

## Appendix 5 – Budget Savings for Consultation - Proposals

Proposal Number	Unique ID	Service Area	Proposal Title
1	AS2021/04	Adult and Community Services	Reduction in Day Opportunities Budget
2	AS2021/05	Adult and Community Services	Telecare Service
3	AS2021/07	Adult and Community Services	Reduction in Funding Awarded to Third Sector Organisations
4	AS2021/08	Adult and Community Service	Staffing Review
5	CFS2021/02	Children and Family Services	Family Support Services – Barnardos Partnership
6	CFS2021/05	Children and Family Services	Staffing across Children’s Services
7	CFS2021/06	Children and Family Services	Reduction of Posts across Children’s Services
8	EDU2021/01	Education	Education Welfare Service Savings Proposals
9	EDU2021/02	Education	The Reduction of the Inclusion Enrichment Team
10	EDU2021/03	Education	Gwent Music Service Reduction in Hardship Funding
11	EDU2021/04	Education	Improved Budget Efficiency within Education Services
12	CS2021/01	City Services	Increase in Fees
13	CS2021/06	City Services	Termination of Home to College Transport Provision and Removal of Post 16 Travel Grants to Mainstream Schools and Colleges
14	CS2021/08	City Services	Increased Recycling – Bag Sorting at Household Waste Recycling Centre
15	CS2021/13	City Services	Car Parking – Faulkner Road and Civic Centre

## Appendix 5 – Budget Savings for Consultation - Proposals

16	PBC2021/03	People and Business Change	Digital Savings – Public Building Wi-Fi – “Community Cloud”
17	LR2021/04	Law and Regulation	Reduction in Statutory Enforcement and Prosecution Work
18	NS2021/01	Non Service	Council Tax Reduction Scheme
19	n/a	Non Service	Council Tax Increase

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult and Community Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reduction in Day Opportunities Budget		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>To reduce the Day Opportunities budget in 2020/21 by £100k.</p> <p>The total budget for the Day Opportunities service for 2019/20 is £1,276,221. There has been a consistent projection of £100k underspend which is because the number of people now attending the Day Opportunities service is below capacity and the level of staffing required has been adjusted.</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	100		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

### **PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
Option one: to reduce the budget by £100k Option two: to maintain the budget at 2019/20 levels
<b>Recommended Option</b>
Option one is recommended. Reducing the budget by £100k is achievable without impacting on current service levels.
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
This proposal should not impact negatively on the Council's ability to deliver the WFG Act, Corporate Plan objectives or legislative requirements of the Social Services and Wellbeing Act or Regulation and Inspection of Social Care Act. It is a saving to the budget that will not impact on our ability to deliver training and development opportunities for our staff and collaboration with wider service providers in the City.
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	AS2021/04
<i>Activity Code</i>	SOC4

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult and Community Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Telecare Service		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>A revamped Telecare service offered by Newport City Council was launched in August 2019.</p> <p>We are using technology to help people live independently for longer in their own home, avoiding hospital admissions and delaying the person moving into a long-term care setting.</p> <p>The service is critical to the delivery of the preventative agenda, which generates financial and resource savings for a wide range of council services and partner agencies.</p> <p>The Community Occupational Therapy team operationally oversees the service as part of a partnership agreement with Monmouthshire County Council and Caerphilly County Borough Council.</p> <p>The savings will be achieved and monitored in the following way:</p> <p>£50k:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reduction in package of care hours over the 12 month period, linked to the provision of telecare</li> <li>• Monitoring of reviews of existing and design of new care packages to ensure telecare is used to prevent the over prescription of care and dependency on statutory services (or that relationship delayed until essential)</li> <li>• The type of equipment issued and reduction of care costs associated with this provision</li> <li>• Residents supported to self-purchase if appropriate and supported by workers to meet outcomes outside of statutory services</li> </ul> <p>£100k :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce existing telecare budget and divert funding via Integrated Care Fund (ICF) or self-funding if appropriate</li> <li>• Monitoring via service agreement with Newport City Council, Monmouthshire Borough Council and Caerphilly County Borough Council</li> <li>• Reduction of Capital expenditure given the successful bid for regional ICF funding for equipment</li> </ul>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	✓	Cabinet

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
---	------------	---	-----------	--

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	150		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	✓
--	------------	--	-----------	---

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

### **PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>The use of technology in the reablement care setting to promote and establish the benefits of telecare before offer of package of care is given – this will prevent need for long term care packages or the frequency / duration of visits</p> <p>Telecare to be integral of the review of current packages of care and consideration to Direct Payments to fund the equipment or private purchase – this will release reduce care plans and increase independence / decrease the number and duration of care visits required</p> <p>Full review of existing budget currently being paid to current service provider for equipment and service provision</p> <p>ICF funding has been secured for a technology coach (a person whose remit it is to work with Newport residents around digital inclusion and promote the use of technology to enhance daily life e.g. use of Alexa devices etc) to realise the aims, maximise the progress and impact of the telecare offer and service</p> <p>Putting the Telecare offer front and centre of the preventative offer before the offer of structured care and support being commissioned</p> <p>Improving staff promotion of the service as a 1<sup>st</sup> choice for the appropriate resident</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
<p>Telecare provision to be part of the annual review of care packages and installed to decrease care package dependence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To maximise the use of the telecare coach to ensure multi-disciplinary, multi-agency participation in training, referrals and promotion</li><li>• Saving by right sizing packages of care following telecare installing and coaching</li><li>• Direct Payments offer to eligible residents to purchase technology options</li></ul> <p>To undertake a service review of the service current provider to equipment covered by ICF funding – there will be a cost saving of around £50k</p> <p>The installation of technology in Parklands for residents to trial the equipment before returning home and have confidence in the equipment as a preferred option to that of a package of care.</p>
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**Integration** – Run in partnership with Monmouthshire CC and Caerphilly CBC, training workers in memory clinic, Learning Disabilities, Frailty, Hospital staff, District nurses and other NHS agencies to become specialist prescribers in this area

**Long Term** – Improve the emotional wellbeing for people by reducing loneliness, social isolation, early intervention and community resilience.

**Prevention** – Part of the preventative agenda and person enablement / continued independence in their own home. To support carers through flexible services. Maximising technology use for health promotion

**Collaboration** - Run in partnership with Monmouthshire and Caerphilly county council, training is across disciplines within Adult social care and multi-agency with the NHS

**Involvement** –

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	AS2021/05
<i>Activity Code</i>	SOC10 & SOC17



## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult and Community Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reduction in Funding Awarded to Third Sector Organisations		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	To reduce expenditure on grant funding from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2020 as follows:		
	Organisation	Budgeted Allocation 19/20	Reduction 20/21
	Growing Space	£63k	£1k
	Hafal	£30k	£30k
	Mind	£109k	£9k
	Deaf Clubs	£8k	£8k
	People First	£12k	£12k
	CAB (contribution SP)	£100k	£20k
	Carers Grant	£40k	£20k
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£362k</b>	<b>£100k</b>
<p><b>Growing Space</b> have agreed to reduce their expenditure by £1k as they have successfully secured European funding for the next 3 years that will negate the impact of this reduction</p> <p><b>Hafal</b> are currently commissioned to deliver Information, Assistance and Advice (IAA) as part of the Aneurin Bevan University Health Board (ABUHB) mental health consortium that is being re-tendered. This element of the service is not included in the new service model.</p> <p><b>Mind</b> are also part of the ABUHB mental health consortium and Newport City Council (NCC) are negotiating a continuation of service based in Newport City Centre. They will continue to be funded at a level of £100k in 20/21</p> <p><b>Deaf Clubs</b> are the beneficiaries of historical funding arrangements, whereby NCC have covered the cost of venue hire for their regular social events. The continuation of this funding is unsustainable when critical service provision is facing budget reductions.</p> <p><b>Newport People First</b> provide advocacy and peer support. The membership consists of a largely long-term group of participants, who have also established a strong network of peer support outside the formal structure provided by the Newport People First Group. Opportunities for structured social activities are also available through My Mates, which is</p>			

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

	<p>funded on a Pan Gwent basis. The need for formal advocacy, should it be required, can be met by the Council's existing contract with Dewis.</p> <p><b>Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB)</b> – NCC currently pay £100k to CAB as a partner in the Third Sector Consortium. The Consortium is being reviewed but the services provided by CAB are critical to Newport and will continue to be funded. Discussions are being held with the Partnerships team who provide CAB with core funding as a grant. The intention is to combine the funding into one agreement to be overseen by the Commissioning and Contracts Team.</p> <p>Supporting People currently do not fund CAB but their financial inclusion workers regularly refer on their complex cases. Therefore, it is a legitimate use of Supporting People money to offer a contribution and the amount has been set at £20k, which will result in a £20k reduction to the £100k total and therefore a saving.</p> <p><b>Carers Grant</b> – The £40k budget has not been fully utilised as NCC now has access to dedicated ICF funding for Carers that is administered by the Carers Trust on behalf of the Gwent Authorities.</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	✓	Cabinet

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
---	------------	---	-----------	--

### **PART ONE**

Net Savings (£000's)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	2022/23 (£'000)
	100		
One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	2022/23 (£'000)
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	There may be but not in the Local Authority
----------------------------	---

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)	YES	✓	NO	
--	-----	---	----	--

**PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>Option 1 - Status quo – savings not achieved</p> <p>Option 2 - To implement savings plan as outlined above</p> <p>Risk mitigation - We will provide sufficient notice and where possible, appropriate support to secure alternative funding.</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
Option 2 – To implement savings plan as outlined above
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well Being Objective 3 – To enable people to be healthy independent and resilient</li> <li>• Well Being Objective 4 – To build cohesive and sustainable communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Long Term –</b></p> <p>Directing resources more appropriately and equitably within a reducing financial envelope. For example, the allocation of funds to the Deaf Club is not equitable, as other organisations do not enjoy the same level of support for social activities.</p> <p><b>Prevention –</b></p> <p>The proposal ensures critical services are protected by sourcing alternative funding streams</p> <p><b>Collaboration -</b></p> <p>We continue to work with the organisations to help them secure alternative funding.</p> <p><b>Involvement –</b></p>

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

FEIA process
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Yes

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	AS2021/07
<i>Activity Code</i>	SOC16

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Adult and Community Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Staffing Review		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>To review the staffing resources across Adult Services and in particular the interface between Frailty and the Hospital Team, First Contact and the Neighbourhood Care Networks (NCN) to improve communication and management of these services.</p> <p>This will be done in the context of the Home First project which is part of the transformation across health and social care in Gwent as set out in 'A Healthier Wales' and the opportunities to use this additional resource to streamline current structures. It will also consider the impact of Integrated Care Fund (ICF) and how this contributes to the delivery of our key responsibilities in the Social Services and Well-being (SSWB) Act.</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	297		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	116		
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>116</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	9 FTE
----------------------------	-------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)	YES		NO	✓
--	-----	--	----	---

### PART TWO (For completion of proposals which have an impact on front-line services)

<b>Options Considered</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do Nothing</li> <li>2. To consider how to make best use of staffing resources across adult services through the use of the transformation grant and ICF and reduce the number of handoffs between teams and ensure the management structure is in place which supports greater integrated working as described in the Healthier Wales. To ensure the management and staffing structure has the right capacity and skill mix to deliver of the key responsibilities.</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
Option 2 which will reduce the streamline the management and staffing structure across Adult Services.
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration</b> - This proposal will support the longer term aim of improving integrated working across health and social care.</p> <p><b>Long Term</b> – This proposal will put in place a staffing structure, which is sustainable and supports the requirements of the SSWB Act.</p> <p><b>Prevention</b> – A key focus of Adult Services is to manage demand effectively at First Contact to ensure that no one goes further into the pathway than is necessary and they have their problem addressed at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>Collaboration</b> – This will involve a partnership approach with Aneurin Bevan University Health Board (ABUHB).</p> <p><b>Involvement</b> – This proposal will deliver the key objectives as set out in the Transformation bid form the Regional Partnership Board to Welsh Government</p>
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
This budget proposal involves an internal review of existing staffing resources carries out by the Head of Service and therefore will not impact on the wider community.

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	AS2021/08
<i>Activity Code</i>	Various activity codes

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Service Area</b>	Children and Families Services			
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Family Support Services – Barnardo’s Partnership			
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>There is a long-standing partnership with Barnardos to deliver Family Support Services for children and families at the edge of care.</p> <p>Currently the service is working to deliver a wide range of interventions directly to families who are at risk of greater intervention from Children’s Services. Social workers work with Barnardo’s staff to give families positive ways to manage their family challenges for example substance misuse, domestic violence, parental mental ill health, neglectful parenting and then offer safer family life for their children.</p> <p>The proposal is to reduce the budget by £75k, which will mean a staff reduction for Barnardo’s, a lower capacity to accept referrals and a potential impact on the number of children in care.</p> <p>If the proposed saving is agreed the service will work to prioritise the services offered to consider the lowest level of impact.</p>			
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet	✓

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
---	------------	---	-----------	--



**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**PART ONE**

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	75		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

### **PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
The options are a) Agree the proposal and reduce the family support service via Barnardo's by £75k b) Maintain the current level of funding
<b>Recommended Option</b>
Accept Option A and for the saving of £75k to proceed.
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p>This proposal reflects a saving in the Children's Services core budget. In terms of the links with the Wellbeing of Future Generations, the link is the contribution the saving makes to ensure the Council as a whole is able to deliver a balanced budget. Officers have looked at the five key ways of working Integration, Long Term, Prevention, Collaboration and Involvement when considering the savings and sought to ensure the proposals have the least negative impact. However, at core these savings are necessary steps towards a balanced budget as opposed to any form of improvement or positive changes to delivery. While officers are cognisant of the principles the proposals are the least damaging options as opposed to desirable steps of change.</p> <p>This proposal is a way of considering where the overall spend within Children's Services lies and the best way to consider the ways of working. All of Children's Services works to the earliest possible intervention and so focusses on prevention. Services are integrated within the Council and more widely regionally and Nationally with other agencies including looking at the use of Transformation and Integrated Care Fund (ICF) grant monies. While the principles have been considered the proposed saving is part of the overall picture rather than a positive step towards working within the principles.</p>
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Yes

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	CFS2021/02
<i>Activity Code</i>	SOC26

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Service Area</b>	Children and Families Services
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Staffing Across Children’s Services
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>Across Children’s Services, a series of posts have been identified. These are a mixture of operational management staff, non-case holding staff and identified social worker posts.</p> <p>Reducing the number of posts across Children’s Services will be challenging against a background of rising referral numbers and increasing caseloads. However, these posts have been identified because some mitigation is possible and so the risk to service is minimised.</p> <p>The posts identified are as follows</p> <div data-bbox="732 582 2085 858" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>3 x social worker posts in the Pathway teams – core funding to be replaced with UASC grant funding from the Home Office and WLGA (£150k)</b></p> <p>The LA receives funding to support Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC). This funding depends on the numbers of UASC. There is a risk that if the number of UASC reduced or there was a change in the grant funding then there would need to see a reduction in posts. However, the past two years has seen increasing numbers and increased funding to better reflect the costs attached to caring for UASC so the risk of this change is low. Thus, this is a shift from core to grant funding without a loss of posts.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="732 865 2085 1141" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Team Manager Preventions (£62k)</b>  <b>Family Support Worker Preventions - VR (£35k)</b></p> <p>The Preventions team has two deputy team managers. Removing the overall manager post will create pressure on these two posts and will mean the service manager taking a different role in order to pick up some of the existing work. However, the staff involved are able to manage this change.</p> <p>The reduction of a family support worker will mean a reduction in the number of cases managed. However, the service has recently had confirmation of additional grant funding from the Early Action Together programme which will mitigate some of this risk by working with families at an earlier stage</p> </div> <div data-bbox="732 1163 2085 1278" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Senior Practitioner Mentoring Assessment and Consultancy (MAC) (£54k)</b></p> <p>This is a post, which has been vacant since August. The previous post holder undertook parenting assessments within the court arena. This work is being picked up by social workers and does create additional pressure</p> </div>

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

	<p>elsewhere. However, a recent reduction in the number of children being removed has reduced the number of assessments. If that is reversed, the deletion of this post will place further pressure on social workers.</p>
	<p><b>Social worker Disabled Children’s team – (DCT) (£50k)</b></p> <p>This is a vacancy, which has been held since the summer. There are work pressures within the team but it will be possible to manage those pressures across the team.</p>
	<p><b>Team Manager Residential Care – VR (£62k)</b></p> <p>As part of the development of the residential care for children and accommodation for care leavers over the past 12 months, two team managers have been working to oversee the developments. Much of this work has now been completed. With one team manager and the service manager picking up some elements of the management of staff this is a reduction, which can be safely managed.</p>
	<p><b>0.5 x Coordinator child sexual exploitation – VR (£30k)</b></p> <p>This post was created in 2014 in order to assist the LA to put in place the structures and processes to work with children at risk of sexual exploitation. This area of work has moved on considerably with far better understanding from all agencies and training for all staff. The loss of this post can therefore be mitigated in the wider field of social workers being able to work in this area.</p>
	<p><b>Social worker MAPS – VR (£50k)</b></p> <p>The Matching and Placement Support team originally worked to support children in long-term foster care. Over the past five years, this work has shifted and is now provided from within the Barnardo’s family support team to ensure continuity for children. There is still a need for work with foster carers and this proposal would leave a Consultant Social Worker post to focus on training for carers. The work currently picked up by the social worker would need to be absorbed by social workers and so would create some pressures but this is not a case holding post and so this is a lower order risk.</p>
<p><b>Youth Justice Officer – VR (£50k)</b></p> <p>The Youth Justice Service has seen a reduction in workloads over the past three years. There has not been a single custodial sentence in the past ten months. Caseloads are relatively lower than other teams. This post was created when the team was under significant pressure in 2014 and this is no longer the case. The risk is if the</p>	

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

	workload again increased this would place considerable pressure on the service and it would be challenging to recruit.			
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	✓	Cabinet	

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	YES	✓	NO	
---	-----	---	----	--

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	543		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	125		
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>125</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	Reduction of 7.5 FTE
----------------------------	----------------------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
--	------------	---	-----------	--

### PART TWO

<b>Options Considered</b>
The options are a) Agree the proposal and reduce by £543K by deleting the identified posts. b) Maintain the current staffing levels
<b>Recommended Option</b>
The recommendation is a) agree the proposal to secure savings by reduction of the identified staff posts.
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
This proposal reflects a saving in the Children’s Services core budget. In term of the links with the Wellbeing of Future Generations the link is the contribution the saving makes to ensuring the Council as a whole is able to deliver a balanced budget. Officers have looked at the five key ways of working Integration, Long Term, Prevention, Collaboration and Involvement when considering the savings and sought to ensure the proposals have the least negative impact. However, at core these savings are necessary steps towards a balanced budget as opposed to any form of improvement or positive changes to delivery. While officers are cognisant of the principles the proposals are the least damaging options as opposed to desirable steps of change.  This proposal is a way of considering where the overall spend within Children’s Services lies and the best way to consider the ways of working. All of Children’s Services works to the earliest possible intervention and so focusses on prevention. Services are integrated within the Council and more widely regionally and Nationally with other agencies including looking at the use of Transformation and ICF grant monies. These posts have been identified as having the lowest impact on overall service delivery.
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Yes

For internal use:

Unique reference number	CFS2021/05
Activity Code	SOC40 & SOC39

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Service Area</b>	Children and Families Services			
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reduction of Posts Across Children’s Services			
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>Children’s Services expenditure is primarily split across salaries and placement costs. There is then a relatively small area of expenditure on all other areas.</p> <p>Managing placement costs is challenging because of the demands for service, which can be very difficult to control. Placements costs are forecast with historical information and analysis of current placement availability. There is a significant body of work being undertaken in relation to both fostering and residential care to bring down costs and manage those areas of spend as tightly as possible.</p> <p>In order to take steps to avoid compulsory redundancies we would first consider options for voluntary redundancy and reduce posts as they become vacant.</p> <p>If compulsory redundancies were required, the current workloads within Children’s Services would be considered. Savings proposals in other related teams would also be considered. Caseloads are on average now above 20 and in some teams are closer to 35. Reducing staff will increase workloads and increase the risk to service delivery and ability to fulfil statutory functions.</p> <p>Children’s Services currently has 81 (72.5 FTE) social worker posts and 20 (17 FTE) Social Work Assistants. The posts are split across 11 teams with different functions. For example, a fostering social worker is undertaking very different tasks from a child protection social worker but all are brought together to complete the statutory duties required of Children’s Services so the posts are not interchangeable..</p> <p>Deletion of a social worker post results in a saving of £50k while deletion of a social work assistant post results in a saving of £31k.</p>			
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet	✓

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
---	------------	---	-----------	--

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**PART ONE**

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	50		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	25		
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>25</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	1 FTE
----------------------------	-------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------



## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

### **PART TWO (For completion of proposals, which have an impact on front-line services)**

<b>Options Considered</b>
To be completed
<b>Recommended Option</b>
To be completed
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p>This proposal reflects a saving in the Children's Services core budget. In term of the links with the Wellbeing of Future Generations the link is the contribution the saving makes to ensuring the Council as a whole is able to deliver a balanced budget. Officers have looked at the five key ways of working Integration, Long Term, Prevention, Collaboration and Involvement when considering the savings and sought to ensure the proposals have the least negative impact. However, at core these savings are necessary steps towards a balanced budget as opposed to any form of improvement or positive changes to delivery. While officers are cognisant of the principles the proposals are the least damaging options as opposed to desirable steps of change.</p> <p>This proposal is a way of considering where the overall spend within Children's Services lies and the best way to consider the ways of working. All of Children's Services works to the earliest possible intervention and so focusses on prevention. Services are integrated within the Council and more widely regionally and Nationally with other agencies including looking at the use of Transformation and ICF grant monies. While the principles have been considered the proposed saving is part of the overall picture rather than a positive step towards working within the principles.</p>
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
tbc

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	CFS2021/06
<i>Activity Code</i>	Various

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Education Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Education Welfare Service Savings Proposals		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	The service area has no further non-staff budget savings to consider. As a result, savings can only be acquired from the removal of staff posts. This proposal describes the options for staff saving costs equating to £66k for 2020/21.		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	66		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	50		
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>50</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	Educational Welfare Officer Team: 8.34 FTE potentially reducing to between 7.09 - 6.2 FTE All posts are currently filled with no vacant posts available to be deleted
----------------------------	--

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)	YES	✓	NO	
--	-----	---	----	--

### PART TWO

Options Considered
<p>There are no other options available within the Education Welfare Service other than to make savings linked to staff reductions. Without the Education Welfare Service making a significant saving, there will be exacerbated pressure on other central education services. Consideration has been given to posts which will have the least impact overall.</p> <p><b>Option 1</b>  <b>Deleting 1 x FTE Educational Welfare Officer (EWO) and reducing the working weeks of 8 remaining EWO posts to term time only:</b> This proposal would delete 1 existing EWO post. In addition, it is also proposed to reduce the number of weeks worked by the remaining EWOs so that these only cover the 39 school weeks. The deletion of this post is likely to impact on the local authority's rate of primary and secondary attendance EWOs play a pivotal part in ensuring that the culture of poor attendance is avoided within families. EWOs support schools with attendance issues and attend home visits, providing welfare checks to pupils with poor rates of attendance and those who are home educated. EWOs work with families extends beyond the school day and their support continues during school holiday periods. At present the EWO Team consists of 1 Senior EWO (0.89 FTE) and 8 x EWOs (7.45 FTE). This proposal would reduce the team to 1 Senior EWO (0.89 FTE) and 7 EWOs (6.2 FTE). In light of this budget saving proposal, the Education Welfare Team would continue to work across all schools, but focus on pupils with a higher rate of non-attendance. In addition, no EWO lateral checks, safeguarding visits or support would be available for 13 weeks of the year. This option would result in a cost saving of £30,459.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b>  <b>Deleting 2 x FTE EWO posts and reducing the working weeks of 7 remaining EWO posts to term time only:</b> This proposal would delete 2 existing EWO posts. In addition, it is also proposed to reduce the number of weeks worked by the remaining EWOs so that these only cover the 39 school weeks. The reduction in number of EWOs combined with a reduction in working weeks will have a significant impact on the local authority's rate of primary and secondary attendance and the increased rate of persistent absence of pupils. All schools would no longer receive individual timetabled support as this would primarily be allocated to pupils in schools with the lowest rates of attendance. Welfare checks on pupils with poor rates of attendance and those who are home educated would also be reduced. This proposal would reduce the team to 1 Senior EWO (0.89 FTE) and 6 EWO's (5.31 FTE) and result in no EWO lateral checks, safeguarding visits or support for 13 weeks of the year. This option would result in a cost saving of £65,771</p>
Recommended Option
<p>In order to make balanced savings and minimise the impact on attendance and safeguarding arrangements, option 2 would be recommended.</p>

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration</b> – This proposal is not supportive of improving educational attainment or supporting pupils disadvantaged by poverty. However, adding additional funding pressure to other service areas also puts council wide services at further risk, particularly those services which are aligned to vulnerable groups.</p> <p><b>Long Term &amp; Prevention</b> – The council must achieve a balanced budget and maintain the best service for its customers. Customers are wider than those in schools alone. This budget proposal prevents a further, disproportionate funding reduction to wider council services.</p> <p><b>Collaboration</b> - This proposal does not aid greater collaboration. In the case of the removal of EWO's it requires more support and independence from school based staff.</p> <p><b>Involvement</b> – All budget proposals will be consulted upon. Key stakeholders linked to this proposal include Chairs of Governors, Head teachers, Trade Unions, parents, pupils, Schools Forum and Newport City Council staff.</p>
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Yes

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	EDU2021/01
<i>Activity Code</i>	EDU10

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Education Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	The Reduction of the Inclusion Enrichment Team		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	Potential savings within the service area are limited, with no non-staff savings available. This proposal presents the option of reducing the Inclusion Enrichment Team equating to a saving of £43k.		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	43		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	25 (tbc)		
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>25</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	The proposal is for 19.61 FTE potentially reducing by 1 FTE or less. All posts are currently filled.
----------------------------	--

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

### PART TWO

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>There are no other options available within Education Services other than to make savings linked to staff reductions.</p> <p>Option 1: Do nothing and maintain the status quo - Retain all the Inclusion Enrichment Team posts, this will ensure the Inclusion Enrichment Team has capacity to carry out statutory duties.</p> <p>Option 2: A reduction in staffing equivalent to £43k, this could range from a reduction of hours or days of several contracts. This is likely to have an impact on the team's capacity to complete their statutory duties.</p> <p>Option 3: Reduce the number of Inclusion Enrichment Team Officer posts equivalent to £43k - this will impact significantly on service delivery.</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
<p>The preferred option is option 2: a reduction in staffing equivalent to £43k, this could range from a reduction of hours or days of several contracts. This is likely to have an impact on the team's capacity to complete their statutory duties.</p>
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration</b> – This proposal is not supportive of improving educational attainment or supporting pupils disadvantaged by poverty. However, adding additional funding pressure to other service areas also puts council wide services at further risk, particularly those services which are aligned to vulnerable groups.</p> <p><b>Long Term &amp; Prevention</b> – The Council must achieve a balanced budget and maintain the best service for its customers. Customers are wider than those in schools alone. This budget proposal prevents a further, disproportionate funding reduction to wider Council services.</p> <p><b>Collaboration</b> - This proposal does not aid greater collaboration, currently all Officers work with schools, parents, pupils, health and other agencies to support learners with Additional Learning Needs. The ability to collaborate would reduce.</p> <p><b>Involvement</b> – All budget proposals will be consulted upon. Key stakeholders linked to this proposal include Chairs of Governors, Head teachers, Trade Unions, parents, pupils and Schools Forum and Newport City Council staff.</p>
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
Yes

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	EDU2021/02
<i>Activity Code</i>	EDU5

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Education Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Gwent Music Service reduction in hardship funding.		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	Gwent Music Service provide subsidised lessons for pupils who are eligible for free school meals but at a higher cost than other local authorities using the regional service. Reducing the Newport subsidy to the same level as other local authorities would achieve a saving of £14k in 2020/21 while maintaining £9k of subsidy to Newport pupils.		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	14		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)	YES	✓	NO	
--	-----	---	----	--

### PART TWO

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>The Gwent Music Service is jointly funded by Newport, Monmouthshire and Torfaen local authorities.</p> <p>In 2019/20, the local authority made a £23k contribution to the Gwent Music Service to subsidise the cost of music lessons for pupils eligible for free school meals. The contribution Newport makes to Gwent Music Service for subsidising music lessons is greater than that of both Monmouthshire and Torfaen (£9k each). With this in mind, consideration has been given to reducing the amount of funding allocated to subsidise the cost of music lessons for learners who are eligible for free school meals.</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> Remove the funding allocated to the Gwent Music Service to subsidise the cost of music lessons for learners who are eligible for free school meals in its entirety. Request that schools fund this support from the Pupil Development Grant (PDG). This would equate to a cost saving of £23k.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> Reduce the funding allocated to the Gwent Music Service to subsidise the cost of music lessons for learners who are eligible for free school meals so that it is in line with that of Monmouthshire and Torfaen. This would equate to a cost saving of £14k</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
<p>In order to continue to support pupils who are eligible for free school meals with access to specialist music provision, option 2 would be recommended.</p>
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration</b> –This proposal is not supportive of improving educational attainment or supporting pupils disadvantaged by poverty. However, adding additional funding pressure to other service areas also puts council wide services at further risk, particularly those services which are aligned to vulnerable groups.</p> <p><b>Long Term &amp; Prevention</b> – The council must achieve a balanced budget and maintain the best service for its customers. Customers are wider than those in schools alone. This budget proposal prevents a further, disproportionate funding reduction to wider council services.</p>



## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**Collaboration** - This proposal does not aid greater collaboration. It requires more support from school budgets

**Involvement** – All budget proposals will be consulted upon. Key stakeholders linked to this proposal include Chairs of Governors, Head teachers, parents, pupils, peripatetic and private music tutors, Schools Forum and Newport City Council staff.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

No

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	EDU2021/03
<i>Activity Code</i>	EDU23

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Education Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Review Gwent Education Minority Ethnic Services management charge and move the Pupil Referral Unit		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	Proposed increase in Newport City Council's management charges to Gwent Education Minority Ethnic Services (GEMS). Transfer the Key Stage 2 Pupil Referral Unit to an alternative and improved location. This budget proposal reduces Education Service spending by £62k in 2020/21.		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	62		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

### PART TWO

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>Option 1: Education Services can increase Gwent Education Minority Ethnic Service (GEMS) management costs by £30k to an annual cost of £51k. At present GEMS contribute £21k per year towards service costs from a £1.6 million grant. The £51k will pay for HR, payroll, finance and all other corporate support services. Education Services can support the transfer of the Key Stage 2 Pupil Referral Unit to an alternative and improved site. The Key Stage 2 PRU provision is currently at the Gol Centre. If transferred to a school or a community venue, there would be a £32k saving from the Pupil Referral Unit budget.</p> <p>Option 2: GEMS corporate charges to remain at £21k. Key Stage 2 Pupil Referral Unit to remain at the Gol Centre.</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
Option 1.
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration</b> – This proposal remains supportive of improving educational attainment and supporting pupils disadvantaged by poverty. The council has to ensure services in receipt of grants (such as GEMS) are corporately supported to ensure the service remains viable, therefore appropriate charges must apply.</p> <p><b>Long Term &amp; Prevention</b> – The council must achieve a balanced budget and maintain the best service for its customers. The</p> <p><b>Collaboration</b> – GEMS is a regional service. Extending corporate charges at an appropriate level ensures the regional collaborative service is maintained in a fair and transparent way. The Key Stage 2 Pupil Referral Unit would thrive in either a school-based building, where pupils could integrate ore.</p> <p><b>Involvement</b> – All budget proposals will be consulted upon. Key stakeholders linked to this proposal include Chairs of Governors, Head teachers, parents, pupils, peripatetic and private music tutors, Schools Forum and Newport City Council staff.</p>
<b>Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment</b>
No, this will not impact on fairness or equality. The level of service or provision will not be detrimental to anyone.

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	EDU2021/04
<i>Activity Code</i>	Various

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	City Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Increase in fees		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>Two areas have been identified with the potential to apply additional fees:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in emergency road closure charge from £250 per event to £800 per event. This is a fee paid by companies when the need arises to close an adopted highway. The increase is in line with a number of other councils and based on current numbers will generate an additional £27k per annum.</li> <li>2. Introduce a charge for waste receptacles for new build low-rise properties when residents initially occupy. There is already a charge for Houses in Multiple Occupation and this new charge is part of the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, but no value had been set. It is proposed to set the charge at £50 for a set of containers. Based on 420 properties a year, this would generate an additional £21k</li> </ol>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	48		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	✓
--	------------	--	-----------	---

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	CS2021/01
<i>Activity Code</i>	Potentially all codes

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	City Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Removal of non-statutory ALN Home to College Transport Provision and Post 16 Travel Grants to Mainstream Schools and Colleges		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p><b>Remove the non-statutory provision of Home to College Transport from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 for over 16 Additional Learning Needs (ALN) students who are attending further education establishments.</b></p> <p>Home to college transport is provided to Additional Learning Needs (ALN) pupils attending Further Education establishments and not continuing in mainstream provision. The current budget does not meet demand and is therefore a budget pressure on the Integrated Transport Unit. The removal of transport would be phased over the next two years so that students currently on two-year courses could complete their courses, but no new applications would be considered for September 2020 onwards. The £113k budget saving would be split £45k in 20/21 and £68k in 21/22.</p> <p><b>Removal of the payment of travel grants to post 16 pupils attending mainstream schools and colleges (currently £150 per annum)</b></p> <p>Travel grants are paid on a termly basis to post 16 students attending mainstream schools and further education colleges. This level of payment has remained constant at £50 per term for a number of years. The grant either is paid directly to the student, or if they require a Coleg Gwent bus pass, to the college as a payment towards the provision of this pass. This is a non-statutory provision but is written in the home to school transport policy so any change would need to be published by 1<sup>st</sup> October for the change to take place in the following September. The £64k budget saving would be split £42k in 21/22 and £22k in 22/23.</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**PART ONE**

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	45	110	22
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

### **PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p><b>Remove the non-statutory provision of Home to College Transport from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 for over 16 Additional Learning Needs (ALN) students who are attending further education establishments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Option 1: The complete removal of post 16 home to college transport for ALN Pupils to Further Education establishments.</li></ul> <p>This option would give a full budget saving over two years, the current first year students would be accommodated in year two to complete their courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Option 2: The partial removal of Post 16 ALN Home to College Transport.</li></ul> <p>This option was considered by setting up a new policy where students would be assessed by a panel consisting of officers from Education, Transport, Health and Social Services. Transport may be given to those who had a specific need and was accessing education outside of mainstream establishments subject</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Option 3: Continue with the status quo of uncontrolled provision of home to college transport to post 16 ALN pupils and the continued budget pressure being endured.</li></ul> <p><b>Removal of post 16 Travel Grants to Colleges:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Option A: Complete removal of travel grants to post 16 learners to mainstream schools and further education colleges.</li><li>• Option B: Continue with the status quo of paying out travel grants to mainstream schools and further education colleges but with a possible increase in budget costs if numbers applying rise.</li></ul>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
<p>Option 1: The recommended option would be to completely remove the non-statutory post 16 home to college transport for ALN pupils to Further Education establishments. This would provide a budget saving of £113k</p> <p>Option A: The complete removal of travel grants to post 16 learners as this is a non-statutory provision. This would provide a budget saving of £64k over two financial years from 2021/22.</p>
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>



## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**Integration** – The removal of this service would bring in line the policies of the authority on non-statutory post 16 provision for mainstream and ALN pupils.

**Long Term** – This would remove the uncertainty of the non-statutory transport provision being provided and would allow students to choose their education establishments in the knowledge that the transport costs would not be covered by the authority.

**Prevention** – The proposal prevents future applications being refused and gives more certainty to students when choosing the further education establishments they wish to access.

**Collaboration** - The removal of this transport has been supported by education colleagues as it is a non-statutory provision and brings the authority in line with other authorities in having a clear policy. It also brings the policy in line with adult services who have adopted a similar policy recently.

**Involvement** – The proposal has involved talks with education colleagues and social services colleagues on removing this travel provision.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

Yes

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	CS2021/06
<i>Activity Code</i>	STR28

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	City Services																	
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Increased Recycling – Bag Sorting at Household Waste Recycling Centre																	
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>This proposal involves a new operational procedure for the disposal of mixed waste at the Docks Way Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC). Under the new arrangements, any mixed bagged waste brought to the HWRC intended for the non-recyclable waste skip will have to be taken to a designated bag sorting area. Site operatives will open bags and sort into designated containers.</p> <p>Compositional analysis for Newport’s HWRC residual waste has shown that 60% of the contents of these bags can be recycled at the site. To counter this, and to continue to encourage behaviour change such that recycling becomes the norm, many Local Authorities in Wales now require the black bags presented at their HWRCs to be sorted and all recycling removed prior to disposing of the waste. This reduces the opportunity to dispose of waste that could be easily recycled at the kerbside and will positively impact Newport’s recycling rate.</p> <p>The arrangement will start in March 2020.</p> <p>Financial breakdown as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1093 794 1792 1050"> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Costs</td> <td>Manpower</td> <td>43,881</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vehicles/maintenance</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Conditioning/containers</td> <td>3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Savings</td> <td>Less disposal costs</td> <td>- 67,172</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Extra income recycles</td> <td>- 41,543</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td></td> <td><b>- 56,834</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>There will be a one-off capital requirement of £25k to install a sorting area, which would be funded through the Invest to Save reserve.</p>			Costs	Manpower	43,881	Vehicles/maintenance	5,000	Conditioning/containers	3,000	Savings	Less disposal costs	- 67,172	Extra income recycles	- 41,543	<b>Total</b>		<b>- 56,834</b>
Costs	Manpower	43,881																
	Vehicles/maintenance	5,000																
	Conditioning/containers	3,000																
Savings	Less disposal costs	- 67,172																
	Extra income recycles	- 41,543																
<b>Total</b>		<b>- 56,834</b>																
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet	✓														

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
---	------------	---	-----------	--

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	57		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other	25		
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>25</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	Increase in staff by 1.75 FTE
----------------------------	-------------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	✓
--	------------	--	-----------	---

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	CS2021/08
<i>Activity Code</i>	STR13

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Service Area</b>	City Services		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Car Parking – Faulkner Road		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>City Services currently operates six pay and display car parks and one multi-storey with a total of 766 spaces.</p> <p>Faulkner Road car park has 159 spaces and is situated in front of the Magistrate’s Court within close proximity of the Civic Centre. Although this is a designated public pay and display, it is largely used by council staff who are issued permits.</p> <p>The average income per space at Faulkner Road is currently £381 per year. This compares with an average of £1,500 across the remaining full price pay and display sites. Approximately 100 spaces Monday to Friday are taken by council staff.</p> <p>This proposal is to introduce 50 designated bays that can be used by council staff, leaving the remaining 109 for paying customers. This is estimated to generate an additional £41k based on 100% of standard utilisation.</p> <p>We believe this provides a balance to free up space to members of the public, while retaining some capacity for staff.</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	41		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related	10		
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>	<b>10</b>		

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE count
----------------------------	------------------------

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	✓
--	------------	--	-----------	---

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	CS2021/13
<i>Activity Code</i>	STR20

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	People and Business Change		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Public Building Wi-Fi “Community Cloud” - reductions in provision		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>Public building Wi-Fi provision has a budget of approximately £175k. A reduction in this service will return estimated savings of £75k from April 2020 onwards. The Gov Wi-Fi service is also available a number of locations, which will minimise any impact.</p> <p>An additional saving is proposed which will require a review of site use, and cancellation of some public Wi-Fi services to achieve a further £25k annually. In 20/21 this will be a part year saving of £20k only due to the notice periods required. Sites will be prioritised based on corporate plan priorities and levels of public use.</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	95	15	
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	No impact on FTE
----------------------------	------------------

**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	
--	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--

**PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>Public building Wi-Fi, known as “Community Cloud”, is a discretionary service providing free Wi-Fi to the public in about 50 council and community buildings. Initial provision of this service was facilitated by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport “Super Connected Cities” funding. The end of this funding stream resulted in the council’s current funding of the Wi-Fi provision.</p> <p>The option to reduce or remove the service is the simplest and lowest risk option. The removal of the service at some sites will impact on some public use but the usage has diminished since the service was initially set up. In addition, the improvements in mobile data coverage and associated increases in data allowances for personal mobile devices over time mean that reductions in access to public Wi-Fi should have less impact than previously.</p> <p>The availability of the Gov Wi-Fi service is also expected to minimise any potential impact of reducing/removing the current service. Priorities for reduction would consider the objectives as set out in the Corporate and Well-being Plan, bandwidth is also being reduced at a number of sites as outlined in a separate business case.</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
<p>The recommended option is to review the contract and remove service provision for some public buildings with free ‘Community Cloud’ Wi-Fi.</p>
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p><b>Integration</b> – the existing service is a discretionary one initially driven by central government funding. Reduction of the service does not conflict with any other plans or strategies, although some of the sites which receive the service are important to corporate plan priorities.</p> <p><b>Long Term</b> – In the long term, it is unlikely that this funding is sustainable. The developments around mobile telecommunications also mean that its value to the community will diminish over time.</p> <p><b>Prevention</b> – this is a discretionary service that does not have any specific preventative effect.</p> <p><b>Collaboration</b> - there is no specific collaboration involved in this proposal due to the planned reduction/removal of an existing service.</p>

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

**Involvement** – It is anticipated that there will be some specific engagement with current users to establish their views and the impact on the reduction/removal of the service.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

Yes. Until the data is explored, we cannot provide assurance that there is not disproportionate impact on a protected characteristic.

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	PBC2021/03
<i>Activity Code</i>	PBC10



**MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

<b>Service Area</b>	Law and Regulation
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reduction in Public Protection Statutory Enforcement and Prosecution Work
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>Reduce the level of statutory enforcement and prosecution work carried out by the Public Protection service and focus on more serious, higher risk offences. This relates to areas of work covered by trading standards and environmental health.</p> <p>Although these are statutory functions, it is a strategic decision for the Council as to how to discharge its statutory enforcement duties. The reduction in the amount of low-level enforcement work undertaken by Public Protection would lead to a corresponding reduction in the numbers of cases referred to the Legal section for prosecution.</p> <p>In relation to trading standards (Commercial), this would entail a reduction in the level of proactive and preventative surveillance and inspection work and a more reactive service. The more complex trading standards investigations into serious fraud and consumer protection offences would continue, and the prosecution work in relation to major offences would also be maintained. However, there would be less routine inspections and “spot checks” being carried out, where there have been no public complaints or intelligence in relation to potential regulatory breaches. Support and advice for businesses to ensure compliance would also not be provided.</p> <p>With regard to Environmental Health Housing work, it is proposed that the process of initially writing to landlords to inform them of complaints, with inspections only following where tenants report no action taken, be extended as the response to all-risk defects.</p> <p>With regard to other areas of work within Environmental Health, it is proposed that systems will also be developed to reduce our response to complaints assessed to have a lower risk of injury or illness. This will apply to Health &amp; Safety at Work, Food Hygiene and Communicable Disease. Reductions may also be made to the small number of proactive Health &amp; Safety at Work interventions we complete, although this would be contrary to the UK-wide commitment between local government and the Health &amp; Safety Executive.</p> <p>Delete one Assistant Solicitor post (£53,835 with on-costs), one Environmental Health Officer (EHO) post (£49,905) and one Trading Standards Officer (TSO) post (£49,905) or equivalent. The Litigation Section is holding a vacant Assistant Solicitor post and, therefore, this part of the saving can be delivered through the deletion of this vacant post. The reduction of posts in Public Protection may also be achieved through a restructure and reallocation of work and the deletion of vacant posts or posts being covered on a temporary agency basis. If the deletion of substantive EHO and TSO posts were unavoidable, then one-off redundancy costs would be incurred.</p>

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet	✓
---	-----------------	--	---------	---

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
---	------------	---	-----------	--

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	153		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension	50		
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			
<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	Reduction of 3 FTE posts– 1 FTE Assistant Solicitor (Grade 10), 1 FTE Environmental Health Officer (Grade 9) and 1 FTE Trading Standards officer (Grade 9) (or equivalent)		

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	✓	<b>NO</b>	
--	------------	---	-----------	--

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

### **PART TWO**

<b>Options Considered</b>
<p>There is no other option for delivering this saving by reducing other work and staffing levels within Public Protection and Legal. There is a core statutory service that the Council has a legal duty to deliver. The enforcement work can only be reduced at the margins, where the Council has an element of discretion as to how the work is carried out and to what level. The legal work is demand-led and can only be reduced where there is a reduced demand for the work. Therefore, there needs to be a reduction in the amount of low-level enforcement work undertaken by Public Protection in order to reduce numbers of cases referred to the Legal section for prosecution.</p> <p>If there is to be a reduction in statutory enforcement work, then the only sustainable way of delivering this saving is to cut back on lower-risk enforcement work and prioritise the higher risk public protection work.</p> <p>The Council has already taken the decision to reduce other statutory services to deliver previous savings, leaving little scope for any further reductions in this area.</p>
<b>Recommended Option</b>
<p>Reduce the level of statutory enforcement and prosecution work and focus on more serious, higher risk offences. Reduce the numbers of cases referred to the Legal section for prosecution. Delete three full time equivalent posts or equivalent within the relevant teams.</p>
<b>Specific Links with Wellbeing of Future Generations (WFG) Act</b>
<p>Integration – The reduction in statutory enforcement work will have an adverse impact on performance and the delivery of Corporate Plan and well-being objectives in relation to improving public health and building resilient communities. However, this impact will be mitigated by only reducing the lower-level enforcement, including proactive and preventative work, and this will safeguard the higher risk public protection work.</p> <p>Long Term –By safeguarding the higher level public protection enforcement and the associated legal work, the saving will assist in delivering the longer-term objectives in relation to improving public health and building resilient communities.</p> <p>Prevention –The proposal will entail a reduction in preventative and early intervention work, which could lead to an increase in non-compliance, but this will be mitigated by a continuation of the higher level enforcement work, which should assist in delivering the longer-term objectives in relation to improving public health and building resilient communities.</p> <p>Collaboration - Officers will continue to work in collaboration with the Police and other enforcement agencies to address issues of public protection and the reduction in low-level enforcement work should not have a material impact on partnership working.</p>

## **MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23**

Involvement – The proposal will be the subject of full consultation as part of the budget consultation process and managers within the relevant teams have been involved in evaluating and developing the options for service reduction.

### **Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment**

No - the statutory investigation and prosecution work is not a front-line public service and, therefore, this decision should not require a full Fairness and Equality Impact Assessment.

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	LR2021/04
<i>Activity Code</i>	LAW6; LAW10; LAW11

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Finance and Non-Service		
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Council Tax Reduction Scheme		
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>The Council Tax Reduction Scheme budget is used to subsidise household Council Tax bills when occupants are eligible for support because of income levels. This budget has been underspent for a number of years due to lower numbers of claimants. It is underspending in 2019/20 by c£1.2m.</p> <p>The scheme itself is an 'all Wales national scheme' with nationally set criteria for eligibility and support levels. This proposal has no impact on the scheme itself. The proposal is predicated on reducing the budget to the level of demand, which would, over the three years shown, reduce the current level of underspending on this budget.</p> <p>However, the underspend on this budget has been required to help balance the Council's overall budget, due to significant service areas overspending elsewhere. These service area overspends have significantly exceeded the Council's revenue contingency budget and it is only through this kind of other significant underspending that the overall budget has been able to be balanced.</p> <p>Any reduction will therefore mean that there is less mitigation available to offset other service area overspends and therefore a potential corporate risk.</p> <p>To manage this, it is proposed that the budget is reduced over a three-year period.</p> <p>In addition, claimant numbers will need on-going review to assess if the figures here remain deliverable as any increase in claimant numbers, following a downturn in the economy for example, would require future year budget reductions to be re-assessed</p>		
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	440	280	280
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	n/a
----------------------------	-----

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	✓
--	------------	--	-----------	---

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	NS2021/01
<i>Activity Code</i>	n/a

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

<b>Service Area</b>	Non Service																										
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Increase in Council Tax																										
<b>Summary Description, Delivery Arrangements and Timescales</b>	<p>A base 4% increase is already included in our medium term financial projections each year. This year, it is proposed that an additional 3.95% increase is applied to council tax in 2020/21 bringing the proposed increase to 7.95%.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="972 395 1906 525"> <thead> <tr> <th>Percentage Increase</th> <th>7.95%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Newport Band D Tax 2019/20</td> <td>£1,209.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increase per annum</td> <td>£89.04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Increase per week</td> <td>£1.71</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is well documented that Newport's council tax is low compared to others in Wales, generating approximately 24% of our income, compared to around 25% for most Welsh councils. Newport continues to have the second lowest council tax levels in Wales.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="869 678 2009 968"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Comparison with existing Band D Council Tax (rounded) Current year (2019/20) before any increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NEWPORT</td> <td>£1,120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Caerphilly</td> <td>£1,131</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wrexham</td> <td>£1,153</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cardiff</td> <td>£1,211</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Torfaen</td> <td>£1,315</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monmouthshire</td> <td>£1,316</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Swansea</td> <td>£1,345</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The Welsh Government uses the Standard Spending Assessment (SSA) to calculate the level of spending required to deliver a 'standard level' of service in each council area. However, our actual spend is well below our SSA (around £8.3m in 2019/20), which is mainly due to our low level of council tax funding.</p>			Percentage Increase	7.95%	Newport Band D Tax 2019/20	£1,209.08	Increase per annum	£89.04	Increase per week	£1.71	Comparison with existing Band D Council Tax (rounded) Current year (2019/20) before any increase		NEWPORT	£1,120	Caerphilly	£1,131	Wrexham	£1,153	Cardiff	£1,211	Torfaen	£1,315	Monmouthshire	£1,316	Swansea	£1,345
Percentage Increase	7.95%																										
Newport Band D Tax 2019/20	£1,209.08																										
Increase per annum	£89.04																										
Increase per week	£1.71																										
Comparison with existing Band D Council Tax (rounded) Current year (2019/20) before any increase																											
NEWPORT	£1,120																										
Caerphilly	£1,131																										
Wrexham	£1,153																										
Cardiff	£1,211																										
Torfaen	£1,315																										
Monmouthshire	£1,316																										
Swansea	£1,345																										
<b>Decision Point (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	Head of Service		Cabinet	✓																							

<b>Public Consultation Required (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	YES	✓	NO	
---	-----	---	----	--

## MTRP Budget Proposal – 2020/21 to 2022/23

### PART ONE

<b>Net Savings (£000's)</b>	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
	2,094		
<b>One-Off Implementation Costs (£000's)</b>			
	<b>2020/21 (£'000)</b>	<b>2021/22 (£'000)</b>	<b>2022/23 (£'000)</b>
Revenue – Redundancy/Pension			
Revenue – Other			
Capital – Building related			
Capital – Other			
<b>Implementation Cost - Total</b>			

<b>Impact on FTE Count</b>	n/a
----------------------------	-----

<b>Does this proposal require an FEIA and/or WFG Act assessment? (Please tick appropriate box)</b>	<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	✓
--	------------	--	-----------	---

*For internal use:*

<i>Unique reference number</i>	
<i>Activity Code</i>	n/a