Changes for Cardiff

Executive Summary of the Consultation Results and Feedback Report on the City of Cardiff Council’s 2015/16 Budget Proposals
Executive Summary

This Executive Summary provides an overview of the Budget Consultation exercise. It is not a detailed summary of the full report, but an articulation of some of the key findings. For a full understanding of the responses received as part of the consultation, links to the appropriate sections of the report are provided.

1.1 Background

The consultation on the Changes for Cardiff Budget Proposals ran from 21st November 2014 until 12th January 2015. It was the City of Cardiff Council’s most far reaching consultation on budget proposals to date. The consultation was communicated and shared through a range of channels, whilst face to face engagement activities were undertaken in locations across the city.

The consultation took three forms:

- **City-wide public consultation** on issues of general interest (set out in the “Changes for Cardiff” document) – these elements represented £6.8m of the total proposed savings.
- **Service-specific consultation** with identified service users/groups or organisations – these elements amounted to £5.533m of the total proposed savings.
- **General consultation** – this included all of the Council’s other savings that have been released for consultation, including internal changes within the Council such as; back office efficiencies, staff changes and process improvements – these components represented £22.899m of the total proposed savings.
### 1.2 Headline Figures

**4,191 people** took the time to complete the *Changes for Cardiff* questionnaire, over **five hundred people** attended engagement events and a large number of the public gave views via petitions, calls for community polls and through correspondence.

From those completing the survey in response to the 2015/16 budget proposals, the following headline figures can be seen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you recognise that a budget gap of a potential £463m for 2015/16 means that difficult budget choices are required?</td>
<td>3498</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the Council in exploring new ways of working with other organisations to deliver its services?</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you support the Council charging more for some services if it meant that they could be continued?</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you support the Council in the greater implementation of fines for non-compliance e.g. littering, parking, failing to adhere to recycling rules etc.?</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that community groups and the third sector organisations should be asked to run more local services and facilities e.g. running local community buildings, maintaining local open spaces etc.?</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services should be brought together into a Hub based approach that includes a full library service</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst keeping the core library service free at point of access additional income streams should be explored – including the sale of e-readers, stationery, room hire, rental of space and coffee machines?</td>
<td>3401</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes for Cardiff

#### Results and Feedback Report

**Do you agree a phased approach should be taken to disinvest from traditional day centre models of provision to ensure that the Council can re-invest in more community based opportunities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1778 (48.1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>600 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1316 (35.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you agree the existing community meals service should develop away from solely home delivery provision at set times of day and work to link up service users with a range of luncheon clubs and other resources in their neighbourhood?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>2570 (69.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>361 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>765 (20.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are you in favour of the proposal to cease Council funding for the following:**

#### Calennig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>2415 (64.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>608 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>723 (19.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cardiff in Bloom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>2259 (59.9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>961 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>552 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cardiff Country Fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>2630 (70%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>527 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>602 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### St David’s Day Celebrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1839 (48.8%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1492 (39.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>437 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Christmas Tree Provision in the City and Bay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1838 (48.8%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1485 (39.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>447 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you agree with the remodelling of the Park Ranger Service?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1432 (38.9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1291 (35.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>979 (25.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Under the new proposals we plan to focus youth work delivery on six well resourced, high quality Youth Activity Centres delivering activities for young people and access to tailored support. Do you agree with the proposal?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1977 (54.7%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>658 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>979 (27.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes for Cardiff

#### Results and Feedback Report

1. **In addition to Youth Activity Centres and community led delivery, young people’s access to youth work in their communities should be supported by a mobile provision, specifically a Youth Bus? Do you agree with this proposal?**

   - Yes: 1769 (48.8%)
   - No: 714 (19.7%)
   - Not sure: 1140 (31.5%)

2. **Do you agree that some funding should be available for Welsh language provision play services?**

   - Yes: 1411 (37.0%)
   - No: 1689 (44.3%)
   - Not sure: 713 (18.7%)

3. **Do you agree that some funding should be available for holiday play provision?**

   - Yes: 2717 (71.5%)
   - No: 552 (14.5%)
   - Not sure: 529 (13.9%)

4. **Do you agree that some funding should be available for children with a disability to access play?**

   - Yes: 3385 (88.5%)
   - No: 142 (3.7%)
   - Not sure: 297 (7.8%)

5. **Do you agree to withdraw the free entitlement to bulky item collections?**

   - Yes: 1965 (51.7%)
   - No: 1391 (36.6%)
   - Not sure: 447 (11.8%)

6. **Do you agree to an increase in existing charges for bulky item collections?**

   - Yes: 1868 (50.1%)
   - No: 1313 (35.2%)
   - Not sure: 551 (14.8%)

7. **Do you agree that street cleansing services should be based upon the priority needs of the local area rather than based upon a fixed timetable?**

   - Yes: 2660 (70.1%)
   - No: 734 (19.3%)
   - Not sure: 400 (10.5%)
Of the five Infrastructure delivery models shortlisted, do you have a preferred option?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Joint Venture</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Public Joint Venture</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment off wholly owned arm's length company</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified in-house service delivery</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you agree with the removal of the Automated Public Conveniences?

- Yes: 2968 (79.1%)
- No: 408 (10.9%)
- Not sure: 374 (10%)

654 respondents to the Changes for Cardiff Budget Proposals Consultation would be interested in becoming involved in volunteering to help guide the delivery of services in their neighbourhood. Of these:

- 512 would be interested in volunteering to assist the Council with service delivery
- 125 would be interested in taking over a building to continue to deliver a similar service
- 97 would be interested in taking over the responsibility of surplus buildings
- 84 would be interested in running a service from an alternative building
1.3 Overarching Themes:

It is clear that respondents to Changes for Cardiff recognise that the financial challenge, alongside other service demand pressures, means that difficult budget choices are required. This understanding is reflected throughout the response to the Council’s budget consultation, with broad support for many of the proposals, and notably for the Council to explore new ways of working.

- **The financial reality:** An overwhelming 88.7% (3,498) of respondents recognised that a £48.3m budget gap for 2015/16 meant that difficult budget choices are required.

- **Support for new ways of working:** 75.1% (2,950) support the Council in exploring new ways of working to deliver its services.

- **Greater charging:** There is mixed levels of support for the Council charging more for some services if it meant they could be continued with 43.9% (1,725) supporting the proposal but 35.9% (1,411) ‘not sure’.

- **Fines for non-compliance:** Over 3,000 respondents (77.6%) supported the Council in the greater implementation of fines for non-compliance such as, littering or illegal parking.

- **Quality and cost of service:** Throughout the Changes for Cardiff consultation and previously as part of the Cardiff Debate, residents have told the Council that ‘quality of service’ and ‘cost of service’ are the most important factors in service delivery. In comparison, ‘who’ delivers the service is not considered an important factor.

- **Community involvement:** 33.3% (1,295) of respondents agreed that community groups and the 3rd sector should be asked to run more local services - 33.6% (1,309) said ‘No’; 33.1% (1,290) said ‘Not sure’.

- Whilst some practical concerns were expressed about community groups and third sector organisations being asked to run more local services and facilities, there is a clear support (74.6%) for volunteers assisting in a new approach to library services.

- **Community interest:** 654 individuals (19.2%) or groups expressed an interest in becoming more involved in the delivery of services. Many were interested in volunteering to assist in delivering a Council service.

- **Use of buildings:** Respondents felt the Council should encourage alternative uses for buildings proposed for closure, rather than selling or permanently closing assets, and
seek to transfer assets to community groups where appropriate. Also, a significant number were interested in taking over the responsibility of surplus facilities (97) or taking over a building to continue to deliver a similar service (125).

- **Local insights:** The nature of the feedback received from area to area on similar issues varied. This has provided the Council with a valuable insight into what different areas consider appropriate solutions to identified issues and is further explored and supported in Appendix 1.

- **Valued public services:** Overall, the results of Changes for Cardiff consultation emphasise the importance people place on their local public services, but also demonstrate a growing understanding of the tough choices that need to be made. In most instances there is support for the Council’s approach to meeting its budget challenge, although it must be stressed that many respondents expressed concern about what this budget shortfall means for their communities and for their services. For comments given as part of the consultation, please see Appendix 2 and 3.

### 1.4 City-wide Budget Proposals

The section below highlights the main issues arising from the responses received for some of the specific proposals in the Changes for Cardiff Consultation Document.

**Community Centres**

The City of Cardiff Council pledged to continue its commitment to join up local services within Community Hubs, with a focus on meeting local needs, making services more accessible and reducing the overall number of buildings used.

- Approximately two thirds (64.7% / 2,476) of respondents were in favour of the Council working to join up existing services offered in community centres with the Hub strategy.

- 62.7% (2,367) felt that proposals for alternative use or building transfer of these facilities should be explored.

Where respondents had indicated that they were not in favour of proposals they were invited to express their reasoning.

- The most frequently expressed concern related to the locality of proposed hubs and the resulting issues that individuals or group may have in accessing the facilities. These concerns were mentioned in 22% of comments.
• A fifth (20.3%) of comments referenced fears over the **capabilities of volunteer groups** to take over services and the longevity of this approach.

Others concerns related to:
• Service provision being biased towards the more socially deprived areas.
• Transfer of buildings to community groups or private companies having a negative impact on the services provided.

---

**Library Services**

Library services have a key role to play in communities but the way in which people use libraries is changing. The 2015/16 Budget Consultation included a range of proposals with the aim of providing more joined up and accessible services with reduced funding.

• **Four in five** (80.8% / 3,157) respondents reported to be library card holders.
• **57.9%** (2,237) stated that they visit a Cardiff library facility **at least once month**.

• **Almost ninety percent** (88.9% / 3,401) of those completing the survey were in favour of **additional income streams being explored**.
• **Three quarters** (74.6% / 2,821) wanted to see the City of Cardiff Council **encourage and support volunteers** in the outlined new approach for library services.

The consultation document also outlined the Council’s preferred options for individual library sites and asked the public if they agreed with the proposals.

• The **highest level of agreement** was found regarding the Council’s proposal to **transform Central Library into a Community Hub** (74.1% / 2,794).
• The public expressed **less agreement** in instances where it was proposed that the Council withdraw funding from specific facilities with high numbers opposing i.e. (i.e **Whitchurch 49.1%, Rhiwbina 49%, Cathays 46.4%, Rhydypennau 44.4%, Roath 44.1%, Radyr 41.8%, Rumney 39.2%**)

Where respondents indicated “no“ to any of the proposals outlined by the Council they were provided with an opportunity to express their reasons for this.

• The distribution of the sites proposed for the withdrawal of Council funding was a significant source of comments with many fearing a ‘**geographical gap**’ in service provision in some communities.
• Respondents were keen to see library services explore a wide range of cost savings and **income generation** options, such as; making use of volunteers, changing opening hours, introducing charges where possible, and adding cafés rather than losing the community service.
Different views emerged from different areas of Cardiff in terms of what local people considered appropriate solutions.

- Opinion was mixed regarding the introduction of services such as café/coffee shops, fears were expressed about the possibility of influence from the any ‘business’ aspect detracting from core services. One particular exception to this however was in the case of Whitchurch library whereby a number of comments expressed support for the introduction of such a facility.
- The proposed transfer of the Local Studies Service from Central Library to Canton was met with some opposition. Those against the move generally felt that the collection was most suitably located within Central Library where it was more easily accessible.

The recent budget consultation saw a number of individuals and organisations (367) express an interest in becoming involved with library services on a volunteer basis.

- Comments reveal, however, public concerns regarding a move to this means for service delivery. It was feared that an overreliance on volunteers and their good will could affect quality of provision and undermine the professional skills demonstrated by existing libraries staff.

### Day Services for Older and Disabled People

Social isolation amongst older people is a serious concern and something that the City of Cardiff Council, working with its partners, aims to safeguard against. However expectations of older and disabled people are changing, with people wanting more choice and control over the support they receive.

This demand, coupled with an increasing demand on existing services and a growing emphasis on prevention from Welsh Government, is driving forward a new model of community based services.

- Those responding were largely in favour of the general principles, however the proposals to disinvest in traditional day centres and remodel community meals received lower levels of agreement (48.1% / 1,778 and 69.5% / 2,570 respectively).
- For those disagreeing, the main concern was the proposals may result in a decline in what was otherwise considered to be an essential and vital service providing support for many service users.
Leisure Centres and Arts Venues

The consultation document explained that the Council is currently exploring the management of leisure centres and arts venues (including St David’s Hall, New Theatre and The Cardiff Museum Story) by different organisations. This could enhance the quality of the provision and also make savings.

- Half (51.9% / 1956) of those responding were in favour of the Council looking at different management models for leisure centres whilst a slightly higher proportion (57.4% / 2118) agreed that this was also appropriate for arts venues. The preference was that these should be managed by a Trust or Social Enterprise as opposed to a commercial management company.
- The most important factors in the future management of leisure centres and art venues were: ‘the cost to use the service’, a ‘varied programme of activities’ and ‘provision for all age groups’. ‘Who’ delivers the service was deemed to be one of the least important factors.

Events and Celebrations

Financial challenges mean that the Council no longer has the resources to support a number of events and celebrations that the Council has traditionally helped to fund.

- Respondents broadly supported proposals to cease Council funding for Calennig (64.5% / 2415), Cardiff in Bloom (59.9%) and Cardiff Country Fair (70%).
- There was less support for ceasing funding for St David’s Day Celebrations (48.8%) and Christmas tree provision (48.8%).

Park Ranger Service

Budget proposals for 2015/16 identify a continued emphasis to maintain the parks and green spaces, but also suggest a remodelling of the existing Park Ranger service which would reduce the current number of Park Rangers whilst making efforts to ensure that negative impacts are mitigated.

- Opinion was mixed as to whether the proposed remodelling of the Parks Services was an agreeable option with less than two fifths (38.9%) in favour of the proposal
- Concerns from those opposing the proposal were largely in relation to reduction in quality of parks and support to Friends Groups
Respondents were also asked to identify which activities of the park ranger service they would like to see prioritised for continuation should a reduced service be implemented in the future. The most important were seen to be:

- Tackling of anti-social behaviour and youth annoyance - 64.6% (2,355) respondents
- Enforcement issues (e.g. dog fouling) - 64.1% (2,336) ; and
- Maintaining site presence at key parks - 54.5% (1,987)

**Youth Services**

The Council is proposing to deliver Youth Services from six well-resourced Neighbourhood Youth Activity Centres. Outreach services and mobile provision via a Youth Bus were also proposed as a means of providing additional flexible options for engaging young people. The results show that:

- Just over half of respondents agreed (54.7% / 1,977) with the proposal to focus youth work delivery on six well resourced, high quality Youth Activity Centres.
- There is support (70.9% / 2,574) for the proposal to engage young people, community groups and third sector organisations in designing and delivering youth services.
- Mobile provision, specifically via a Youth Bus, was less well supported with 48.8% agreeing with this proposal and 19.7% expressing disagreement.
- There was broad support (76.4% / 2,761) for the Council’s commitment to the active involvement of young people in shaping youth support provision.

**Children’s Play**

Under the Council’s proposed model for Children’s Play it would no longer manage or operate play centres from the beginning of April 2015, instead supporting other organisations to run activities. Key findings on the response to these proposals were:

- 60.8% (2,328) of respondents agreed that in the future the Council should support other organisations to run children’s play activities rather than manage them itself.
- There was stronger support for funding being made available for children with a disability to access play (88.5%) and for holiday play provision (71.5%), with less support (37%) for funding being made available for Welsh language provision play services.
- Respondents agreed (72.4%) with the proposal for the Council to encourage proposals from community groups for alternative uses or building transfer where appropriate.
Supported School Transport for 16-19 Year Olds

- Over half of respondents (54.6% / 2,033) were not aware the Council subsidised school transport for 16-19 years and 53.5% felt it shouldn’t be continued if it impacts on other services (with respect to savings being found elsewhere).

- A small number of respondents (61 comments) did stress that removing this subsidy would put additional pressure on the financial position of their family.

Supported Public Transport

- Less than half (46.3% / 1,755) of those responding to the questionnaire were unaware that the Council subsidises bus services when passenger numbers are too low to make it commercially viable. Public opinion was however mixed as to whether the Council should continue to support these services.

- The 37.2% of respondents who were opposed to the Council ceasing support of these services were asked to outline their reasons and a total of 836 responses were received. More than one in five comments (22.4% / 187) were from respondents who were in favour of a reduction to the Bay car service.

Parking

Participants in the consultation were asked their opinion regarding proposed increases to the parking charges in the city centre and at Heath Park.

- Three quarters of those responding (75.2% / 2,837) were in favour of increased charges at the Heath Park site compared to 55.7% (2,118) regarding changes to long stay parking in the city centre.

- Where opposition was expressed regarding the proposals, a number of respondents were concerned that this would deter shoppers and visitors from coming into the city centre. Many also felt that public transport needed to improve and become more affordable before the proposals were introduced.
LED Lighting

- Residents strongly support (89.6% / 3,431) the proposal to deliver new LED lighting to our strategic road network.
- Reasons for opposing the proposal were provided by just 72 respondents with the most common reasons found to be either concern that the cost savings would not be substantial enough or that the proposed LED lighting would provide an inferior quality of light leading to concerns regarding safety.

Neighbourhood Partnership Support

- There is support (63.1% / 2,355) for the proposal to create a community co-ordination function within the Council to support community groups, and just 6.9% expressed any opposition to the plans.
- Of the comments opposing this proposal, over a quarter (27.9 or 41 comments) called for the complete withdrawal of the fund as opposed to the proposed ‘re-profiling’.

Waste

**Bulkly Waste**

The Changes for Cardiff document outlined the City of Cardiff Council plans to review its approach to bulky waste services. Proposals were put forward for public consultation that outlined plans to a) withdraw the free entitlement to collections and b) increase the existing charges for bulky item collections.

- Approximately half of the respondents (50.1%) were in favour of increasing the charges for collections whilst 51.7% of respondents were in favour of withdrawing the free entitlement.
- When asked if they were aware of existing alternatives to the bulky collection service seven in eight respondents (86.6% / 2,807) specified Household Waste Recycling Centres and 80.2% (2,600) charities.
**Green bags & food liners**

The consultation also outlined proposals for changing the way in which the Council provides green bags and food liners.

- **Two thirds (67.1% / 2,552) of respondents were in agreement** that the current approach of bag provision was **in need of review**.

**Neighbourhood Cleansing**

The consultation recognised that different areas of Cardiff have different characteristics and explained plans to pilot a new way of dealing with cleansing at a neighbourhood scale. The new plans involve the pooling of resources and targeting response to the needs of local communities.

- The **new proposals were supported by 70.1% of respondents** whilst one in five (19.3%) were against the changes.

**Infrastructure**

The Council will be considering the merits of delivering its Infrastructure Services in different ways in the future that would both enhance services and reduce costs. This might involve different private sector, community or public sector organisations delivering services to Cardiff citizens either with, or on behalf of the Council.

- **Two thirds (65.7% / 2,353) of respondents agreed** that the Council should consider alternative ways of delivering these services.

Participants in the consultation were provided with a brief description of five potential delivery models.

- Delivery via the model of a **modified in-house service was the most popular of the options** with the public with over a third (36.7% / 1,539) specifying this option as their **first choice**.
- Also notable was that a significant proportion of respondents who either ‘**did not know**’ or had ‘**no preference**’ regarding the adoption of a new model.
- The public were also asked to choose (by picking up to three) factors they believed to be most important in the delivery of service and should be taken into account in choosing a preferred delivery model for the services detailed.
- **Quality of Service** was by far the most important factor (90.3% / 3,105) followed by Cost (49% / 1,685) and **Frequency** (48.2% / 1,657). ‘**Who**’ provides the services was the 5th most important factor with 24.8%.
Public Conveniences

- 79.1% (2,968) respondents agreed with the proposed closure of automated PC’s and (68.2% / 2.548) for closure of the non-automated public conveniences.

- A total of 432 respondents provided details of their opposition to these proposals, with around one-fifth commenting on the essential nature of these facilities to older people, young children, pregnant women and those with specific medical conditions.

Next Steps

The results of the consultation, along with updated Equality Impact Assessments, will now be considered by the City of Cardiff Council’s Scrutiny Committees and Cabinet and be used to inform the final budget proposals for 2015/16. The final budget proposals will be agreed by the Cabinet on Thursday 19th February and at Full Council on Thursday 26th February 2015.