

COUNCIL, 23 MARCH 2017 : WRITTEN QUESTIONS

CORPORATE SERVICES AND PERFORMANCE (COUNCILLOR GRAHAM HINCHEY)

W1

WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR WALKER

Will you provide a breakdown by service area of expenditure on agency staff cover?

For each service area, please specify separately the amount spent on short term cover for reasons such as absence and sickness and the amount spent providing agency cover for other reasons.

Reply

The total amount spent on external agency staff with Comensura during the 2015/16 financial year, which represents the last full financial year, is set out below. The information is set out by directorate and the reasons for agency staff being engaged. It does not include expenditure in relation to delegated schools.

Directorate	Annual Leave / Flexi Cover	Cover for Vacant Post	Long Term Sickness Cover	Planned Peak in Demand / Seasonal	Project Work	Short Term Sickness/Absence Cover	Short-term Demand (Unplanned)	Grand Total
City Operations	320,108	94,745	67,095	848,718	85,072	93,484	132,191	1,641,413
Communities, Housing & Customer Services		1,470		1,293	35,229	5,100		43,092
Economic Development	5,058		40,390	418,196	29,473	202	4,664	497,984
Economic Development - Commercial Services	542,615	1,467,351	84,937	1,365,880	272,125	488,825	512,232	4,733,965
Education	0				0	111,303		111,303
Governance & Legal Services		34,019	6,188					40,207
Housing Revenue Account	1,005	20,438	9,540			224	58,960	90,167
Resources		22,309			79,023	644		101,976
Social Services	13,690	2,146,264	309,622	57,001	231,617	43,644	189,640	2,991,478
Grand Total	882,476	3,786,595	517,774	2,691,087	732,538	743,425	897,688	10,251,585

The agency expenditure with Comensura in 2015/16 represented 5.06% of the total direct employee expenditure incurred by the Council, excluding delegated schools. Overall, the use of agency staff has reduced significantly over the past few years with the Comensura spend in 2015/16 showing a 27% reduction compared to the spend in 2012/13.

WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR WALKER

It has been claimed during scrutiny questioning that some Council agency spend can be justified on the basis of value for money and/or operational necessity; if this is correct, what are these justifications?

Which departments are involved in such 'justified' agency spends?

Reply

Agency staff are utilised for a variety of reasons including:

- Annual Leave / Flexi Leave Cover;
- Cover for Vacant Posts;
- Long Term Sickness Absence Cover;
- Planned Peak in Demand / Seasonal;
- Project Work;
- Short Term Sickness / Absence Cover; and
- Short Term Demand (Unplanned).

This is normally to cover essential frontline services, maintain staffing levels from a health & safety perspective or to provide seasonal or ad-hoc support where employing staff in full-time roles would not be practical or achieve value for money for the Council.

The main directorates utilising agency cover for these purposes are:

City Operations

The main area is in relation to seasonal work in Parks; although, in previous years, significant agency cover was also required in Leisure Services and Play Services to cover front line services and maintain staffing ratios.

Economic Development (including Commercial Services)

This includes a significant requirement for agency staff to provide cover for frontline services, including waste collection.

Social Services

This is mainly to cover vacancies in social work posts, particularly in Children's Services where there has previously been a high turnover of staff. This is required in order to provide essential frontline services and to maintain appropriate caseloads.

The Council's Agency Managed Services contract represents value for money in terms of the rates negotiated.

W3

WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR WALKER

What proportion of the Council's total payroll cost is taken up by spending on agency staff?

Reply

As confirmed previously in response to your first question, external agency expenditure with Comensura in 2015/16 represented 5.06% of the total direct employee expenditure incurred by the Council, excluding expenditure in relation to delegated school budgets.

W4

WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR WALKER

Please provide a comparison of the number of staff employed by the Council in May 2012 and today? Full and part time numbers outlined separately.

Reply

Staff Numbers as at **3rd May 2012:**

	Schools	Non-Schools	Total
Full-time	2685	4654	7339
Part-time	3893	3292	7185
Total =	6578	7946	14524

Staff Numbers as at **13th March 2017:**

	Schools	Non-Schools	Total
Full-time	3021	3835	6856
Part-time	3949	2288	6237
Total =	6970	6123	13093

W5

WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR WALKER

Without specifying names, what was the total amount paid or pledged by the Council to departing officers at director level or above since May 2012?

Reply

The total amount paid or pledged to departing officers at director level or above since May 2012 is £698,400. This relates to 8 officers and includes £434,491 in pension strain costs, which are required to be paid by the Council to the Local Government Pension Scheme. These figures are set out in the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts over this period.

	<p>This also reflects the changes that were made as part of the revised senior management arrangements that were approved by the Cabinet in February 2015, which reduced the number of Tier 1 posts from 11 to 7 and released a budget saving to the Council of £650,000 per annum.</p>
W6	<p><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR CLARK</u></p> <p>In January 2017 replies were given to the following written question:</p> <p>“What was the total amount spent on external consultants by the Council in each of 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16? Please could the name of the consultant, the date(s) the service was provided and the amount given to each consultant in each year be provided?”</p> <p>How many days work was undertaken by each of the consultants in each year and what daily financial rate was paid to them?</p> <p><u>Reply</u></p> <p>In reply to your follow up question about the information that was provided in January 2017, I can confirm that it is neither possible nor feasible to provide a detailed analysis of the number of days worked by external consultants from the records available. This is due mainly to the extensive amount of time and resources required to deal with the volume of transactions and related difficulties in identifying and verifying the source information.</p>

ENVIRONMENT (COUNCILLOR BOB DERBYSHIRE)

W7	<p><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR CLARK</u></p> <p>What was the total tonnage of contaminated waste presented for recycling in 2011/12?</p> <p><u>Reply</u></p> <p>The amount of non-recyclable materials from green bags, which was received by Cardiff’s Material Reclamation Facility (MRF) in 2011/12, was 2,216 tonnes from a total of 27,703 tonnes received (8%).</p>
----	--

	<p>However, it should be noted that this was prior to the worldwide market crash in early 2012 and the withdrawal of certain low grade plastics from the global recycling market. It was also prior to moving to an alternate weekly collection of residual waste. Our MRF remains within industry norms (for 2016) which can vary between 12% and 20%. Separate food waste recycling has very low levels of contamination of less than 3%.</p> <p>Any contamination is discounted from recycling performance prior to the Welsh Government signing off the performance figures (i.e. contamination is not included in the year's recycling output).</p>
--	--

**LEADER – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PARTNERSHIPS
(COUNCILLOR PHIL BALE)**

W8	<p><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR BRIDGES</u></p> <p>What discussions has Cardiff Council had – both internally and externally – about the future of the former Grape & Olive pub site on the Allensbank / Wedal Road junction?</p> <p>Given that the council owns the freehold to the land, what commitment will be given to engaging in a dialogue with local residents over any plans to redevelop the site?</p> <p><u>Reply</u></p> <p>The Council leased this property to Whitbread Plc for a term of 125 years with effect from 1 July 1994. This lease is currently assigned to Brains Brewery and, therefore, the property is not under the control of the Council.</p>
----	---

SKILLS, SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT (COUNCILLOR DAN DE'ATH)

W9	<p><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR CLARK</u></p> <p>In January 2017 the following written question was asked:</p> <p>“How are landlords monitored on whether they tell their tenants about the correct waste presentation arrangements and how many of these landlords have been fined for not telling their tenants about the correct waste presentation arrangements?”</p>
----	--

Could you clarify whether any landlords have been fined or prosecuted for not telling their tenants about the correct waste presentation arrangements or for any other lack of compliance by landlords with regard to their waste responsibilities under the additional licensing scheme?

Reply

In response to your previous Written Question on this subject in January 2017, you were advised that all licence holders are required to inform their tenants of the correct waste presentation and disposal arrangements and that these arrangements are laid out in the licence conditions. Landlords must also obtain a signed declaration from tenants that they will abide by those arrangements. However, I should make clear, once again, that it is beyond the scope of the current scheme to monitor compliance with this requirement. As a result, to date, no landlords have been prosecuted for failing to comply with this specific requirement.

It is important to recognise that these arrangements do not, of course, operate in isolation and the Council's Waste Education and Enforcement Team also operates in the area to address street scene concerns. Extensive education and enforcement work is undertaken in Cathays, including knocking doors to speak to tenants and distributing messages via the Landlords Forum about correct waste presentation.

Enforcement officers also work in conjunction with the HMO licensing team and, should they find evidence of repeat breaches from residents who are tenants, then this is reported to the licensing team for them to challenge landlords' responsibilities and licence conditions.

TRANSPORT, PLANNING AND SUSTAINABILITY
(COUNCILLOR RAMESH PATEL)

W10

WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR BRIDGES

Back in [November](#), under questioning from Cllr. Joe Boyle about gritting the Taff Trail during icy weather, Cllr. Patel said: "...we are investigating his use of smaller vehicles, such as carts or quad bikes, to actually put [gritting] material down on the Taff Trail". What happened as a result of these investigations?

	<p><u>Reply</u></p> <p>A review has commenced to ascertain the potential to grit the Taff Trail in future years. An investigation into demand, benefits, constraints, benchmarking, vehicle suitability, material choices, overall methodology and resource requirement is currently underway.</p> <p>As it would not have been practicable to introduce gritting of the Taff Trail into the 2016/17 Winter Service, which had already been designed, resourced and established, it was deemed to be more suitable to undertake and complete the review in readiness for the 2017/18 season. An analysis of the current season will also be undertaken to help gain a full understanding of the requirements of this additional request when aligned to the existing service. The review is scheduled to be completed by the end of May 2017.</p> <p>In addition, I can also confirm that officers are undertaking a comprehensive review of the quality of the Taff Trail cycle infrastructure and a phased upgrade is being planned over the next three years.</p>
W11	<p><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR CLARK</u></p> <p>How much did the new built out pavement at the junction of Llantrisant Street and Maindy Road cost? I understand this was paid for through a section 106 agreement.</p> <p><u>Reply</u></p> <p>The highway works on Maindy Road, up to and including the remodelling of the large junction with Llantrisant Road, was subject to an agreement made under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 that was funded entirely by Cardiff University on the back of the ongoing Maindy Road Campus development.</p> <p>As the scheme was completed via Section 278 by a third party (not the Council), we have no records of the actual cost of the scheme.</p>
W12	<p><u>WRITTEN QUESTION FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR CLARK</u></p> <p>Over the last 2 years, much of Tewkesbury Street, Malefant Street, Tewkesbury Place, Monthermer Road, Dogfield Street and Robert Street in Cathays footway has been treated with a micro-asphalt surface. What was the total cost of this treatment for these streets?</p>

Reply

The table below provides the cost of surface treatment for each requested street in Cathays and the total cost of these schemes:

Street Name	Cost (£)
Tewkesbury Street	6,582
Malefant Street	9,340
Tewkesbury Place	2,524
Monthermer Road (2013/14)	7,907
Dogfield Street	6,083
Robert Street	3,320
Total Cost =	£35,756

Please note that Monthermer Road was completed three years ago in 2013/14, but has been included above as specifically requested.