COMMUNITY & LEISURE SERVICES

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN SAVINGS OPTIONS

2015/2016

REQUIRING FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Medium Term Financial Plan – 2015/2016

Budget Title / Ref:	CESSATION OF BANDS IN THE PARK, EVENTS
	PROGRAMME – NEW SAVING
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£2,000 2015-16 The past programmes have been supported in the main by a few Community councils,and one partnership (see below in brackets) these fund 50% of the costs to produce the programme of events in specific locations. These locations in 2014 included, • Tiryberth Park, Tir y Berth. (Gelligear Community Council) • Waunfawr Park, Crosskeys. (Crosskeys and Pontywaun
	 partnership). Morgan Jones Park, Caerphilly. (Caerphilly town council). Ystrad Mynach Park, Ystrad Mynach. (Gelligear Community Council). Tredegar Park, Risca. (Risca Town Council). Llanbradach Park, Llanbradach (Llanbradach and Pwllpant Community council) Morgan Jones Park, (Caerphilly Town Council). Showfield Blackwood. (Blackwood Town Council). Rhymney park, Rhymney. (Rhymney Town Council)
	Locations where Concerts did not take place include, Grove Park, New Tredegar. Bargoed Park Wern Park Nelson Maesycwmmer Park Sengenydd Welfare Ground Abertridwr Park Penyrheol Park David Williams Park Bedwas Park Machen Welfare Ground Oakdale welfare Ground Islwyn Park, Pontllanfraith

	Ynysddu Welfare Ground Pontyminster Park Abercarn Welfare Ground Newbridge Welfare Ground Newbridge Park Crumlin Park
	Trelyn Park, FleuDelys Gelligear Welfare Ground
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs:	£470. Overtime None anticipated. £1,530
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>t</u>
Consultation: Statutory Process:	No statutory processes are required.
Risks of Implementation	<u>1</u>
Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required elsewhere in the service area, which are likely to be of a higher impact.
Savings: Timeframe:	No associated risk, can be implemented if approved.
HR Implications:	
Redundancy: Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None anticipated. None anticipated. None anticipated.
Other Options/Issues:	Current 50% sponsorship partners, (Community Councils) on these events could consider picking up the whole costs per event.

Budget Title / Ref:	2 ND PHASE OF THE REMOVAL OF FLOWERBEDS IN PARKS AND OPEN LOCATIONS. (A) PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£40,000 £40,000 2015/2016 2016/2017 The first phase of the removal of floral displays was undertaken during 2014-2015.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs: Resource Costs:	Circa £15K would be needed for material costs such as topsoil, grass seed etc.
Additional Costs:	None anticipated.
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>nt</u>
Consultation:	Consultation will take place with Town / Community Councils, Community Partnerships, Town Centre Management Group and Trade Unions.
Statutory Process:	No statutory processes are required.
Risks of Implementatio	<u>n</u>
Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required elsewhere in the service area, which are likely to be of a higher impact.
Savings: Timeframe:	No risk - can be implemented if approved. Works can be undertaken during the autumn / winter period of 2015.
HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	It is anticipated that this will affect 1 full time equivalent post within the structure, which could be subject to redundancy or redeployment.
Redeployment: Redirected Resource:	None anticipated
Other Options/Issues:	The removal of core works at specific times of the year will impact on the in-house workforce. It will also impact on the appearance of the county borough, could lead to significant public complaints and lead to some reputational damage.

Budget Title / Ref:	REDUCTION IN PLAYING FIELD MAINTENANCE – NOT SUPPORTED and (C) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE IN JULY 2014
Savings (£):	£30,000 – Material Costs
Financial Year:	2015-16
Comment:	This could be achieved by removing 2 applications of fertilizer
	(summer / winter) and the 'end of season' renovation works
	normally undertaken to playing fields in the county borough.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	None anticipated.
Resource Costs:	None anticipated.
Additional Costs:	None anticipated.
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>it</u>
Consultation:	Consultation will take place with Town / Community Councils,
	Community Partnerships and user groups.
Statutory Process:	No statutory processes are required.
Risks of Implementation	<u>n</u>
Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required elsewhere in the service area,
_	which are likely to be of a higher impact.
Savings:	No risk can be implemented if approved.
Timeframe:	
HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	None anticipated.
Redeployment:	None anticipated.
Redirected Resource:	None anticipated.
	1

Other Options/Issues:

The removal of this function could lead to significant complaints from service users (e.g. rugby and football clubs). It is possible that there could be an increase subsequent insurance claims. Potentially, some clubs may wish to fund these works and bring the standard of maintenance in line with some private facilities in the borough. Officers have considered an alternative option involving cessation of regular pitch marking and handing over pitch marking responsibility to clubs (subject to consultation). The saving would be the same but some pitch renovation could then be undertaken. The clubs would be expected to purchase materials themselves.

Budget Title / Ref:	INCREASING OUTDOOR FACILITIES CHARGES -
	(D) OFFICERS ASKED TO LOOK AT OTHER OPTIONS BY SCRUTINY IN JULY 2014
Savings (£):	£20,000 2015/2016 and £20,000 2016/2017
Financial Year:	2015-16 & 2016-17
Comment:	The current charging structure would be increased by 20% per
	annum.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	None anticipated.
Resource Costs:	None anticipated.
Additional Costs:	None anticipated.
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>t</u>
Consultation:	Consultation will take place with Town / Community Councils,
	Community Partnerships and service users.
Statutory Process:	No statutory processes are required.
Risks of Implementation	n
Trions of implementation	<u></u>
Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required elsewhere in the service area, which are likely to be of a higher impact
Savings:	No risk can be implemented if approved.
Timeframe:	Could take effect from the 1 st of April 2015.
HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	None anticipated.
Redeployment:	None anticipated.
Redirected Resource:	None anticipated.
	1

Other Options/Issues:

When this matter was considered by the Scrutiny Committee in July 2014, officers were asked to consider the effect of increasing outdoor facilities charges for adults but retaining the existing pricing structure for juniors. Officers have therefore suggested 5 options as follows:

Increase adult fees by:-

- 30% = £20k additional income
- 40% = £27k additional income
- 45% = £31k additional income
- 50% = £34k additional income
- 100% = £69 additional income

Budget Title / Ref:	REVIEW OF THE PARK RANGER SERVICE. (A) PREVIOUSLY
Covingo (C):	SUPPORTED
Savings (£): Financial Year:	£40,000 2015-16
Comment:	This would be the first of a phased review of the Park Ranger
	Service within the county borough. It is anticipated that the service will eventually be reduced to 6 Park Rangers from the
	current level of 18. Although this first phase involves reduction
	from 18 to 12.
	Hom To to 12.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	None anticipated.
Resource Costs:	None anticipated.
Additional Costs:	None anticipated.
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>ıt</u>
Consultation:	Consultation will take place with Town / Community Councils,
	Community Partnerships and service users.
Statutory Process:	No statutory process.
Risks of Implementatio	<u>n</u>
Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required elsewhere in the service area,
	which are likely to be of a higher impact.
Savings:	No associated risk, can be implemented if approved.
Timeframe:	If approved, the Park Ranger service will be withdrawn at some
	locations for the 2015-16 bowls / cricket season.
HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	None anticipated.
Redeployment:	None anticipated.
Redirected Resource:	Yes, this will result in the non-engagement of some agency
	personnel during the 22-week summer period. Existing
	permanent staff will be accommodated at other parks locations.

Other Options/Issues:	This would result in the removal of any formal presence at five
	Council operated Parks and associated outdoor facilities
	throughout the spring / summer period. (Ty Isaf Pontymister,
	Abertridwr, Senghenydd, Ynysddu, Blackwood). Negotiation and
	agreement would need to be reached with service users (e.g.
	bowls clubs) to permit continual use of the facility.

Show Newbr	00
Financial Year: 2015-7 Comment: The lo Show Newbr	6 cations affected by withdrawal include, field, Blackwood, idge Park. le Welfare ground.
Comment: The lo Show Newbr	cations affected by withdrawal include, field, Blackwood, idge Park. le Welfare ground.
Show Newbr	field, Blackwood, idge Park. le Welfare ground.
Newbr	idge Park. le Welfare ground.
	le Welfare ground.
Oakda	
I	: Moltoro ground Dontymiotor
l	
	awr Park, Crosskeys.
l l	gar Park, Risca.
	ney Park.
l	ed Park.
	n welfare ground.
Penyn	neol Park, Caerphilly. dwr Park.
	nydd Welfare ground. adach Park.
	Mynach Park.
	ocations above are not cleansed on Sundays or Bank
holida	·
I .	ition to the above locations the following Parks locations
	ly cleansed on a routine week day, these include,
Feede	r Row Park, Pontywaun.
	oridge Recreation ground, Risca.
	t Recreation Ground.
	rille Recreation ground.
	ellinfach gardens.
	venue Gardens, Pentwynmawr.
	n Park.
l '	penmaen Recreation ground.
-	laying fields, Pontllanfraith.
	Park Penllwyn, Pontllanfraith.
	finch park, Pontllanfraith.
	ieldside Recreation ground.
	s Recreation ground, Pontllanfraith. oush recreation ground.
	am welfare ground.
	nia Recreation ground.
	rid's recreation ground, Pengam.
	Park, Flue De Lys.
•	ry Park, Abercarn.
	eld, Crumlin.
	's pond, Rhymney.
	Mac Harris Park, Rhymney.

Eisteddfod field, Rhymney.

Abertysswg Park

Pontlotyn Recreation ground.

Pontlotyn welfare ground.

Fochriw welfare ground.

Deri recreation ground.

Bute house play ground, Brithdir.

Phillipstown recreation ground.

Grove Park, New Tredegar.

Aberbargoed Recreation ground.

Aberbargoed welfare ground.

Lewis street playground, Aberbargoed.

Gelligear welfare ground.

Capel ground, Gilfach.

Basin Ground, Gilfach.

Tiryberth welfare ground.

Cascade playing field.

Hanbury Street play area, Glanynant.

Machen welfare ground.

Lanfabon drive, Trethomas.

Waunganol Park, bedwas.

Trap well park, Rudry.

Porset Park, Caerphilly.

Pontypandy Caerphilly.

Cwm farm lake/ play ground, Caerphilly.

Heol belah, llanbradach.

Winfield tip ground, llanbradach.

Forge mill playground, Ystrad Mynach.

Griffiths street play ground, Ystrad Mynach.

Mase y Cwmmer Park, play ground.

Park lane play ground, Tredomen, Ystrad mynach.

Cefn hengoed youth club ground.

Nelson Wern Park.

Abertridwr heritage park, Abertridwr.

Cost to Implement

Staff Costs: £12,000, over time payments, 2 members of staff would need to

be served with 13 weeks notice of removal of over time

payments.

Resource Costs: None anticipated.

Additional Costs: As Above.

Timeframe to Implement

Consultation: None undertaken

Statutory Process: No statutory processes are required.

Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required elsewhere in the service area, which are likely to be of a higher impact.
Savings: Timeframe:	No associated risk, can be implemented if approved.
HR Implications:	
HR Implications:	None anticipated.
HR Implications: Redundancy: Redeployment:	None anticipated. None anticipated.

Dudget Title / Defe	DEMOVAL OF DARRIED ATTENDANTS AT 5 LOCATIONS
Budget Title / Ref:	REMOVAL OF BARRIER ATTENDANTS AT 5 LOCATIONS –
	NEW SAVING
Savings (£):	£14,000.
Financial Year:	2015-16
Comment:	The 5 locations were historically established due to past anti
	social activities, vehicles parking up at the locations during the evenings/ weekends and hours of darkness, the locations being, Showfield, Blackwood. Rhymney Park.
	Wern Park, Nelson.
	Abertridwr Park.
	Morgan Jones Park, Caerphilly.
	Duties include 30 minutes to 1 hour opening and closing the facilities
	Other main parks/ locations not included in the list above, have barriers or gates that are either left open or may have a
	vehicle barrier/gate that is kept locked outside working hours. Public have access via pedestrian openings.
	Pontymister recreation ground.
	Ty Isaf welfare ground, Pontymister.
	Tredegar Park, Risca.
	Waunfawr Park, Crosskeys.
	Abercarn welfare ground.
	Ynysddu welfare ground.
	New bridge park.
	Newbridge welfare ground.
	Crumlin Park.
	Wattsvile recreation ground.
	Oakdale recreation ground.
	Islwyn Park, Pontllanfraith.
	St David's playing ground, Pengam. Cefn Forrest welfare ground.
	New Tredegar recreation ground.
	Bargoed Park.
	Gilfach welfare ground.
	Gelligear welfare ground.
	Maes y Cwmmer Park.
	Ystrad Mynach Park.
	Llanbradach Park.
	Sengenydd welfare ground.
	Penyrheol Park, Caerphilly.
	David Williams park, Caerphilly.

	Waunganol Park, Bedwas.
	Machen Welfare Ground.
	Markham welfare ground.
	Trelyn Park, fleu de Lys.
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	£14,000. 5 members of staff would need to be served with notice
	of termination of contract of employment
Resource Costs:	None anticipated.
Additional Costs:	None anticipated
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>t</u>
Consultation:	None to date undertaken – but consultation with staff and TU's will be required/
Statutory Process:	No statutory processes are required.
Risks of Implementation	<u>n</u>
Not Achieving -	Budget cuts would be required from elsewhere in the service area, which are likely to be of a higher impact.
Savings: Timeframe:	No associated risk - can be implemented if approved.
HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	None anticipated.
Redeployment:	None anticipated.
Redirected Resource:	None anticipated.
	·
Other Options/Issues:	

Budget Title / Ref:	CHARGE FOR ALL REPLACEMENT/NEW ISSUE CONTAINERS (NO CONCESSIONS): (B) NOT SUPPORTED and ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED
Savings (£):	£60,000
Financial Year:	2015/16
Comment:	Rejected by Members for 2014/15 and not supported again by
	Scrutiny for 2015/16
	There will be a need for IT development for the charging regime and additional work for Contact Centre processing payments
Cost to Implement	
Staff Costs:	n/a
Resource Costs:	
Additional Costs:	May have an impact on Contact Centre or Cash Offices
	processing payments
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>nt</u>
Consultation:	Consultation with Staff, Trade Unions and Contact Centre
Statutory Process:	Prior notification to public and possible consultation with
	Community Councils and other Statutory Consultees
Risks of Implementatio	<u>n</u>
Not Achieving -	Public resistance
Savings:	
Timeframe:	It may be difficult to introduce from April 1st 2015 and if delayed
	then it is likely that we will not achieve the full saving.
HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	
Redeployment:	May result in decrease in demand so reduced delivery crew
	requirements and non-achievement of income
Redirected Resource:	

Other Options/Issues:	Suggested charging regime Replacement/new issue bins £25 Replacement/new issue boxes £6 Replacement/new issue garden waste bags £3 Where residents request bags for recycling/waste £5 per roll of 25 The only options for taking payment would be via card or cash offices as it would not be cost effective to raise sundry debtor invoices for these amounts.

Medium Term Financial Plan - 2015/2016 - 2016/2017

APPENDIX 3

Budget Title / Ref:	REDUCED OPENING DAYS AND HOURS ON CA SITES. (D) ORIGINAL PROPOSAL NOT SUPPORTED AND ALTERNATIVE OPTION CONSIDERED			
Savings (£):	£100,000			
	The original proposals covered a variety of options to close any combination of up to 5 of our 6 sites.			
	This was not supported by Scrutiny but Members asked that Officers consider alternative options such as closing all sites on certain days/times.			
Financial Year: Comment:				
Comment.				
Cost to Implement				
Staff Costs: Resource Costs:	The Authority now has a range of HR policies designed to manage reductions in staff numbers and these will be used to manage the process in this service area. However it is important that negotiations with staff/Trade Unions and resultant decisions are reached in a timely manner if the level of savings required is to be achieved.			
Additional Costs:	There may be additional security and Illicit tipping issues at the sites on the days they are closed but these are difficult to quantify, would probably reduce over time and may be mitigated to some extent by use of CCTV			
Timeframe to Impleme				
Timeframe to Impleme Consultation:				
	The manning level reductions would probably require cross matching some posts within Waste Strategy and Operations which will be discussed with TU's and HR.			
Statutory Process:	The provision of one CA Site is a Statutory requirement. The legislation requires that at least one facility should be available on weekends although it is quite likely that we will endeavour to keep at least 50% of our sites open every day			
Risks of Implementation	on .			
Not Achieving –	Limited risk			
Savings:	The Authority now has a range of HR policies designed to manage reductions in staff numbers and these will be used to manage the process in this service area. However it is important that negotiations with staff/Trade Unions and resultant decisions are reached in a timely manner if the level of savings required is to be achieved.			
Timeframe:	Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge.			

HR Implications:

Redundancy: The Authority now has a range of HR policies designed to

manage reductions in staff numbers and these will be used to

manage the process in this service area.

Redeployment: Not applicable. Redirected Resource: Not applicable.

Other Options/Issues:

In order to achieve the £100k saving all 6 sites would need to close on 2 days per week (on a rotational basis) or, alternatively 1 site could be permanently closed. Closure of less than 6 sites for 2 days/week would not realise the £100k saving that is required.

Medium Term Financial Plan – 2015/2016 APPENDIX 3

Budget Title / Ref:	REDUCED LEVEL OF CLEANSING ON BANK HOLIDAYS (CLEANSING WILL BE REDUCED TO SAME LEVEL AS WEEKENDS – LIMITED TO MORNING CLEANSE OF TOWN CENTRES). (A) PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED				
Savings (£):	£13,000				
Financial Year:	2015/16				
Comment:					
Cost to Implement					
Staff Costs:	n/a				
Resource Costs:					
Additional Costs:					
Timeframe to Implemen	Timeframe to Implement				
Consultation:	Consultation with Staff and Trade Unions				
Statutory Process:	Prior notification to public and possible consultation with				
Statutory Process.					
	Community Councils and other Statutory Consultees				
Risks of Implementatio	<u>n</u>				
Not Achieving -	Public resistance, Staff resistance				
Savings:					
Timeframe:	2015/16				
Timename.	2010/10				
HR Implications:					
Redundancy:	n/a				
Redeployment:	- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1				
Redirected Resource:					
Other Options/Issues:					
<u> </u>					

Medium Term Financial Plan – 2015/2016

APPENDIX 3

Budget Title / Ref:	REDUCE CONTRIBUTION TO WINTER REAR LANE GRUBBING OUT TEAM: (A) PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED				
Savings (£): Financial Year:	£100,000 2015/16				
Comment:	The rear lane weed removal work is lower priority work than keeping streets free of litter				
Cost to Implement					
Staff Costs: Resource Costs: Additional Costs:	n/a				
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>ıt</u>				
Consultation: Statutory Process:	Consultation with Staff and Trade Unions Prior notification to public and possible consultation with Community Councils and other Statutory Consultees				
Risks of Implementation	n				
Misks of implementation	<u></u>				
Not Achieving -	Public resistance, Staff resistance, affects Grounds Maintenance (Parks) Service				
Savings: Timeframe:	2015/16				
HR Implications:					
Redundancy:	Possible Redundancy or redeployment issues for staff involved in undertaking this work or reduction in Agency				
Redeployment: Redirected Resource:					
Other Options/Issues:					

Budget Title / Ref:	REDUCE NUMBER OF PEDESTRIAN SWEEPERS FROM 4 TO			
_	3. (A) PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED			
Savings (£):	£14,000			
Financial Year:	2016/17			
Comment:	As 2 Drivers have already retired there is the opportunity to not			
	replace one of the machines when they are due for renewal in			
	2016/17			
Cost to Implement				
Staff Costs:	n/a			
Resource Costs:				
Additional Costs:				
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>t</u>			
Consultation:	Consultation with Staff and Trade Unions			
Statutory Process:	Prior notification to public and possible consultation with			
	Community Councils and other Statutory Consultees			
Risks of Implementation	<u>n</u>			
Not Achieving -	Public/Member resistance as there will be a reduced level of			
i to the method	pavement sweeping			
Savings:	,			
Timeframe:				
HR Implications:				
Redundancy:	n/a			
Redeployment:				
Redirected Resource:				
Other Options/Issues:				

Budget Title / Ref:	REDUCTION IN CLEANSING BUDGET VIA				
Budget Title / Itel.	REDUCTION IN CLEANSING BODGET VIA REDUCTION IN STAFF NUMBERS - NEW SAVING				
Savings (£): Financial Year: Comment:	£100,000 2015/2016 and £200,000 2016/2017 2015/16 and 2016/17 This should provide a part year saving of £100,000 in 2015/16 and then a full year saving of an additional				
	£200,000 in 2016/17. This new option considers the general reduction in cleansing staffing levels across the county borough. The reduction in staffing levels are in addition to those identified in CA Site reductions (6 number) and an additional 6 to achieve the balance of the Route Optimisation changes introduced in 2014/15. These reductions will effectively mean circa 15 less personnel on street cleansing which will result in an increase in SLA's for responding to non-emergency cleansing and missed waste collections from 48 hours to 7 days and the integration of hygiene and nappy collections into the fortnightly refuse with the provision of additional containers				
	Containers				
Cost to Implement					
Staff Costs:	The Authority now has a range of HR policies designed to manage reductions in staff numbers and these will be used to manage the process in this service area. However it is important that negotiations with staff/Trade Unions and resultant decisions are reached in a timely manner if the level of savings required is to be achieved.				
Resource Costs:	We will evaluate the option of reducing the number of cleansing gangs as part of this exercise although there should be no additional savings associated with this consideration. There may be some issues regarding increased complaints and how these are dealt with and it may place additional burdens not only on the service area but also the contact centre and enforcement teams				
Additional Costs:	None				
Timoframo to Impleme	nnt				
<u>Timeframe to Impleme</u> Consultation:	There would need to be wide spread consultation with				
Consultation.	TU's, HR and town/community councils.				
Statutory Process:	Street Cleansing is a Statutory function although the levels of pro-active cleansing is left very much up to the service provider. The risk revolves around keeping the borough sufficiently clean to avoid just becoming a service that responds to complaints				

Risks of Implementation			
Limited risk.			
As detailed above. The Authority now has a range of HR policies designed to manage reductions in staff numbers and these will be used to manage the process in this service area.			
However it is important that negotiations with staff/Trade Unions and resultant decisions are reached in a timely manner if the level of savings required in 2015/2016 is to be achieved. Dependent on consultation process/outcome/challenge but would be achieved in 2015/16.			
The Authority now has a range of HR policies designed to manage reductions in staff numbers and these will be used to manage the process in this service area.			
Possible option			
Possible option			
T			
Other Options/Issues:			
As this budget is mainly manpower (we reduced vehicle costs last year) savings can only be achieved via reductions in manpower.			
,			

Medium Term Financial Plan - 2015/2016

APPENDIX 3

Budget Title / Ref:	CWMCARN LEISURE CENTRE (A) SUPPORTED				
Savings (£):	£25,000				
Financial Year:	2015/16				
Comment:	Discussions currently on-going with the school. Cabinet report				
	scheduled for late 2014.				
Cost to Implement Signi	ificant investment has been made to improve the standard of the				
facility prior to the handov	ver. Full saving should be made.				
Staff Costs:	Staff have already been made redundant				
Resource Costs:	Already paid from within the budget				
Additional Costs:					
Timeframe to Implemen	<u>t</u>				
Consultation:	Currently consulting with key stakeholders and school.				
Statutory Process:	Cabinet report to be presented in late 2014				
	· ·				
Risks of Implementation	n				
	_				
Not Achieving - Curriculum PE delivery will be maintained but community u					
could be affected.					
Savings:	£30,000				
Timeframe:	It is hoped the school will manage the facility or if this is not an				
	option then it will be expected to contribute to the running cots.				
HR Implications:					
Redundancy:	Already one member of staff redundant (as part of the Leisure				
	Restructure)				
Redeployment:	Already one member of staff is in redeployment Pool (as part of				
	the Leisure Restructure)				
Redirected Resource:	None				
Other Options/Issues:	Negotiations ongoing with the school but they have indicated that				
	they are unlikely to agree to the handover. Consequently the				
	school's financial contribution will be required.				

HR Implications:	
Redundancy:	
Redeployment:	
Redirected Resource:	None
Other Options/Issues:	

Budget Title / Ref:	CLOSURE OF BEDWAS SWIMMING POOL ON SUNDAYS – NEW SAVING				
Savings (£): Financial Year:	£10,000 2015/16				
Comment:	It is proposed to close the swimming pool during Sundays				
301111101111	as there are very few customers (average 25) with little				
	income and high staff and energy costs. These swimmer				
	can be accommodated at Caerphilly Leisure Centre.				
Cost to Implement					
Staff Costs:	Non anticipated.				
Resource Costs:	Non anticipated.				
Additional Costs:	Non anticipated.				
Timeframe to Implemen	nt				
Consultation:	Consultation has taken place with users, staff, the school				
	and trade unions.				
Statutory Process:	Non statutory process.				
Risks of Implementatio					
Not Achieving – Budge impact.	et cuts would be required elsewhere with higher potential				
Savings:					
Timeframe:					
IID been beet en ee					
HR Implications:	New auticipated				
Redundancy: Redeployment:	Non anticipated Non anticipated.				
Redeployment.	Non anticipated.				
Redirected Resource:	Non anticipated.				
Other Options/Issues:					
	5 users on Sundays during public swimming sessions. The				
	of disers of Suridays during public swiffining sessions. The				
energy costs. The customers can use the swimming pool at Caerphilly Leisure					
Centre which is just over a mile away. There will be no HR implications as the					
staffing is currently covered on a non contractual basis.					
,					

Budget Title / Ref:	AVERAGE PRICE INCREASE OF 5% + INFLATION ON LEISURE CENTRE FEES – NEW SAVING			
Savings (£):	£100,00			
Financial Year:	2015/16			
Comment:	A 5% price increase (+ inflation) will achieve the savings			
	required while still providing value for money for			
	customers at competitive prices compared to similar			
	provision.			
	provision			
Cost to Implement				
Staff Costs:	None anticipated.			
Resource Costs:	None anticipated.			
Additional Costs:	None anticipated.			
Timeframe to Implement				
Consultation:	Consultation has taken place with staff and a			
	communication with customers will be the next step.			
Statutory Process:	No statutory process.			
-				
Risks of Implementation	<u>n</u>			
Not Achieving –				
Savings:	Budget cuts would need to be required elsewhere in the			
_	service area which are likely to result in higher impact.			
	There is the potential risk customers would stop attending.			
Timeframe:				
HR Implications:				
Redundancy:	Non anticipated.			
Redeployment:	Non anticipated.			
Redirected Resource:	Non anticipated.			
Other Options/Issues:				
	s inflation), would still provide excellent value for money for			
	k that customers could stop using our facilities, but through			
market research it is evident that the increased charges are still competitive				
compared to neighbouring local authorities. Effective communication with customers				
will be crucial to ensure that the message is understood and we continue to increase				
the number of new users while also improving the retention of existing customers.				
An example of the actual price increase and compatible prices is highlighted below.				
in champio of the dotter	price men sace and companies prices to mg.mg.med botom			

Activity	Current	Proposed	Other LAS	Regional Area
Adult Gym	£4.25	£4.46	Torfaen £5.15 Cardiff £5.25	£4.90
Adult Fitness	£3.90	£4.10	Torfaen £4.70 Cardiff £5.25	£4.36
Adult Badminton	£5.75	£6.04	Tofaen £8.50 Cardiff £11.40	£8.25
Artificial Turf Pitch	£42.65	£44.78	Newport £54.00 Blaenau Gwent £50.35	£52.18
Adult Swim	£3.05	£3.20	Torfaen £3.40 Cardiff £3.80	£3.35