

ISLE OF ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL Scrutiny Report Template

Committee:	Corporate Scrutiny Committee
Date:	4 th February, 2019
Subject:	2019/20 Budget Setting (Revenue and Capital)
Purpose of Report:	Further consideration to the 2019/20 budget proposals
Scrutiny Chair:	Cllr Aled Morris Jones
Portfolio Holder(s):	Cllr Robin Williams
Head of Service:	Marc Jones, Head of Resources / Section 151 Officer
Report Author:	Anwen Davies, Scrutiny Manager
Tel:	01248 752578
Email:	AnwenDavies@ynysmon.gov.uk
Local Members:	Not applicable

1 - Recommendation/s

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee is requested to:

R1 Agree a formal response to the Executive¹ on the Council's proposed 2019/20 revenue and capital budgets (using the key scrutiny questions in section 4 of the report), taking into account the key messages from the recent public consultation exercise

R2 Consider the propriety of inviting the Finance Scrutiny Panel to consider the areas identified by residents to be explored for further possible savings in 2020/21 and beyond.

2 – Link to Council Plan / Other Corporate Priorities

Direct link with the Council Plan / transformation priorities. The Committee's consideration of the budget proposals for next year will include how the proposals enable the Executive to deliver on the Council Plan and transformation programme as well as any specific risks.

It is a statutory requirement that the Council sets a viable budget for the coming year by 11th March, 2019. The final budget proposals will be considered by the Executive on 18th February, 2019 and then submitted to Full Council on 27th February, 2019, for ratification.

3 – Guiding Principles for Scrutiny Members

To assist Members when scrutinising the topic:-

3.1 Impact the matter has on individuals and communities [**focus on customer/citizen**]

3.2 A look at the efficiency & effectiveness of any proposed change – both financially and in terms of quality [**focus on value**]

3.3 A look at any risks [**focus on risk**]

¹ To be submitted to a meeting of the Executive to be convened on 18th February, 2019

3.4 Scrutiny taking a performance monitoring or quality assurance role **[focus on performance & quality]**

3.5 Looking at plans and proposals from a perspective of:

- Long term
- Prevention
- Integration
- Collaboration
- Involvement

[focus on wellbeing]

4 - Key Scrutiny Questions

The Medium Term Financial Plan was based on a 1% reduction in the AEF, a 5% increase in Council Tax and a savings requirement of £5m. The draft budget proposals and final settlement has changed the budget ie the final reduction in the Aggregate External Finance (AEF) was 0.3% and only £3.7m of savings were identified for 2019/20. As illustrated in the report of the Head of Function (Resources) / Section 151 Officer (**APPENDIX 1**), it will be necessary to raise the Council Tax by 6% in order to achieve a balanced budget. However, as reported by the Section 151 Officer, reducing schools budgets by £1.7m will have a significant impact on schools (through reduced staffing numbers and increased class sizes) and although additional funding has been included in the draft budget proposals for Children's Services and Education, there is still a risk that the proposed budget will be insufficient to meet the increased demand for social care. The Medium Term Financial Plan beyond 2019/20 is to continue with efficiency savings (around £1m - £1.5m per annum) and continued rises in Council Tax of 5%.

In light of the above, the Scrutiny Committee is invited to consider the following questions:

1. Does the Committee support the proposal to raise the Council Tax by at least 6%?
[section 2, Appendix 1]
2. In light of the key messages from the Public Consultation, the Committee is requested to consider whether any of the proposed savings should not be implemented. If so, would the Committee support a further increase in Council Tax ie above 6%, to allow the unsupported savings proposals not to be implemented?
[paragraph 3.6 – 3.9, Appendix 1 and paragraph 5, Appendix 2]
3. Does the Committee consider that any savings proposals will have an adverse impact on the citizens of Anglesey or any protected groups? Does the Committee consider that any further actions should be taken to mitigate the effect of the savings proposals on the citizens of Anglesey or any protected groups? [Savings Table, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2]
4. A significant number of responses were received on the proposed changes to the second home and empty properties premium during the recent public consultation. Does the Committee support the current proposals or does the Committee wish to make any further comments on the proposal to the Executive?
5. Does the Committee support increasing the Council Tax above 6% in order to allow for more funding to be allocated to social care? [paragraph 3.1 – 3.5 & 5, Appendix 1]
6. Given the falling level of reserves and the professional opinion of the Section 151 Officer, does the Committee have any observations on the use of reserves to balance the 2019/20 revenue budget? [paragraph 6, Appendix 1]

7. Does the Committee have any observations on the Council's financial strategy beyond 2019/20 (ie the need to continue to make further savings and to have above inflation increases in the Council Tax)? [paragraph 7, Appendix 1]
8. Does the Committee have any observations on the proposed capital budget in terms of whether it addresses the Council's key corporate objectives and in terms of affordability? [paragraph 8, Appendix 1]

5 – Background / Context

1. CONTEXT

1.1 Scrutiny of the budget setting process has developed and matured over recent years, laying the foundations for a better, more systematic process based on outcomes and good practice. In fact, the process allows for a more systematic approach to financial scrutiny, as an essential building block of sound financial management and governance. Our financial scrutiny approach is emerging as a potential model of good practice.

1.2 Members will be aware that finance is critical to the services the Council delivers and that there are far reaching effects to financial issues facing us as a local authority – both in terms of the services being received by our citizens and also the level of Council Tax or fees and charges being levied². As it becomes increasingly difficult to find the necessary levels of savings through efficiencies, the Council will need to give detailed consideration to all possible options. This will inevitably require us to ask challenging questions about which services to offer to the future and the degree to which current methods of service delivery remain appropriate. Another consideration is how best to manage expectations (internal and external) in making the necessary changes.

1.3 Initial draft budget proposals

As discussed in paragraph 3.3 below, the Finance Scrutiny Panel gave detailed consideration to some of the initial draft budget proposals prior to the Scrutiny Committee's consideration and comment on the report of the Head of Resources & Section 151 Officer at its meeting of 6th November, 2018. The report set out the initial draft proposals for the 2019/20 budget in terms of the savings identified to date and a schedule of proposed efficiency savings set out per service for 2019/20. The Committee also received a report by the Head of Transformation setting out the 2019/20 budget consultation plan.

A resume of the Committee's deliberations can be seen in the minutes of the Committee meeting.

1.4 In considering their response to the final budget proposals, members of the Scrutiny Committee need to consider the proposals in terms of the wider long term financial position of the Council (as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan) and the Council's long term aims and objectives (as set out in the Council Plan for 2017/2022).

2. SETTING THE COUNCIL'S 2019/20 BUDGET

2.1 Attached is the report of the Head of Resources / Section 151 Officer on the proposed revenue and capital budgets for 2019/20 (**APPENDIX 1**) and which provide a position statement on the following issues:

² Raising the Stakes: financial scrutiny in challenging times. A guide for Welsh local authorities (Centre for Public Scrutiny June, 2014)

- The Executive's initial budget proposals
- Local Government final settlement
- Revised budget position for 2019/20
- Council Tax
- Reserves and general balances
- Savings proposals
- Budget pressures
- Risks.

3. FINANCIAL SCRUTINY – SETTING THE 2019/20 BUDGET

3.1 In the current economic climate, Members need to be assured that the Council is making the most effective use of diminishing resources, especially finances:

*"... The importance of effective scrutiny is magnified as public services respond to the challenge of the global financial situation whilst continuously seeking to improve the evidence base for decisions on the allocation of resources as well as ensuring that decisions are transparent and in accordance with the needs of the local community....."*³

How to add value at each stage of the financial process should be the key question from a financial scrutiny perspective. The **budget setting process** is one of those key stages.

3.2 Financial scrutiny is much more than adding value to decisions taken by the Executive. It is about ensuring that there is proper scrutiny in the effective planning, delivery and follow up of key decisions impacting on taxpayers and local communities. Scrutiny should therefore:

- Provide effective challenge
- Hold decision makers to account; and
- Assist the Executive to develop a robust budget for the coming year (by testing how choices are being made about resource allocation and how well resources are used to deliver our policy objectives and priorities).

3.3 Finance Scrutiny Panel

Members will be aware that a Finance Scrutiny Panel has been established to ensure the following key outcomes:

- i. Develop a model of working on finance matters focusing on a smaller group to enable Members to become more involved, develop a level of subject expertise, encourage good attendance and teamwork
- ii. Forum to develop a group of members with the expertise and ownership to lead financial discussions at the Corporate Scrutiny Committee

Financial scrutiny has developed considerably over the past year through the work of the Panel, with external expert input and guidance from CIPFA Wales. The Panel has taken a strategic approach to scrutiny of financial matters and developed a questioning strategy to underpin their work. The Panel has taken a risk approach to its consideration of the 2019/20 budget proposals and prioritised the following 3 service areas⁴:

- Learning Service
- Adult Services
- Highways, Waste & Property.

³ Good Scrutiny? Good Question! Auditor General for Wales improvement study: Scrutiny in Local Government, May 2014

⁴ Meeting of the Finance Scrutiny Panel convened on 26/09/18

A summary of the Panel's comments were considered as part of the Committee's consideration of the initial budget proposals for 2019/20⁵.

4. KEY MESSAGES FROM THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCES

The Public Consultation

4.1 The Council consulted on the Executive's initial budget proposals between 16th November and 31st December. The 7 week consultation period focused on 17 proposals

4.2 These proposals were the result of the annual budget setting process and were consulted upon in order to gain the views of the public and ensure the Executive can (as the process draws to a close) make recommendations from a fully informed position. They were presented by the services during the Autumn where they were also challenged and agreed upon for the purpose of consultation by Elected Members of every political group in the Council

4.3 The proposals were split into the following themes:

- Learning
- Social Services
- Reduction in budgets
- Buses, Parking and Regeneration
- Council Tax
- Tax Premiums
- Ideas

4.4 These proposals were publicised in various ways:

- Briefing session for the local press
- Statements and articles in the press
- The proposals were published on the Council's website (home page)
- Extensive use of social media – Twitter and Facebook, to promote the proposals to a broader breadth of residents
- Emails drawing attention to and inviting citizens to attend discussions on the proposals
- Interview by the Council Leader on MônFM promoting the consultation and its content

Each of the above channels were aimed at publicizing and creating enthusiasm amongst citizens and staff to engage and respond to the initial proposals. Citizens, partners and staff were asked to respond to the consultation through different means including – on-line survey on the Council website, email or by letter.

Engagement with Citizens and other Stakeholders

4.5 As well as the above, the Council arranged further engagement exercises:

- ✚ Focus group session with young people from our secondary schools (in the Council Chamber)
- ✚ Sessions with secondary school councils and also with Young Farmers and the Urdd
- ✚ Session in the Council for partners eg North Wales Police, Fire & Rescue Service, Health Board, Town & Community Councils, 3rd Sector organisations and other agencies
- ✚ Session with the Island's school Heads and Senior Managers
- ✚ Town & Community Councils Forum

⁵ Meeting of the Corporate Scrutiny Committee convened on 6th November, 2018

4.6 This year, the Public Consultation followed a similar pattern to previous years but with a greater emphasis this year on promoting an electronic response via use of social media

Key Messages

4.7 This year the rate of responses has risen considerably with approximately 5,400 responses received against 17 proposals thus averaging approximately 317 responses per proposal. This is considerably higher than in previous years and this is to be welcomed. This has been achieved by using a variety of different channels as outlined above, with respondents using all engagement methods available to them

4.8 The most successful method of collecting responses this year was the online survey – in excess of 95% responded through this channel which is a further increase compared to previous years and perhaps demonstrates once again citizens' willingness to participate using this method

4.9 Responses were received from organisations such as town councils, schools governing bodies, older people, disabled people, young people, teachers and other citizens that could not be included within any particular groups

4.10 There appears to be an obvious balance from the responses to the types of savings proposed in respect of the 2019/20 budget with some respondents against and some in favour. Tensions exist as expected between these and the most contentious areas (with responses exceeding 70%). There is a significant level of opposition to the following proposals:

- ✚ Council Tax – Premiums on 2nd homes
- ✚ Cuts to schools' budgets
- ✚ Making savings by reducing the demand for home care and supported living services

4.11 It is also noted that the response rate to this year's consultation has been far greater than previous years and it is proposed that a full evaluation is undertaken of this year's consultation process in order to learn lessons and provide a sound foundation to improve next year.

Attached is the report of the Business Planning, Programme and Performance Manager summarising the key messages from the Council's recent public consultation exercise (**APPENDIX 2**).

5. KEY SCRUTINY ISSUES

5.1 The 2019/20 budget setting process has provided an opportunity for Elected Members to consider and challenge the implications of the draft efficiency proposals. Notably, the series of budget workshops convened during the Autumn enabled Members to give detailed consideration to each individual budget proposal across all Council services. Input was also received from the Finance Scrutiny Panel in light of detailed consideration of the efficiency proposals. At this stage in the process, the Corporate Scrutiny Committee is now requested to consider any final views on the draft budget for 2019/20 prior to consideration by the Executive⁶ of its proposed final draft budget on 18th February.

5.2 In light of the 2019/20 budget setting process to date, it is therefore proposed that the Committee should:

⁶ Meeting of the Executive to be convened on 19th February, 2018

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consider the key messages from the recent public consultation exercise on the 2019/20 budget proposals ii. Examine in further detail the impacts on citizens of the proposals which caused concern in the recent public consultation exercise iii. Consider the proposed capital budget for 2019/20 onwards. |
|---|

6 – Equality Impact Assessment [including impacts on the Welsh Language]

Attached are the impact assessments in relation to the following service areas which will enable the Committee to assess the impact of the key budget proposals for 2019/20:

1. Cessation of bus service on some routes
2. Review the future of all school crossing patrols
3. Cessation of additional nappy collection service
4. Reduce the demand for homecare services
5. Reduce the demand for supported living support
6. Provide schools with a cash settlement which is lower than the full cost of all budget pressures faced by schools in 2019/20
7. Increase the cost of school meals
8. Only purchase the statutory minimum of nursery provision from nursery organisations.

7 – Financial Implications

This report discusses the process for setting the Council's 2019/20 budget, which includes consideration of the budget proposals and key messages from the recent public consultation process.

8 – Appendices:

APPENDIX 1: report of the Head of Resources on the proposed revenue and capital budgets for 2019/20

APPENDIX 2: key messages from the Council's recent public consultation exercise

APPENDIX 3: equality impact assessments

9 - Background papers (please contact the author of the Report for any further information):

Anwen Davies, Scrutiny Manager, Isle of Anglesey County Council, Council Offices, Llangefni. LL77 7TW

Date: 11/01/19

(amended 24/01/19 & 28/01/19)

2019/20 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1. The context for the 2019/20 revenue budget was set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for 2019/20 to 2021/22, which was approved by the Executive in September 2018. The plan is summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Medium Term Financial Plan

	2019/20 £'m	2020/21 £'m	2021/22 £'m
Net Revenue Budget B/F	130.95	131.73	133.59
Budget Pressures and Inflation	5.78	3.91	4.24
Revised Budget	136.73	135.64	137.83
Aggregate External Finance (AEF)	94.85	94.85	94.85
Council Tax	36.88	38.74	40.67
Total Funding	131.73	133.59	135.52
Savings Required	5.00	2.05	2.31
Main Assumptions			
Pay Awards – Non Teaching	3.1%	2.0%	2.0%
Pay Awards - Teaching	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Teachers Pension	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%
General Inflation	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%
Reduction in AEF	-1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Increase in Council Tax	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%

- 1.2. The Executive considered its initial budget proposals at its meeting on 12 November 2018 and approved the initial Standstill Budget of £137.402m and, based on the provisional settlement of £95.159m, this gave a funding gap before increasing Council Tax of £7.156m. The initial budget proposal included savings of £3.747m, leaving £3.409m to be raised from Council Tax. The proposed budget savings are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Proposed Budget Savings 2019/20

Savings Category	Proposed Saving £'000
Cessation / Transfer of Service	320
Income Generation	475
General Efficiency Savings	473
Staff Restructure	308
Service Transformation	237
Demand Management	195
Reduction in School Budgets	1,739
TOTAL	3,747

- 1.3. The Executive also proposed an increase in the Council Tax premium from 25% for both categories to 35% for second homes and 100% for long term empty properties. This change would generate an additional £0.69m (based on 2018/19 charge). To generate the remaining £2.719m would require an increase in Council Tax of 7.55%.

2. REVISED STANDSTILL BUDGET 2019/20 AND FINAL REVENUE SETTLEMENT

- 2.1. The provisional standstill budget has been reviewed and updated to reflect additional responsibilities included in the final local government settlement, to update budgets for known changes, to update for changes in the fire service levy and to correct any errors or omissions identified through the budget verification process. This has increased the standstill budget by £0.266m.
- 2.2. The final local government funding settlement was published by the Welsh Government on 19 December 2018. Across Wales, the Standard Spending Assessment increased by £33.559m, however, the anticipated revenue from Council Tax also increased by £10.942m. As a result, the overall Aggregate External Finance (AEF) for Wales increased by £23.591m. This was made up of £7.0m to meet the costs of raising the threshold of capital from £40,000 to £50,000 before clients in residential/ nursing care would have to pay the cost in full, an additional £1m to meet the costs of free school meals, an additional £0.975m to raise the maximum reduction in any Council's AEF from -1.0% to -0.3% and an additional £14.616m in extra funding.
- 2.3. For Anglesey, this raised the AEF from £95.159m to £95.791m, an increase of £0.632m. Anglesey did benefit from raising the funding floor from -1.0% to -0.3% but it does represent a reduction of 0.3% in the AEF on a like for like basis.
- 2.4. Based on the revised standstill budget (after budget savings) of £133.921m and a final AEF of £95.791m, £38.130m would have to be generated from Council Tax to fund this budget. Taking into account the increase in the premium and the change in the taxbase, it would require the Band D Council Tax to be set at £1,208.52, which is equivalent to an increase of 6%.

3. ADDITIONAL BUDGET PRESSURES AND RISKS

- 3.1. In the current financial year (2018/19), the Council is projected to overspend by £2.3m and this is mainly due to increased demand for services in Children's Services (estimated £2m overspend), Adult Services (estimated £1m overspend) and Central Education (estimated £0.7m overspend).
- 3.2. In drawing up the standstill budget, additional funding has been included to meet some of the projected overspend, £1.4m for Children's Services and £0.2m for Central Education but, since the standstill budget was initially drafted in September / October 2018, the situation has worsened with an increase in the projected overspend in Children's Services and Adult Services.
- 3.3. The three Services are implementing plans and projects to manage demand and to reduce costs, which include:-
 - Children's Services – Small Group Homes (this will also reduce Out of County education fees), increasing the number of Council foster carers.
 - Adult Services – Provision of extra care housing, reviewing and reducing low level packages, remodelling the provision of homecare services, reviewing the provision of adult day care services and supported accommodation.
 - Central Education – retendering school transport contracts.

- 3.4. In addition, the Welsh Government have announced additional grants outside the settlement for Social Care. £35m has been allocated to Wales and Anglesey will receive in the region of £720k in additional funding (figures to be confirmed).
- 3.5. Given the above, it has been estimated that the underlying potential under-funding across the 3 services is £1.0m, assuming that the planned projects result in the projected savings being delivered and that there are no further increases in the demand for services. Given that the level of reserves has fallen significantly, an overspend of this level again in 2019/20 would place the Council at a greater financial risk.
- 3.6. The initial budget proposals include £3.7m of savings and although the savings proposals have been scrutinised and the risks of not delivering assessed, including a review by the Finance Scrutiny Panel, there is a risk that some savings may not be delivered or not delivered on time. For example, in 2018/19 it is estimated that £267k (10.6%) of the planned savings will not be achieved. Having considered the proposed savings, the majority can be implemented and the risk of non-delivery is minimal but £235k are considered to carry a higher risk of non-delivery.
- 3.7. The budget proposals include a proposal to allocate less funding to schools than is required to meet all of the budget pressures (pay, pension contributions and general price inflation). The cost of all these pressures faced by schools is estimated to be 7% but, by reducing the delegated schools' budget by £1.739m, the actual proposed cash increase to schools is 1.95%.
- 3.8. Headteachers have expressed concern that this proposal will have a significant impact on schools and will result in a reduction in teaching numbers and increased class sizes. Initial work with individual schools is highlighting the difficulties schools will have to set a balanced budget in 2019/20. School balances are available to provide additional funding in the short term but the level of balances has gradually fallen from £2.4m in March 2016 to a projected figure of £0.8m in March 2019.
- 3.9. The impact of the proposal on individual schools is shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Impact of Various Reductions in the Delegated Schools Budget on a sample of schools

Sector	School Size	Potential Budget Reduction
Primary	28 pupils	£760
	46 pupils	£11,810
	71 pupils	£14,110
	130 pupils	£23,820
	183 pupils	£33,080
	241 pupils	£40,420
	352 pupils	£58,600
	430 pupils	£72,640
Secondary		£103,240 to £187,800
Special		£76,000
The above is based on the budget reduction of £1.739m being allocated pro rata on the basis of the size of the budget in each sector		

4. COUNCIL TAX

- 4.1. The Council's Band D Council Tax charge for 2018/19 was £1,140.21, which was 18th from the 22 Authorities in Wales and is lower than the Welsh Average of £1,241. More importantly for Anglesey is the comparison to the 5 other North Wales authorities. This is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Comparison of Council Tax Band Charges for North Wales Authorities

Authority	Band D Charge 2018/19 £	Amount Above / Below Anglesey £	Percentage Above / Below Anglesey %
Anglesey	1,140		
Gwynedd	1,301	+ 161	+ 14.1%
Conwy	1,169	+ 29	+ 2.5%
Denbighshire	1,248	+ 108	+ 9.5%
Flintshire	1,178	+ 38	+ 3.3%
Wrexham	1,093	- 47	- 4.1%

- 4.2. The impact of each 0.5% rise from 6% to 10% is shown in Table 5 below. It should be noted that the level of Council Tax rise is not only important in setting the 2019/20 budget but will also have an impact for 2020/21, as the starting point for the Council Tax will be determined by the rise applied in 2019/20 and this will impact on the rise required in 2020/21.

Table 5
Impact of Varying Increases in the Level of Council Tax for 2018/19

Percentage Increase	Change in Overall Council Funding £'m	Funding Above Requirement to Fund the Revised Budget Requirement £'m	Band D Charge 2019/20 £	Increase from 2018/19 Charge £	Weekly Increase from 2018/19 Charge £
6.0%	+ 2.160m	-	1,208.61	+ 68.40	+ 1.31
6.5%	+ 2.340m	+ 0.18m	1,214.19	+ 73.98	+ 1.42
7.0%	+ 2.520m	+ 0.36m	1,220.04	+ 79.83	+ 1.53
7.5%	+ 2.700m	+ 0.54m	1,225.71	+ 85.50	+ 1.64
8.0%	+ 2.880m	+ 0.72m	1,231.47	+ 91.26	+ 1.75
8.5%	+ 3.060m	+ 0.90m	1,237.14	+ 96.93	+ 1.86
9.0%	+ 3.240m	+ 1.08m	1,242.81	+ 102.60	+ 1.97
9.5%	+ 3.420m	+ 1.26m	1,248.57	+ 108.36	+ 2.08
10.0%	+ 3.600m	+ 1.44m	1,254.24	+ 114.03	+ 2.19

5. BALANCING THE 2019/20 REVENUE BUDGET

- 5.1. As shown in paragraph 2.4, it will require an increase of 6% in the level of Council Tax to fund a budget of £133.921m and this will require the implementation of £3.747m of savings.
- 5.2. However, as noted in Section 3, there is an element of under-funding which has not been addressed in this budget, there is a risk that some savings may not be delivered on time or that circumstances may prevent implementation of all the savings and consideration needs to be given to the impact of the reduction in schools budgets.
- 5.3. The following table (Table 6) highlights the impact of funding a percentage of the potential unfunded budget / savings risks along with the impact of reducing the budget reduction to schools. The additional costs of these changes would be funded from setting the Council Tax increase higher than 6%.

Table 6
Options on How to Use the Additional Funding if the Council Tax was increased by more than 6%

ADDITIONAL FUNDING GENERATED	Percentage of the Unfunded Budget Pressures to be included in the Final Net Revenue Budget			
	25%	50%	75%	100%
Level of Reduction in the Delegated Schools Budget				
£1.739m – no change from original proposal	358,750	674,500	990,250	1,306,000
£1.2m - £539k lower than the original proposal	897,750	1,213,500	1,529,250	1,845,000
£1m - £739k lower than the original proposal	1,097,750	1,413,500	1,729,250	2,045,000
£800k - £939k lower than the original proposal	1,297,750	1,613,500	1,929,250	2,245,000
£400k - £1.339m lower than the original proposal	1,697,750	2,013,500	2,329,250	2,645,000
INCREASE IN COUNCIL TAX	Percentage of the Unfunded Budget Pressures to be included in the Final Net Revenue Budget			
	25%	50%	75%	100%
Level of Reduction in the Delegated Schools Budget				
£1.739m – no change from original proposal	6.92%	7.80%	8.67%	9.55%
£1.2m - £539k lower than the original proposal	8.42%	9.29%	10.17%	11.05%
£1m - £739k lower than the original proposal	8.97%	9.85%	10.73%	11.60%
£800k - £939k lower than the original proposal	9.53%	10.40%	11.28%	12.16%
£400k - £1.339m lower than the original proposal	10.64%	11.51%	12.39%	13.27%

6. RESERVES AND BALANCES

- 6.1.** As at 31 March 2018, the Council's general reserves stood at £6.899m, which is equivalent to 5.3% of the Council's net revenue budget for 2018/19, 7.4% if the delegated schools' budget is excluded. The level of general reserves held is a matter for the Council to decide, based on a recommendation from the Section 151 Officer, but, as a general rule of thumb, 5% of the net revenue budget is considered to be an acceptable level. Based on the 2019/20 standstill revenue budget, this would require a level of general reserves of approximately £6.7m. This takes into account that the majority of secondary schools no longer have any reserves to fall back on and that primary schools are increasingly relying on their service reserves to balance their budgets. If the delegated schools budget is taken out of the calculation, the general level of reserves required would be £4.8m.
- 6.2.** During 2018/19, £0.59m of the general reserves have been released to fund one off costs. This brings the current level of reserves down to £6.309m.
- 6.3.** It is currently projected that the revenue budget will overspend by £2.35m in 2018/19, which will have to be funded from general reserves. Taking all of these factors into account, it is estimated that the level of general balances will fall to approximately £4m by the end of the 2018/19 financial year, which is equivalent to 3% of the 2019/20 standstill revenue budget.
- 6.4.** In times of financial austerity, budgets are reduced and do not have the capacity to deal with increases in demands, particularly in those services which have less control over demand e.g. Social Services. There is, therefore, an argument that the need for general reserves is greater because the risk of budget overspending increases and the Council will require a greater level of financial resources to minimise the risk.
- 6.5.** It is the opinion of the Section 151 Officer that the level of general reserves has now reached a critical point and should not be allowed to fall any further. Having as little as 3% of financial reserves is a financial risk to the Authority and this risk increases the longer the reserves remain at this low level. In the medium term, the Council's financial plan must include budgeting for a surplus which can be used to restore the level of the general reserves back to the minimum figure of £6.7m. It is accepted that this cannot be achieved in one financial year and it may take between 3 to 5 years for this to be achieved and this annual contribution to the reserves will have to take place during a period of continued austerity and the need to find further savings.
- 6.6.** The Council also holds £9.9m as earmarked and restricted reserves (as at 31 March 2018). The majority of these reserves are necessary and are identified to fund specific projects, relate to the balance of unallocated grants or are available to fund potential risks should they materialise into an issue. These earmarked and restricted reserves continue to be used and it is estimated that the balance will have fallen to £6.3m by the end of the 2018/19 financial year. The majority of the £6.3m is to cover potential risks e.g. uninsured risks, to hold unallocated grants and to fund projects which are partly underway and will be completed during 2019/20.

7. UPDATING THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

- 7.1.** The initial budget proposals to the Executive on 12 November 2018 was based on the Medium Term Financial Strategy approved by the Executive in September 2018 (see Table 1). This estimated that the total AEF would reduce by 1% in 2018/19 and that Council Tax would rise by 5% and that the premium on second homes and empty properties would remain unchanged.

- 7.2. The actual settlement reduced the AEF by 0.3% and this has had a significant impact on the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The situation is not unique to Anglesey and a majority of Welsh Councils had planned for a significant cut in the AEF, when the AEF for 9 of the 22 Councils actually increased in cash terms.
- 7.3. Estimating future changes in the AEF is difficult and much will depend on the performance of the UK economy post Brexit. The UK Government has revised their fiscal policy and it is no longer a target to clear the UK budget deficit by 2020 but, if economic growth is lower than anticipated, this may result in further cuts to the Welsh Government's overall budget. The protection that the Welsh Government gives to other areas of spending compared to local government will also have a significant impact on the level of future local government settlements.
- 7.4. No indication has been given by Welsh Government as to the level of future funding and in the absence of this information, the MTFP continues to assume no increase in the level of the AEF over the next 3 years.
- 7.5. Inflation and pay awards are assumed to be in line with each other over the next 3 years with an assumed annual increase of 2%. Demand is anticipated to remain at the current level across the services but, as has been shown over the past 2 years, this may be an optimistic assumption.
- 7.6. Council Tax is assumed to continue to grow by 5% per annum. If the actual rise was less than this figure, each 1% below the 5% would require additional savings of £0.41m.
- 7.7. Based on these assumptions, it is estimated that the Council will have to continue to make further savings of between £1m and £1.5m in each of the following three years. This is based on a high level update of the MTFP and a more detailed assessment will be provided to the Executive in September 2019.

8. CAPITAL BUDGET 2019/20

- 8.1. The draft Capital budget for 2019/20 was approved by the Executive at its meeting on 12 November 2018. The budget gave priority to the following areas:-
- To any schemes that had been approved in previous years but had not commenced/ been completed;
 - Investing in the upgrade and maintenance of existing assets, including buildings, roads, vehicles and I.T.;
 - Continued investment in new schools;
 - Developing new Council housing;
 - Any schemes which attract a significant level of grant funding for minimal investment from the Council;
 - Schemes which generate future revenue savings.
- 8.2. The capital budget will be funded from the following sources:-
- General Capital Grant;
 - Supported Borrowing;
 - Capital Receipts;
 - Unsupported Borrowing for 21st Century schools;
 - Capital grants;
 - Capital reserves.

Table 7
Proposed Capital Programme 2019/20

Scheme	2019/20 Budget £'m	External Grants £'m	Council Funding £'m
Holy Island Visitor Gateway	1.000	0.950	0.050
Lôn Newydd Wylfa	7.000	7.000	0.000
Holyhead and Llangefni Strategic Infrastructure	3.400	3.330	0.070
Flood Alleviation Schemes	0.900	0.765	0.135
Gypsy and Traveller Sites	0.779	0.000	0.779
Holyhead Market Hall	0.350	0.250	0.100
Ysgol Santes Dwynwen	0.085	0.000	0.085
Ysgol Rhyd y Llan	0.037	0.000	0.037
Ysgol Y Graig Extension	3.120	1.185	1.935
Ysgol Bro Llangefni	3.521	2.324	1.197
Ysgol Beaumaris, Llandegfan and Llangoed	0.400	0.132	0.268
Ysgol Syr Thomas Jones and nearby primary schools	0.400	0.132	0.268
Disabled Facilities Grant	0.750	0.000	0.750
Disabled Access – Education Buildings	0.300	0.000	0.300
Replacement Vehicles	0.150	0.000	0.150
IT Infrastructure	0.439	0.000	0.439
School Refurbishment	0.500	0.000	0.500
Non School Refurbishment	0.400	0.000	0.400
Highway Resurfacing	1.359	0.580	0.779
HRA Capital Expenditure / New Developments	13.110	2.660	10.450
TOTAL CAPITAL PROGRAMME	38.000	19.308	18.692
Funded By:			
External Grants	18.728	18.728	
Funding Brought Forward from 2018/19	1.099		1.099
General Capital Grant	1.327		1.327
Supported Borrowing	2.026		2.026
Highways Refurbishment Grant	0.580	0.580	
Capital Receipts	-		-
Unsupported Borrowing 21 st Century Schools	1.847		1.847
Supported Borrowing 21 st Century Schools	1.943		1.943
HRA Unsupported Borrowing	1.000		1.000
HRA Revenue / Reserves	9.450		9.450
TOTAL FUNDING	38.000	19.308	18.692

8.3. In the final local government settlement for 2019/20, the Welsh Government announced an increase of £738k in the general capital grant but the Executive have yet to allocate this to any specific projects.

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Highways, Waste & Property	Cessation / Transfer of Services	Realising savings within the bus service by stopping the following journeys which are low in use – 50b - 07.13 from Amlwch to Llangefni (service 32) on Saturday mornings 63a – 63 Service which travels from Amlwch to Llanerchymedd to Bangor (via Brynteg) on Saturday afternoons 43a – Daily (43a) Service which services estates and residential areas in Menai Bridge and Llanfairpwll together with providing a service between Caernarfon and Llangefni	EA 1	133	Terminate existing contracts with the contractors	April 2019	Public resistance to the Council cutting these services.
Highways, Waste & Property	Income Generation	Increase the annual parking voucher fee by £20 to realise more income	Not Required	8	Publish the increase in the price	April 2019	May reduce demand for vouchers which could reduce the overall income generated.
Highways, Waste & Property	Cessation / Transfer of Services	Review the future of all school crossing patrols	EA 2	58	Terminate existing staff contracts. This will require the payment of redundancy payments to the staff concerned	April 2019 or Sept 2019	Public concern over safety.

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Highways, Waste & Property	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce the budgets for maintenance of Coastal Path, Structures and Traffic	Not Required	15	Reduce allocated budget	April 2019	Insufficient budget to meet essential repairs and maintenance costs.
Highways, Waste & Property	Cessation / Transfer of Services	Stop the additional nappy collection service	EA 3	30	Inform Contractor and service users of the change	April 2019	Public resistance to the change.
Highways, Waste & Property	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce Street Lighting R & M budgets as a result of the installation of more LED street lights	Not Required	42	Reduce budget allocation	April 2019	None
Highways, Waste & Property	General Efficiency Savings	Stop using safecote additive for gritting	Not Required	25	Reduce budget allocation	April 2019	None
Highways, Waste & Property	Income Generation	Increase the private street works income budget to reflect the current level of income received	Not Required	100	Increase income target	April 2019	Actual income does not achieve the revised higher target.
Highways, Waste & Property	Cessation / Transfer of Services	Transfer the responsibility for certain public conveniences to communities	Not Required	10	Identify and reach agreement with a willing party to take over a public convenience	When a willing party is identified	No party comes forward to express and interest.
Highways, Waste & Property	General Efficiency Savings	More use of LPG and electric cars	Not Required	40	Budget adjusted to reflect the current revised costs	April 2019	None

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Highways, Waste & Property	Income Generation	Additional income from new industrial units	Not Required	14	Let new units	As new tenants are identified	Insufficient tenants are identified for the new units.
Highways, Waste & Property	Staff Restructure	Restructure of the Property Management Team	Not Required	85	Agree the changes to the job descriptions of the staff affected. Release the staff for the posts no longer required	Already implemented	Lack of capacity within the remaining staff to undertake all the required work, resulting in a reduction in service performance
Highways, Waste & Property	General Efficiency Savings	Savings on energy budgets following capital investment	Not Required	30	Undertake capital investment	April 2019	None
Highways, Waste & Property	Service Transformation	Rationalise the management of cleaning staff	Not Required	20	Transfer the management of staff to schools	September 2019	Inability to reach a satisfactory agreement with schools
Highways, Waste & Property	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce building/ running costs budget following the disposal of Shire Hall, Llangefni	Not Required	20	Complete the sale of the Shire Hall	April 2019	Agreement not reached with the potential buyer - building not disposed of.
Total for Highways, Waste & Property				630			
Adult Services	Demand Management	Reduce demand for residential and nursing placements by 2.5% per annum	EA 4	111	Ensure adequate alternative provision is available	April 2019	Demand for residential and nursing care does not decrease – requires culture change which may take longer to achieve

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Adult Services	Demand Management	Reduce demand for homecare services by 53 hours per week	EA 5	46	Review how care packages are determined and client needs are assessed	April 2019	Demand for homecare cannot be reduced due to increasing client numbers or clients having increasing care needs – requires culture change which may take longer to achieve.
Adult Services	Demand Management	Reduce demand for supported living support by 50 hours per week	EA 5	38	Review how the care is provided to clients. Agree changes with service providers, clients and staff	April 2019	Changes cannot be agreed and implemented.
Adult Services	Service Transformation	Increase the number of clients using direct payments by 10 clients per annum	Not Required	30	Identify and transfer clients to direct payments	April 2019	Insufficient numbers of clients are identified.
Adult Services	Income Generation	Increase the standard charge cost of care at Council run homes to closer reflect the cost of providing the service	Not Required	30	Request approval for the increased fee from the Executive	April 2019	Challenge from a client affected.
Adult Services	Income Generation	Commence charging the statutory allowed for all adult clients consistently across all ages and disabilities	Not Required	250	Inform clients of the change. Undertake the necessary financial means tests	May 2019	Challenge from a client / client group affected. Increased number of assessment appeals.

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Adult Services	Service Transformation	Full year saving following the closure of Plas Penlan	Not Required	70	Remove budget	Already Implemented	None
Adult Services	Service Transformation	Outsource more homecare packages to the private providers	Not Required	11	Transfer packages by managing the in-house provision through natural wastage	April 2019	Insufficient staff numbers leave the Authority.
Total for Adult Services				586			
Learning & Culture	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce book purchasing fund	Not Required	20	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None
Learning & Culture	General Efficiency Savings	Delete unused budget - Talnet	Not Required	20	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None
Learning & Culture	Schools Budgets	Provide schools with a cash settlement which is lower than the full cost of all the budget pressures faced by schools in 2019/20	EA 6	1,739	Agree delegated budget for 2019/20, allocate to individual schools via the agreed formula	April 2019	A number of schools will find it difficult to provide the statutory service with the revised budget.
Learning & Culture	Income Generation	Increase the cost of school meals by 20p	EA 7	43	Publish the revised price	Sept 2019	Demand for school meals falls and the total income does not achieve the higher target.

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Learning & Culture	Cessation / Transfer of Services	Only purchase the statutory minimum of nursery provision from nursery organisations	EA 8	89	Inform nursery organisations and providers of the change	Sept 2019	Providers are no longer financially viable and they close, resulting in a loss of provision in certain areas.
Learning & Culture	Service Transformation	Review the delivery of integration services in order to use the available resources more efficiently	Not required	106	Agree the change with schools and staff	Sept 2019	Not possible to reach the required agreement with schools and/or existing staff. Parents resistant to the change.
Learning & Culture	General Efficiency Savings	Delete marketing budgets for Melin Llynnon, Beaumaris Gaol and South Stack – no longer required	Not Required	15	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	The two remaining attractions are not transferred and remain open under the Council's control.
Learning & Culture	General Efficiency Savings	Close 1 club and reduce the number of weeks other clubs are open along with no longer paying children to work in the Coffee Bar at Clwb Jesse Hughes	Not Required	10	1 Club already closed. Implement the change in Clwb Jesse Hughes by informing the children of the change	April 2019	None

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Learning & Culture	Staff Restructure	Staff Restructure	Not Required	36	Undertake restructure and identify posts to be deleted from the structure	April 2019	Lack of capacity within the remaining staff to undertake all the required work, resulting in a reduction in service performance.
Learning & Culture	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce Arts Grants budget to reflect the actual sum required	Not Required	15	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None – this amount of budget remains unallocated in 2018/19.
Learning & Culture	Income Generation	Increase the income budget for Oriel Ynys Môn to reflect the current performance	Not Required	30	Increase income budget	April 2019	Income falls from its current level and, as a result, the target is not achieved.
Total for Learning & Culture				2,123			
Regulation and Economic	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce Maritime budgets	Not Required	16	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None
Regulation and Economic	Staff Restructure	Reduce capacity within the Regeneration Function	Not Required	66	Undertake restructure and identify posts to be deleted from the structure	April 2019	Lack of capacity within the remaining staff to undertake all the required work, resulting in a reduction in service performance.
Regulation and Economic	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce Tourism and Countryside budgets	Not Required	5	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Regulation and Economic	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce the Outdoor Facilities budget following the transfer of assets from the Leisure Function	Not Required	42	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None
Regulation and Economic	Staff Restructure	Reduce capacity within the Public Protection Function	Not Required	42	Undertake restructure and identify posts to be deleted from the structure	April 2019	Lack of capacity within the remaining staff to undertake all the required work, resulting in a reduction in service performance.
Total Regulation and Economic Development				171			
Housing	Staff Restructure	Staffing restructure	Not Required	54	Delete unrequired post from the approved establishment	April 2019	None
Total for Housing Services				54			
Resources	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce central procurement budgets	Not Required	5	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None, change in budget reflects the usage in 2018/19.
Resources	Staff Restructure	Staffing restructure	Not Required	25	Undertake restructure and identify posts to be deleted from the structure	April 2019	Lack of capacity within the remaining staff to undertake all the required work, resulting in a reduction in service performance
Total For Resources				30			

2019 / 20 Proposed Revenue Budget Savings							
Service	Savings Category	Savings Proposal	Equality Impact Assessment Reference	Savings to be Implemented £	Actions to Implement	Timetable	Risks to Successful Implementation
Transformation	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce training budget for summer placements	Not Required	20	Reduce the budget provision	April 2019	None
Transformation	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce telephone budgets following the termination of unused or low use telephone lines	Not Required	20	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	Insufficient numbers of low use telephone lines are identified to generate the necessary saving
Transformation	General Efficiency Savings	Delete video conferencing budget – system no longer used	Not Required	3	Delete budget provision	April 2019	None
Total For Transformation				43			
Corporate	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce historic pension budgets to reflect the reduced costs	Not Required	100	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None
Corporate	General Efficiency Savings	Reduce external audit fees to reflect the revised service and cost	Not Required	10	Reduce budget provision	April 2019	None
Total For Corporate				110			
TOTAL SAVINGS PROPOSALS				3,747			

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2019/20 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes
1	20.09.2018	Final draft

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
<p>1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?</p>	<p>Public Transport</p> <p>The Highways Department have undertaken a review of bus services, identifying routes with low passenger numbers and a high subsidy.</p> <p>Contract 50b - Propose to cease operating 0713 departure from Amlwch to Llangefni under the 32 service number and propose to cease operating the journeys involved with this contract on a Saturday. This contract no longer operates at the time of writing on a Saturday afternoon, saving of £10.7k.</p> <p>Contract 63a - Propose to cease operating the 63 service from Amlwch to Llannerch-y-medd to Bangor (via Brynteg) on Saturday afternoons, saving of £6.2k.</p> <p>Contract 43a - Propose to cease operating every journey involved with this contract, saving of £95k. The current journeys serve housing estates and residential areas in Menai Bridge and Llanfairpwll and a single journey operating directly between Caernarfon and Llangefni.</p>
<p>2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?</p>	<p>Huw Percy, Interim Head of Service, Highways, Waste & Property Iwan Cadwaladr, Senior Engineer Transportation</p>

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	New proposal
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be effected by this proposal?	Bus passengers will be affected by this proposal. Particularly those users less-able to walk to the nearest bus stop.
5 – How will this group of stakeholders be effected?	The journeys in question will not be available to passengers.
6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?	Not aware of any other proposal.
7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?	The regular passengers on the journeys in question will no longer be able to use them which may lead to more car journeys or the individuals being unable to travel. The regular passengers on the journeys in question will have to walk further to an alternative bus stop for 43a ceased services or use two connecting services.
8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal e.g. decreasing investment in road maintenance might cause greater	There is a risk that reducing the public transport service budget could affect Bus Services Support Grant levels in the future. These grants are currently under review.

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

number of potholes which may cause greater number of insurance claims.	
9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision	Before changing or ceasing any major bus journeys a further consultation exercise will be required. This involves consulting with specific users groups, councillors, town/community councils and members of the public over 3 months. There is a requirement to give the bus operators 84 days' notice.

Step 2: Assessment Result

10 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)	By cutting the journeys in question it would result in the regular passengers being affected. In some cases, alternative journeys are available (journeys involved with contract 43a specifically). Passengers in Menai Bridge would have to walk to the B5420 and use the 62 service bus. Passengers in Llanfairpwll would have to walk to the A5 and use the 4/X4/42 service bus. Passengers travelling from Llangefni to Caernarfon would have to make a connection in Bangor or Ysbyty Gwynedd.
11 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren't unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?	Alternative bus journeys would be available for the affected bus passengers, but there would be a longer walk to those services. There are bus stops and shelters on the proposed routes and a more frequent service.

<p>12 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as a result of undertaking this impact assessment?</p> <p>(this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)</p>	<p>No</p>
---	-----------

Step 5: Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale
	3 months consultation with users	IC	Commence November
	84-day Notice period to bus operators	IC	Commence December

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2018/19 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes
1	20.09.2018	Final draft

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?	Cease School Crossing Patrol Service
2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?	Huw Percy, Interim Head of Service, Highways, Waste & Property Jennifer Clark, Senior Engineer Strategic Transport and Road Safety
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	New - previous policy was one of not replacing school crossing patrols who left the service.
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be effected by this proposal?	School Crossing Patrols - Kingsland, Holyhead Cybi, Holyhead (x 2) Llanfawr, Holyhead (1x permanent, 1 x relief) St. Mary’s, Holyhead Y Graig, Llangefni Amlwch Llanfechell Caergeiliog Llannerch-y-medd

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
	<p>Primary school children walking to school at the above schools. Parents are responsible for primary school age children at the above schools.</p>
<p>5 – How will this group of stakeholders be effected?</p>	<p>All staff affected would lose their posts.</p> <p>Children/parents - it is currently the parents' responsibility to make sure children get to school safely - this will not change.</p>
<p>6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?</p>	<p>Financial - redundancy costs.</p>
<p>8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal</p> <p>e.g. decreasing investment in road maintenance might cause greater number of potholes which may cause greater number of insurance claims.</p>	<p>Removing school crossing patrols might increase the risk of children being involved in collisions.</p> <p>Possible increased congestion outside schools and potential health implications due to less walking.</p> <p>Negative publicity to the Council.</p>

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision

There would need to be consultation with the affected School Crossing Patrols and Schools.

Step 2: Assessment Result

10 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)

Removing patrols may increase the risk of children being involved in collisions, which may be mitigated by improving physical crossing facilities – an assessment will be required at all schools to identify any necessary provision where there is none currently, and to check the suitability of facilities where they exist.

School

Kingsland, Holyhead
Cybi, Holyhead

Llanfawr, Holyhead
St. Mary's, Holyhead
Y Graig, Llangefni

Amlwch
Llanfechell
Caergeiliog
Llannerch-y-medd

Current facilities

No crossing
Zebra crossings exist at both sides of the school but not at the locations used by the SCPs

No crossing
No crossing
Puffin crossing at SCP location, toucan crossing outside the school

Zebra crossing
No crossing
Traffic island
No crossing

Road Safety lessons will be provided by the Road Safety staff at the affected schools - at no extra cost to the Authority.

Education Service/Schools - Update their School Travel Plans

<p>11 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren't unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?</p>	<p>The School Crossing Patrol (SCP) service is a non-statutory function. The Council currently follows the SCP service guidelines criteria for assessing sites which uses the PV2 formula as its basis (P =Number of Pedestrians, V= Number of Vehicles).</p> <p>The relationship PV2 provides a measure of both the potential conflict and the delays experienced by pedestrians. It also accounts for the need to help small numbers of pedestrians to cross roads safely when traffic flows are heavy and the delays long; and conversely, large numbers of pedestrians when traffic was lighter and the delays shorter.</p> <p>All SCP sites on Ynys Mon were assessed in 2007 and based on the PV2 formula, no sites were justified. The Authority therefore adopted the policy of not replacing SCPs who left the service. The PV2 figures have been reviewed and are anticipated to remain significantly below the threshold. The three routes to the new Ysgol Cybi site were assessed in September 2017 and all locations were below the threshold.</p> <p>There are puffin or zebra crossings outside four of the schools (the ones located on the busiest roads) and road safety lessons will be provided.</p>
<p>12 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as a result of undertaking this impact assessment?</p> <p>(this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)</p>	<p>No.</p>

Step 5: Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale
	Review any marginal sites	JC	November 2018
	Consult with Staff	JC	December 2018

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2018/19 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes
1	20.09.2018	Final Draft

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?	Cease the independent child nappy collection service and propose to collect child nappies as part of black bin service (this would result in child nappies being collected in the standard black bin every 3 weeks)
2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?	Huw Percy, Interim Head of Service, Highways, Waste & Property Meirion P Edwards, Chief Waste Management Officer
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	New
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be effected by this proposal?	Families with young children in nappies Families where children have special healthcare requirements

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
5 – How will this group of stakeholders be effected?	<p>Removal of this service will mean soiled nappies will be collected every three weeks in the standard black bin rather than every two weeks as the current service.</p> <p>It is likely that these families will experience significant problems storing nappies due to their high volume. This could lead to an overspill of nappies with the potential of health related issues and a negative impact on Anglesey’s street cleansing e.g. fly tipping of nappies, littering and other environmental impacts such as odours.</p>
6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?	No
7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?	<p>Negative publicity to the Council as adjacent local authorities in North Wales currently collect child nappies on a weekly basis. Potential increase in fly-tipping, health implications and a reduction in street cleanliness standards.</p> <p>Potential redundancy implications for the contractor due to removal of this service.</p> <p>Increased complaints to call centre by aggrieved parents.</p>
8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal	<p>Health Implication – the Council already collects child nappies less often than its neighbouring local authorities (every two weeks compared to every week). It is likely that changing the collection frequency to every three weeks would have a negative impact on health due to the nature of the content of nappies.</p>

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
	<p>Special Health Needs - Some older children with special health needs require this service and due to their age the volume of nappies produced is higher than young infants. These households will struggle if this proposal is implemented.</p> <p>Fly Tipping and Street Cleanliness – the proposed change could reduce the island’s overall street cleanliness which could have a negative impact on the local community, tourism, business opportunities etc.</p>
<p>9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision</p>	<p>There would need to be consultation with stakeholders.</p>

Step 2: Assessment Result	
<p>10 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)</p>	<p>The Council could investigate the possibility of promoting a Real Nappy Service. This would involve encouraging householders with young children to use real nappies instead of disposal nappies. Officers are not aware of any such initiative in the locality at the current time.</p>
<p>11 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren’t unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?</p>	<p>The collection of household waste is a statutory service. However, the Council can decide how often it collects this waste. The Council has made a Policy decision to collect child nappies every two weeks. This decision was made when the new three weekly collection of “black bag waste” was introduced in October 2016. A commitment was made at that time to ensure that all families with children in nappies would not be any worse off in terms of their collection frequency as a result</p>

	of the new service change.
<p>12 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as a result of undertaking this impact assessment?</p> <p>(this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The final decision on whether to collect child nappies every three weeks must consider whether it is reasonable to expect young families to manage all their “black bag waste” and child nappy waste into their wheeled bin.</p>

Step 5: Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2019/20 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes
1	20.09.2018	Final draft

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?	Managing Requirements in several areas. The specific areas are 1) Number of placements within homes; 2) Number of hours of home care provided; 3) Support in supported living projects.
2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?	Head of Adults - Alwyn Jones - with support from members of the team, specifically Iola Richards and Barbara Williams, Senior Managers within the department
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	Annual offer.
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be effected by this proposal?	Individuals within service and those who wish to receive services for the future
5 – How will this group of stakeholders be effected?	There will be a change in the offer that individuals receive from the service with less pressure on solving individuals' demands and more focus on their personal resources and trying to avoid the services that increase dependency

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?	Due to the nature of this saving, there is no link to any other saving
7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?	There is a risk that will continue to arise due to the demographic pressures of a change in practice within the service
8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal e.g. decreasing investment in road maintenance might cause greater number of potholes which may cause greater number of insurance claims.	No, reduced dependence on service and increased in independence can be positive
9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision	No

Step 2: Assessment Result	
<p>10 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)</p>	<p>Impact = Reduction in service offer Mitigation = Offer support based on individual assets and meet personal results</p>
<p>11 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren't unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>12 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as a result of undertaking this impact assessment?</p> <p>(this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)</p>	<p>No</p>

Step 5: Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2019/20 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchasing the statutory minimum of nursery provision 2. Providing schools with a settlement which is lower than the full price of the whole pressure on them during 19/20 3. Increasing the cost of school meals by 20p 4. Moving to a model of assistants in Secondary catchment areas
2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?	Arwyn Williams
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	Yearly consideration in recent years
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be affected by this proposal?	Effect on school staff and on the capacity to sustain / raise standards Indirect effect on pupils and on the provision and support given to them

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

5 – How will this group of stakeholders be affected?	<p>Adhering to the cut which is being consulted upon, unavoidably there will be job cuts – that being of teachers, assistants or administrative staff.</p> <p>Job cuts will place additional stress and pressure on the staff remaining in our schools, and will affect the maintenance, provision and resources for pupils.</p>
6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?	<p>See number 4 above.</p>
7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?	<p>Yes:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deterioration of provision quality and standards• Negative effect on staff welfare and morale• Staff leaving work – clear pressure on Headteachers due to having to implement the cuts• Increased number of our schools going into debt• Less leadership time for Headteachers in our primary schools, especially in the smaller schools• Substantial impact on the budgets of secondary schools and large primary schools
8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal? e.g. decreasing investment in road maintenance might cause greater	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Staff leaving their jobs / the profession• More difficulty in attracting headteachers• Estyn inspection results have been positive lately, and this is likely to be affected

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
number of potholes which may cause greater number of insurance claims.	over a period of time due to full implementation of the cut.
9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Finance Forum, 6th of February

Step 2: Assessment Result	
10 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)	<p>The full cut will affect standards, provision and maintenance for pupils in our schools. Staff welfare and morale will be affected.</p> <p>Hard to mitigate; schools will basically have to find different ways of providing the service on less finance. With some schools it could be argued that this is possible, but with other schools it's very difficult to see how it's possible without either going into debt or endangering standards.</p> <p>A good number of Headteachers and Governing Body Chairs have contacted the Head of Learning noting that they cannot see how there are</p>

Step 2: Assessment Result	
	<p>means to implement the cut.</p> <p>Officers of the education and finance departments have been working with headteachers and governing bodies to try to find ways to cut the 5%.</p>
<p>11 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren't unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?</p>	<p>The priority will be to ensure pupil safeguarding and safety and to maintain standards. Raising standards will be very challenging considering the effect of cuts on those schools that don't have clear areas where finances could be cut.</p>
<p>12 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as a result of undertaking this impact assessment?</p> <p>(this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)</p>	<p>The cut will mean that the majority of schools will be going into debt if they don't cut jobs. Most schools that continue to be in debt will be able to put a recovery plan in place over the years, but some schools will struggle to put a plan of this kind in place. Some schools are facing a state of going into debt (some of which will be substantial debts) or not being able to staff classes.</p> <p>The greatest price to pay is the possible effect this could have on the education of Anglesey's children. As a result, although the cut is possible, I believe it should be reconsidered since its effect would be so damaging.</p>

Step 3 – Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2019/20 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contributing towards maintaining the statutory stage on nursery provision 2. Providing schools with a settlement which is lower than the full price of the whole pressure on them during 19/20 3. Increasing the cost of school meals by 20p 4. Moving to a model of assistants in Secondary catchment areas
2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?	Arwyn Williams
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	The price increased last year
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be affected by this proposal?	School parents / pupils

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
5 – How will this group of stakeholders be affected?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in price • Will possibly impact the choice of lunch, e.g. some will decide against school meals that meet a specific standard in terms of nutritious food etc.
6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the council were to decide to raise council tax – these costs would also add to the increase in costs for parents.
7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibility that less income would be drawn by school meals • Impact on costs for parents
8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal? e.g. decreasing investment in road maintenance might cause greater number of potholes which may cause greater number of insurance claims.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupils turn to a less nutritious lunch.

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision?	No

Step 2: Assessment Result

1 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)	-
2 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren't unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?	-
3 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as	There is a link in terms of increase in costs for parents and other decisions,

Step 2: Assessment Result**a result of undertaking this impact assessment?**

(this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)

e.g. council tax. Therefore the need to re-consider depends on other decisions.

Step 3 – Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale

Isle of Anglesey County Council – Budget Proposals 2019/20 Impact Assessment Template

Revision history:		
Version	Date	Summary of changes

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks	
1 - What is the budget proposal you are assessing?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contributing towards maintaining the statutory stage of nursery provision 2. Providing schools with a settlement which is lower than the full price of the whole pressure on them during 19/20 3. Increasing the cost of school meals by 20p 4. Moving to a model of assistants in Secondary catchment areas
2 - Who is the lead Officer responsible for the proposal?	Arwyn Williams
3 – Is this a new proposal or one that’s been previously considered?	This was considered some years ago.
4 – Which group of stakeholders will be affected by this proposal?	Playgroups – staff, volunteers and committees Parents of pupils attending a playgroup in the term of their child’s 3 rd birthday.

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

5 – How will this group of stakeholders be affected?	<p>By accepting the proposal, the council won't be contributing towards nursery education between the 1st of September and the 31st of December. The statute is to provide 10 hours of education in the term following the pupil's 3rd birthday.</p> <p>Provision will be for pupils that are three years old before August 31st in their primary school (except for Talwrn, Corn Hir, Henblas and Llandegfan). Pupils that are 3 years old between September the 1st and December 31st will receive nursery education in the first term after this, i.e. from 1st of January onwards.</p> <p>There will be opportunities for playgroups to attract income by providing care around the 10 hours, and for pupils that aren't in their first term after their 3rd birthday.</p>
6 – Are you aware of any other proposal which could affect this group?	-
7 – Are there any risks associated with this proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Playgroups must take advantage of providing 30 hour care opportunities in order to create another source of income during the first term.

Step 1: The Proposal and Associated Risks

<p>8 – Would there be any associated risks if a decision was taken to agree to the proposal?</p> <p>e.g. decreasing investment in road maintenance might cause greater number of potholes which may cause greater number of insurance claims.</p>	<p>It's possible that there will be a side-effect on the nursery provision that could in its turn impact how ready pupils are to start in a school nursery class.</p>
<p>9. Do you anticipate a further consultation exercise will need to be undertaken (i.e. in addition to the corporate one) before implementing the decision?</p>	<p>Discussion to continue with nursery classes and Mudiad Meithrin.</p>

Step 2: Assessment Result

<p>1 – Can you note the main effects and how you would mitigate against the negative effects (i.e. summary of table above)</p>	<p>In order to mitigate, playgroups are encouraged to attract another source of income during the first term of the academic year.</p> <p>An officer from the education department has already started discussions with a Mudiad Meithrin officer in regards to this.</p>
---	---

Step 2: Assessment Result

2 – Is there a strategy in place to deal with those effects which aren't unlawful but cannot be mitigated or avoided?	
3 – Is there a need to re-consider this proposal as a result of undertaking this impact assessment? (this assessment could provide evidence that the proposal is illegal. If you have identified such impact then consideration should be taken as to whether to continue with the proposal at this time)	No

Step 3 – Action Plan

Please detail any actions that are planned following completion of your assessment. You should include any changes that have been made to reduce or eliminate the effects of potential or actual negative impact, as well as any arrangements to collect data or to carry out further research.

Ref	Proposed actions	Lead officer	Timescale

Response to the Executive Committee's Initial Budget Proposals – 2019/20

ISLE OF ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL

January 2019

Analyst – Alwyn Williams, Performance & Business Analyst

Author – Gethin Morgan, Business Planning, Programme and Performance Manager

Head of Service – Carys Edwards, Head of Human Resources & Corporate Transformation

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Council recently undertook a consultation exercise on the initial budget proposals agreed for consultation by the Executive Committee between 16 November and 31 December, 2018. The 7 week consultation period focused on approximately 15 proposals.
- 1.2. These proposals were the result of the annual budgetary process and were consulted upon in order to gain the views of the public and ensure the Executive can (as the process draws to a close) make recommendations from a fully informed position. They were presented by the services during the autumn where they were also challenged and agreed upon for the purposes of consultation by the Elected Members of every political group in the Council.
- 1.3. The proposals were split into the following themes as outlined below, namely:
 - Learning
 - Social Services
 - Reduction of Budgets
 - Buses, Parking and Regeneration
 - Council Tax
 - Tax Premiums
 - Ideas
- 1.4. Consideration was given to a broad range of savings where the internal challenge and consensus had led to proposals that varied from matters such as increasing Band 'D' Council Tax levels by £2.19 per week to stopping the nappy collection to only providing the statutory minimum of nursery provision across the island.
- 1.5. These proposals were publicised in various ways;
 - 1.5.1.A briefing session for the local press
 - 1.5.2.Statements and articles in the press
 - 1.5.3.The proposals were published on the Council's website (homepage)

1.5.4. Extensive use of social media – Twitter, Facebook to promote the proposals to a broader range of residents

1.5.5. Relevant e-mails drawing attention to, and inviting residents to attend discussions on the proposals

1.5.6. An interview by the Leader on MônFM promoting the consultation and its contents

Each of the channels above were aimed at publicising and creating enthusiasm amongst citizens and staff to engage and respond to the initial proposals.

1.6. Citizens, partners and staff were asked to respond to the consultation through different means, including:

- An on-line survey on our website
- E-mail or
- Writing to us in the traditional way by posting a letter

1.7. As well as the above, the Council held further engagement exercises with :

- A focus group session for young people from our secondary schools in the Council Chamber
- Sessions with secondary school council's together with further sessions with Young Farmers and the Urdd.
- A session in the Council for a number of partners such as the Police, the Fire Service, Health, Town and Community Councils, 3rd Sector organisations and other agencies.
- A session with the Head teachers and Senior Managers of schools on the Island
- A Town and Community Councils Forum on 28th November, 2018

The consultation this year followed a similar pattern to previous consultation events that have been held in recent years, but an even greater emphasis was placed this year on promoting an electronic response through our extensive use of social media.

In addition, this year we sought our residents' views on ideas where we could make further savings or increase our income over the years to come to plug the budgetary gap envisaged as a result of our Medium Term Financial Plan. The purpose of this was to spark a discussion with our residents and communities on the issues under consideration.

We have received a wide range of ideas in response to this year's consultation and most are included as **Appendix A** to this report.

It is recommended that these ideas are considered further by the Scrutiny Finance Panel as a supplementary part of the current process to see whether they can be accepted as genuine ideas which could be developed for the years ahead.

2. Findings

- 2.1. The response to the initial budget proposals for 19/20 over a period of 7 weeks was balanced with a number of positive and negative comments surrounding the various proposals. This year the rate of responses has risen considerably with approximately 5,400 responses received against a total of 17 proposals averaging approx. 317 responses to each proposal. This is considerably higher than in previous years which is welcomed and has been achieved through the various channels outlined above, with respondents using all methods available to them to engage.
- 2.2. The most successful method of collecting responses this year was the online survey – in excess of 95% responded through this channel which is a further increase compared to past years and perhaps demonstrates once again residents greater willingness to participate using this means.
- 2.3. Responses were received from bodies such as town councils, school governing bodies, older people and disabled people, young people, teachers, and other residents that could not be included in any particular group.
- 2.4. Like the previous years, we have been able to capture the ‘reach’ and engagement we made as a Council through social media. By promoting the consultation through these media we reached approximately 62,000+ people.
- 2.5. We posted the consultation on social media several times over the period (7 weeks).
- 2.6. The fact that we managed to reach so many does not confirm that they visited the consultation page itself on the website, but the figures undoubtedly show that these numbers were aware of the consultation that was underway.
- 2.7. Indeed, from the analytical information we have, we can see that the reach of the marketing drive on social media this year has meant a strong engagement with around 1,300 individuals who visited the consultation on our website.
- 2.8. This figure is reiterated by the numbers who visited our corporate website during the 7 week period, and the geographical origin of those individuals who visited the survey from countries such as –
 - 2.8.1. USA
 - 2.8.2. Ireland
 - 2.8.3. Austria
 - 2.8.4. India
 - 2.8.5. Netherlands
 - 2.8.6. Canada
 - 2.8.7. Germany
- 2.9. Nonetheless, the majority of visits to our website were by UK citizens (approx. 94%).

3. The Results of the Consultation

- 3.1. The results of the consultation this year similar to last years have been balanced on the whole, with viewpoints in favour of and against a number of proposals. There were specific fields where a clear opinion was offered as a result of this year's consultation. These fields will become evident as part of this report. (see below)
- 3.2. The remainder of this report addresses the formal responses that were received through the various methods outlined in 1.6 and 1.7 above. It is drawn up to address / follow the relevant topics / themes outlined at the top of this report.
- 3.3. **Point to note** – against the proposals that follow there are the % responses to the closed questions asked as part of the survey and thereafter a commentary of the comments posted associated with those proposals.
- 3.4. **Learning.** There were 4 proposals to consider as part of the consultation –
- Only buy the statutory minimum of nursery provision i.e. two terms instead of three
 - **37% agree / 63% disagree**
 - Provide schools with a cash settlement which is lower than the full cost of their forecasted budget pressures in 2019/20
 - **15% agree / 85% disagree**
 - Increase cost of school meals (primary & secondary) by 20p –
 - **64% agree / 36% disagree**
 - Move to a secondary catchment area model for school assistants in order to make more efficient and effective use of staff.
 - **49% agree / 51% disagree**

The total value of the 4 proposals above was - £1,977,000.

3.4.1. The respondents to the set questions obviously seem to disagree with the majority of the proposals with the most overwhelming disagreement being evidenced against the proposal to fund schools at a lower level than their forecasted costs. The increase in school meals proposal was the only one of the four that was supported by almost two-thirds of the respondents.

3.4.2. In addition to the above conclusion a number of comments were received (68), indicating some strong viewpoints. Although those viewpoints weren't always associated with the actual proposals and in the main tended to be against and not supportive of these savings proposals.

3.4.3. For example, some talk about the lack of responsibility by parents in educating their children, whilst others talk about the continued need to rationalise schools and sell redundant buildings to maximise resource. It has been noted that the process of modernising schools needs to be speeded up. Others take a hard-line view that no cuts should be made to the education service as this is the education of our future and undertaking such steps would only be a short-term mind-set which would undoubtedly put added pressure on teaching staff.

3.4.4. In the same vein, some comments reflect the feeling and the need that the Council should ring-fence any additional resource allocated by Welsh Government through the budget setting process or any increase in Council Tax made by the Authority to the Education service and in particular school provision to assist school budgets.

3.4.5. Responses from School Councils, Urdd and the Young Framers Club are also concerned and not very supportive of these proposals e.g. Bodedern's School Council response was emphatic in their position –

- 3.4.5.1. increase Council Tax,
- 3.4.5.2. do not cut school budgets
- 3.4.5.3. look elsewhere like waste management to make savings

3.4.6. The Town & Community Council Forum noted that a cut to schools and children's services would realise fake savings and the Council should look at increasing Council Tax as opposed to making such cuts.

3.4.7. Therefore, to close on the proposals to make savings through the schools' and their associated costs, it seems that there is an obvious split with the majority against such saving proposal and some in favour. The discussion above demonstrates some of those tensions.

3.5. **Social Services** – 3 proposals were being proposed from Social Care and these were as follows -

- Reducing demand for homecare services and supported living support
 - **22% agree / 78% disagree**
- Increase number of clients arranging own care through DD and increasing standard charge of care at Council run homes to closer reflect the cost of provision
 - **47% agree / 53% disagree**
- Reducing demand for residential and nursing placements by continuing with our drive to promote independence within the community
 - **64% agree – 36% disagree**

The total value of these 3 proposals were - £255,000

3.5.1. In addition 22 comments were received and the responses range from those that acknowledge that community independence still requires support to the need to be cautious that any cut would overburden community workers.

3.5.2. Other note that there is a need for families to 'take more responsibility for their loved ones' which again resonates with the drive to enable people to be as independent as possible into old age.

3.5.3. There is also an acceptance that by living longer, care needs become more complicated and that the Council should develop the role and status of paid-carers and provide a career structure which reflects the importance of their work and responsibilities.

3.5.4. Some question whether what's put forward can actually be realised i.e. if a person requires these services then there is no alternative. Is reducing demand a true possibility and by aiming to do so is there a risk that we will actually be increasing costs as good quality home care is the first line of defence in the community and prevention? Some note that there is a desperate need to invest in high quality community based provision in order to assist the agenda.

3.5.5. There is also the questioning surrounding nursing placements and whether it should be considered as part of this consultation and that perhaps it would be better suited in an NHS consultation.

3.5.6. Finally on this part of the consultation the fact is noted that with statistics demonstrating that people are living longer some state that this budget should be maintained or even increased as there will always be a need for it.

3.6. Reducing Budgets – 2 proposals were put forward under this theme

- Reducing or deleting the following budgetary lines –
 - Talent (libraries book buying fund) / Melin Llynonn (Marketing budget) / Gaol & Courthouse (marketing budget) / Coastal Path / Structures & Traffic / Maritime (blue flags) / Outdoor facilities following transfer of assets to community / central procurement / training budget for summer placements / tourism and countryside
 - **38% agree / 62% disagree**
- Stopping the nappy collection service
 - **55% agree / 45% disagree**

3.6.1. The total value of these proposals were £188,000

3.6.2. 38 comments were received associated with these proposals and these ranged from those that were unhappy with the fact that a number were combined together and consulted upon therefore making it difficult for them to have a full understanding of

the financial position, to those who vehemently disagree with any reduction related to the Library provision (Talnet – Libraries book buying fund).

3.6.3. Indeed it appears that the Library service is well-regarded from a few respondents and that these should be viewed as potential community hubs into the future.

3.6.4. Others note that the proposals which were combined together as proposals are good solutions and there is scope to further centralise marketing, through greater service utilisation of central corporate communications staff.

3.6.5. Those who are against the removal of the nappy collection proposal have undoubtedly voiced their concern as they note that this service is a necessity and if cut a review of black bin collection needs to be undertaken with a view that it should become a more regular occurrence than the 3 weekly service currently in operation.

3.6.6. One proposal questions why Oriel Ynys Mon isn't up for deletion under section 1 and others point to the fact of how important tourism is to the island and their concerns are noted to the proposals to cut tourism related activities at a delicate time for the economy under the 'looming brexit'.

3.6.7. To close this field therefore, the questions highlighted under 3.6 demonstrate a position against the proposed cuts and the discussion above provides a taste of the views of those who disagree with those proposals.

3.7. **Buses, Parking & Regeneration** is the next theme which includes 3 proposals –

- Reduce capacity within the Regeneration Function
 - **Agree 64% / Disagree 36%**
- Increasing the annual parking voucher fee by £20 to realise more income
 - **Agree 75% / Disagree 25%**
- Realise savings within bus services by stopping the following journeys
 - 50b Amlwch to Llangefni (service 32 on Saturday mornings)
 - 63a – 63 Service which travels from Amlwch to Llanerchymedd to Bangor via Brynteg on Saturday afternoons
 - 43a – Daily 43 a service which services estates and residential areas in Menai Bridge and Llanfairpwll together with providing a service between Caernarfon and Llangefni
 - **Agree 70% / Disagree 30%**

3.7.1. These proposals are different to the other fields which have been consulted upon and provide an overwhelming support for the savings identified.

3.7.2. Having noted this, it is also important to draw the committee's attention the fact that a petition has been received by the Council which is against the cut to the 43a bus service which services Menai Bridge and Llanfairpwll. This petition (wording noted in appendix B) is signed by 229 individuals from both Menai Bridge and Llanfairpwll.

3.7.3. Of the other comments (22 in total) there is a consistent message of the need to review a greater number of bus journeys across the island but keeping in mind some journeys are the only way certain people are able to travel and from a sustainable model this needs further consideration.

3.7.4. There is a tension between some respondents who see the need to increase the parking voucher further whilst others believe the Council should do more to increase the free parking provision across the island but most notably in the town centres.

3.7.5. This field is undoubtedly different to its counterparts and apart from the petition received the majority of respondents agree with the said proposals.

3.8. Council Tax – this year the proposals put forward for consultation did not divulge % figures but instead used monetary figures which it was envisaged would make it clearer for respondents around its impact on day to day living. The questions asked were as follows -

- Would respondents be happy to pay on average (Band D property) an extra £2.19 a week on your Council Tax in order to protect the Council's key statutory services and enable us to meet the islands growing service pressures and demands
 - Agree 43% (66 respondents) / Disagree 57% (89 respondents)
- If no, please tick which weekly increase on your Council Tax you would be happy to pay (only select one box) –

<i>Proposal</i>	<i>% response</i>	<i>No. of responses</i>
£1.97 extra a week	5%	4
£1.75 extra a week	3%	2
£1.53 extra a week	9%	7
£1.32 extra a week	5%	4
£1.10 extra a week	77%	58

3.8.1. What the above demonstrates is that the willingness or not to pay an extra £2.19 a week in Council Tax wasn't as overwhelmingly opposed as some of our other proposals put forward during this year's consultation.

3.8.2. Of those who did oppose it, it appears that the favoured option of an increase in Council Tax is the minimal increase proposed of £1.10 extra a week.

3.8.3. 58 comments were received in line with this proposal and their differing views can be encapsulated as follows.

3.8.4. The majority of the comments received were against the raise in Council Tax. Indeed, a recurring theme coming from the comments is that the residents who responded did

not see why they should be asked to pay more Council Tax when the services they receive are decreasing. It was noted by a number that if it were to rise then we should expect improved services and the other proposals put forward by this consultation should be scrapped. Criticism was also apparent with the fact that Anglesey compares itself with other authorities on a council tax basis and this it was noted was flawed due to the average lower wages and smaller population of the island.

3.8.5. A couple of respondents criticised the fact that no %'s were noted within the consultation and that using monetary terms (£'s) did not give the full picture.

3.8.6. Having said that, it is apparent that 9 of the 58 respondents who provided comments were agreed to the increase in council tax, indeed the common theme running throughout those responses were the fact that if there was an increase in council tax costs, then all the additional funding gained should be used to lessen the cut if not completely ring-fenced for the benefit of education and the schools.

3.8.7. Whilst on the whole, the opposition to the increase in Council Tax was apparent, some felt there was a need for it and that as a Council it should be undertaken.

3.9. Council Tax – Premiums

3.9.1. The survey was responded to by almost 1000 people and was by far the element of the survey which had the most responses out of the budget consultation.

3.9.2. Approximately 70% of those that responded also included additional comments to support their cases.

3.9.3. Many of the comments however failed to understand the difference between a long term empty home and a second home which is unoccupied during long periods during the year. This caused some difficulties when analysing the data but many of the themes were similar.

3.9.4. Below is a breakdown of the two questions asked along with themes coming from the responses:

- **Do you think we should increase our Council Tax Premium on Long-term empty properties from 25% to 100%?**

3.9.5. This question on the survey was responded to 979 times.

3.9.5.1. 56% do not agree with the increase to 100%

3.9.5.2. 44% do agree.

3.9.6. Of the 979 responses there were 678 additional comments, not all responses related to the empty properties but mainly second homes.

3.9.7. Themes within the comments against the premium on empty homes include:

- 3.9.7.1. Empty Homes do not use as many Council Services
- 3.9.7.2. Money being used to renovate empty homes will be lost resulting in them being empty for longer
- 3.9.7.3. Some empty homes are difficult to sell
- 3.9.7.4. Generational Family Homes
- 3.9.7.5. Financial Hardship
- 3.9.7.6. Forced to sell up

3.9.8. Themes in favour of the premium on empty homes include:

- 3.9.8.1. Increase results in empty homes being brought back into use
- 3.9.8.2. Increase but do so slowly over time e.g. Year 1 -50%, Year 2 - 75%...
- 3.9.8.3. Increase for only the longer term empty homes, e.g. over 2 years
- 3.9.8.4. Offer scheme to reduce the number of empty homes
- 3.9.8.5. Compulsory purchase long term empty homes

- ***Do you think we should increase our Council Tax Premium on Second homes from 25% to 35%?***

3.10. This question on the survey was responded to 992 times.

- 3.10.1. 83% do not agree with the increase
- 3.10.2. 17% do agree.

3.11. Of the 992 responses 689 additional comments were received, although like above not all comments were to do with the council tax premiums on second homes.

3.11.1. Themes within the comments against the increase in the premium on second homes include:

- 3.11.1.1. Economic Benefits to the Island will be lost
- 3.11.1.2. Tourism will be affected
- 3.11.1.3. Second Homes use less council services
- 3.11.1.4. Many Second Homes are future Retirement Homes
- 3.11.1.5. Forced to sell up
- 3.11.1.6. Second Homes should pay less council tax not more
- 3.11.1.7. Short Sighted decision
- 3.11.1.8. Discrimination
- 3.11.1.9. Change second home to main residence
- 3.11.1.10. Themes in favour of the premium on second homes include:
- 3.11.1.11. Second Homes Council Tax should be increased even further as they can afford it
- 3.11.1.12. The increase could lead to more homes for local people

- 3.12. These views are also reflected in the 50 or so e-mails received on this matter. Those that have contacted the Council through this means have undoubtedly demonstrated their displeasure with such proposals and are against it.
- 3.13. The word cloud below (Fig 1) gives a summary of the comments. Larger words are discussed more often in the comments and smaller words less so.

Fig 1.



4. Final Conclusion

4.1. To close therefore, it seems from the responses to the types of savings proposed in respect of the 2019/20 budget, that there is an obvious balance, with some respondents against and some in favour. The above demonstrates some of these tensions and identifies the most controversial areas (responses over 70%) whereby there is a resounding disagreement with the proposals. These are:

- 4.1.1.1. *The Council tax – Premiums on 2nd Homes*
- 4.1.1.2. *The cuts to school budgets and*
- 4.1.1.3. *Making savings by reducing the demand for homecare and supported living care*

4.1.2. It is also noted here that the response rate to this year's consultation has been much greater than over past years and it is proposed that a full appraisal of this year's consultation process is undertaken to learn lessons and provide a sound base from which to improve again next year.

4.1.3. Based on these conclusions, it is recommended that –

4.1.3.1. the Scrutiny Committee and Executive Committee consider the response as part of their discussions before making final recommendations

4.1.3.2. the Corporate Scrutiny Committee's Finance Panel considers further the areas of savings that have been proposed by our citizens (Appendix A) as the first part of the process for setting the 2020/21 budget.

Appendix 'A' – Summary of Responses / Ideas**1. Bin Collection Services**

- Suspend the green bin collection service between October and March.
- Stop the green bin collection service completely.
- Reduce green and black bin collections to once a month
- Large recycling bins (different colour for different recycling materials) to be collected once a month – encourage people to recycle more and reduce waste so that the black bin can also be collected once a month.

2. Libraries

- Closure of underused libraries.
- Centralise libraries or merge them with Secondary School libraries.
- Provide activities for children in libraries and charge a small fee.
- Charge an entrance fee to Oriel Môn.

3. Schools

- Close schools for children at 1pm every Friday. This will enable teachers to take their 10% non-contact time at the same time – promoting collaboration and reducing core staffing costs (i.e. supply teachers' costs for the 10%).
- Also an option to reduce other staffing costs during this period – this could save over £100,000 per year in large schools.
- Increase the cost of school meals – however, to do this there must be an improvement in the quality of school meals (from £2.40 to £3.00).
- 4.5 day week for schools?
- Heater on all the time in school – unable to control it. On/off button only.
- Fine parents that bus their children to primary schools outside the appropriate catchment area by introducing a licence.
- Charge for school buses for secondary pupils.

4. Public Transport

- Combine the 62 & 61 bus service to link Bangor and Holyhead with places like Cemaes and Cemlyn.
- Review the bus system – reduce / merge journeys.

5. Tourism

- Raise the profile of tourism on the Island – we must invest to make money.
- Anglesey missing an opportunity to promote the island's culture and legends.

- Charge a toll on visitors to cross the bridges when they visit the Island.
- Develop tourism – including a tourist centre.

6. Tax Increase

- 10% increase in tax.
- Increase the tax to the same level as Gwynedd.
- Charge an additional tax on houses that are purchased as personal holiday homes – local people buying a second house to rent out for income shouldn't be penalised.
- Increase the premium on second homes / holiday homes to 100%.

7. Staffing Suggestions

- Make staff redundant
- Internal re-structuring
- Stop advertising jobs
- The Executive is too big – needs to be reduced in size
- Look at 'middle management' and higher tiers in all departments – is there a need for so many officers?
- There's no need for two assistant chief executives.
- Reduce the use of 'consultants' and give the responsibility to officers that have the same qualifications.

8. Employment

- Reduce staff salaries
- Cut pay for staff earning over £40,000
- Stop paying overtime and bonuses to staff

9. Parking Charges

- Charge staff for parking their cars – at the offices.
- All staff who park in Council spaces (including offices and schools) should be charged £200 per year (depending on pay grade) – the sum to be deducted by payroll.

10. Reducing the number of Councillors

- A small island does not need 30 elected members.
- Review the number of councillors by area (2 would be sufficient)
- Reduce councillors' expenses
- Reduce expenditure on councillors – such as buying i-pads
- Reduce local councillors' salaries.

Appendix 'B' – Petition against proposal to cut bus service

Dear Sir /Madam

Please find enclosed our petition ruling against the final desition to withdraw from the service 43/47 running through Llanfair P.G also the surrounding villages of menai bridge All names on this petition have been written down by people who use this service only. We will continue to collect names up until the end of march. Also please note all the names on the petition are from people who use the bus and not from general public.

The comunity feel that yes the service needs looking at and at the worse Reducing / Fine turning but not withdrawing. Thou we know the service has been reduced in use, The service is being used by all walkes of life the Disabled, Sick, Enabled, Young, Students, Elderly and more. We wish to put to you if the service is taken away we want to know what will happen and where and how do some of the passengers get around and go about their buisness, shopping, visiting family members and much more.

Park and ride Llanfairpwll

We have people visiting their sick and dying Family members / Wifes there is no other service passing throu here so how will these public passengers visit them in the Fairways nursing home located behind the park and ride.

Llanfair Doctors and Dental surgery

We have Elderly, Sick and Disabled people who visit here on a daily basis people who physically cant walk long distance and are coming from the higher end of Llanfair p.g and the surrounding villages of tyddtn to.

Co.op Llanfairpwll

We have the local comunity who are unable to walk who go on a daily basis to get their shopping needs there is usually around 30 minutes between each service and for those who are unable to stay on their feet very long go and do their shopping.

E.G we have one gentleman who can spend a max hour and a half on his feet his visit to the shop consists of a journey on the bus do his shopping and gets next bus back, his visit will after withdrawal will end up around 3 and a half hours how will that impact his life.

Ysbyty Gwynedd

How are people who live where there will be no bus meant to get to appointments and emergencies.

We also have a lady who goes to the surgery 2 times a week for her tablets and shopping she struggles on a daily basis anyway but in some cases the driver helps her off with her shopping. This lady lives in the top end of Llanfair and certainly cant walk long distance. She is so disabled she gets of the bus backwards

Withdrawal of the service will have a massive impact on most of the comunity who use this service. Yes in some cases they can use an alternate service but in lots of cases the busses are full and full of children in the morning and evening so where are the elderly sick and disabled meant to sit. We also carry students and vulranable children for their school and in these dark wet mornings what will

happen to them. Not only will it have an impact on peoples lives it will also have some impact on local buisnesses who reply on this service.

This service is also linked to a service 46 which serves bangor – Llangefni also Bangor – Caernarfon also Llangefni – Caernarfon and Llangefni – Caernarfon This service carries children to school, Students to college, Council workers to work in llangefni and local cumunity shoppers, what will happen to this service.

There is also the job loss of 3 drivers who serv the comunity on this service.

Before plans to withdraw service we the comunity feel we need a meeting so we can talk about the impact this will make on our comunity.

Please contact me on the address and tel no at top of this petition if you wish to talk and for further information.