costs due to the doubling up of operations i.e. several rounds of dredging, partial and full to treat the same section of canal.

Damage to reputation of Caerphilly and people perception of us

Also, please identify the mitigating actions that will assist in managing this:

Spot dredging which just moves silt to the edges/banks of the canal channel to allow water through flow, no silts are taken off site.

| PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT UPON MEMBERS OF STAFF : | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|
| Increase workload dealing with complaints claims and service requests. | | |
| NUMBER OF FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | 0.05 FTE | |
| STAFF IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS IN BUDGET AREA AFFECTED: | None | |
| | | |
| | | |
| NUMBER OF POSTS AFFECTED BY THE | None | |
| PROPOSED SAVING: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| PLEASE SPECIFIY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | |
| PLEASE SPECIFIY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | |
| PLEASE SPECIFIY HOW THIS WILL BE MANAGED: POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | |
| | HOW MANY POSTS? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | HOW MANY POSTS ? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: | HOW MANY POSTS? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: | HOW MANY POSTS? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: | HOW MANY POSTS? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: REDEPLOYMENT: | HOW MANY POSTS? | |
| POST(S) ALREADY VACANT: VOLUNTARY SEVERANCE: RETIREMENT: | HOW MANY POSTS? | |

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF WHEN THIS WILL | April 2019 | |
|--|------------|----|
| BE IMPLEMENTED: | | |
| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
| ON ANOTHER DIRECTORATE, SERVICE AREA OR | | |
| TEAM WITHIN THE COUNCIL? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Engineering Projects Group

Reduced workload for staff managing contractors and designing projects

Network Contracting Services

Reduced budget to undertake maintenance works

| WILL THE PROPOSED SAVING HAVE AN IMPACT | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| ON ANOTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PARTNER OR | | |
| | X | |
| VOLUNTARY SECTOR PARTNER? (PLEASE TICK) | X | |
| | | |

IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE BELOW:

- THE AREA(S) AFFECTED; AND
- HOW THE PROPOSED SAVING WILL IMPACT

Torfaen, Newport and Monmouth Councils have a responsibility along the Canal together with Monmouth and Brecon Canal Association and Islwyn Canal association.

Users of the canal are the Risca angling club

Any deterioration of the canal or resultant major works can close the canal which affects all users and visitors enjoyment of the facility. Closures also have environmental impacts in water quality and control which in-turn can affect wildlife and fisheries.

4. RISK(S) AND SENSITIVITIES

| HAVE ANY RISKS/SENSITIVITIES BEEN IDENTIFIED IN | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| CONNECTION WITH THIS SAVING PROPOSAL? | Y | |
| (PLEASE TICK) | Λ | |

IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:

Future maintenance costs will be higher and an increase in reactive maintenance will be required to deal with potential water flow /supply issues.

Potential water supply issues to lower reaches of canal which in times of prolonged dry weather can lead to fish distress and possible kills.

The "appearance" and perception of Caerphilly will be tarnished as stakeholders compare the state of the canal with other Boroughs or areas.

PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW HOW THESE RISKS/SENSITIVITIES WILL BE MITIGATED?

Limited mitigation, however, engagement with associated partners and users try and secure alternate funding sources would be an option.

We could also engage with "Self-appointed guardians" and the local community who voluntarily undertake minor maintenance and litter picking to "formalise" what they do and provide them with the tools to undertake this work to enable them to widen the scope and area of work they do.

5. CONSULTATION

| PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS OF ANY SPECIFIC CONSULATION(S) THAT HAVE BEEN UNDERTAKEN, ALONG WITH FEEDBACK RECEIVED: |
|--|
| None |
| |
| |
| 6. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION |
| PLEASE USE THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION WHICH YOU FEEL HAS NOT |
| BEEN CAPTURED. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| HEAD OF SERVICE: |
| DATE OF COMPLETION:7/11/18 |