



Budget proposals 2018/2019

Overall Summary Equality & rural impact assessment report

For further information about this report please contact Jo Richardson, Equality & Diversity Manager:

Telephone: 01603 223816

Email: jo.richardson@norfolk.gov.uk

Text relay: 18001 0344 800 8020

Fax: 0344 800 8012



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Neil Howard on 0344 800 8020 or 18001 0344 800 8020 (Text relay).

Contents

1.	Introduction
2.	The purpose of equality and rural impact assessments
3.	The legal context
4.	Overview of findings for 2018/19
5.	Policy & Resources Committee budget proposals 2018/2019
6.	Service Committee budget proposals 2018/2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adult Social Care Committee• Children's Services Committee• Communities Committee• Environment, Development and Transport Committee• Business & Property Committee• Digital Innovations Committee
7.	Accessibility considerations
8.	Human rights implications
9.	Recommended mitigating actions
10.	Evidence used to inform this assessment
11.	Further information and contact details

Introduction

1. This report summarises the findings of equality and rural impact assessments of Norfolk County Council's 62 budget proposals for 2018/19.
2. This includes all budget proposals made by Policy & Resources Committee and the Council's six service committees. It also includes the proposal to increase Council Tax.

The purpose of equality and rural impact assessments

3. The purpose of equality and rural assessments is to enable elected members to consider the potential impact of decisions on different people and communities prior to decisions being taken. Mitigating actions are developed if detrimental impact is identified.
4. It is not always possible to adopt the course of action that will best promote the needs of people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. However, assessments enable informed decisions to be made, that take into account every opportunity to minimise disadvantage.

The legal context

5. Public authorities have a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to consider the implications of proposals on people with protected characteristics. The Act states that public bodies must pay due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act¹;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic² and people who do not share it³;
 - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it⁴.
6. The full Act is available [here](#).

The assessment process

7. The assessment process comprises three phases:
 - **Phase 1** – evidence is gathered on each proposal, to examine who might be affected and how. This includes reviewing the findings of related assessments and public consultation, contextual information about local populations and other relevant data. Where appropriate, public consultation takes place.
 - **Phase 2** – the results are analysed. The assessments are drafted, making sure that any potential impacts are fully assessed. If the evidence indicates that a proposal may have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural communities, mitigating actions are considered.

- **Phase 3** – Policy & Resources Committee considers the findings of the assessments and mitigating actions at its meeting on 29 January 2018. The Committee takes any impacts into account before making a decision about which proposals to recommend to Full Council on 12 February 2018, which is when a final decision on the budget proposals will be made.

Overview of findings for 2018/19

8. The core aim of the Council's budget proposals for 2018/19 is to work better and more efficiently, to maximise technological solutions and invest the authority's total budget of £1.4b in services to meet the needs of residents, particularly the most vulnerable. This will impact positively on all protected groups, particularly disabled and older people, as well as children and families in need.
9. This year, as in previous years, every effort has been made to find savings from efficiencies and new ways of working, to avoid impacting on residents, businesses and visitors in Norfolk.
10. Many of the proposals will have a positive impact. There are some that will enhance services, by exploiting emerging technology to keep people independent for longer; making services simpler to access and providing better information about the choices people have.
11. Only six of the Council's 62 budget proposals may have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas - this includes disabled and older people; Black, Asian and minority ethnic people; children and families and women:
 - (i) Review charging policy to align to actual disability related expenses (Adults)
 - (ii) Remodel children's centre services (Children's)
 - (iii) Reduction in Healthwatch funding (Communities)
 - (iv) Norfolk Community Learning Services – remodelling the staff structure, including staffing reduction (Communities)
 - (v) Review the operation of bus services supported by the County Council (Environment, Development & Transport)
 - (vi) Reduce the number of roads gritted in winter (Environment, Development and Transport).
12. It is critical to note that there is no risk to the Council that agreeing the proposal to remodel children's centre services may lead to detrimental impacts on children, families, parents or women going undetected. This is because if any options emerge as a result of this proposal to change children's centre services, public consultation and equality and rural assessments will be undertaken. Any detrimental impact will be reported to Children's Services Committee for consideration before a final decision is made.
13. When considering the impact of its budget proposals, the Council is required to take into account other factors which may be impacting on residents – for example, Norfolk's rural geography; the rising cost of living; changes to welfare reform and social issues, such as the priority of disabled and older residents to remain independent for as long as possible.

14. The impact on rural areas – detailed in each assessment - is important to note as around a third of Norfolk residents live in small, isolated communities. Getting around Norfolk, and accessing services, can be more difficult in rural areas, and can limit opportunities and outcomes, particularly for vulnerable people.
15. The impact of changes to welfare reform on residents is covered in more detail later in this document, relating to the proposal to increase Council Tax.
16. It is important to note that this report only considers the impact of the Council's budget proposals for this year. For obvious reasons, it does not detail the various positive impacts of the Council's day-to-day services on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas - such as promoting independence for disabled and older people; supporting children and families to achieve the best possible outcomes; keeping vulnerable adults and children safe, and lobbying nationally on the big issues for residents and businesses – such as transport and better broadband for Norfolk.
17. In view of this, the task for Policy & Resources Committee is to consider the various impacts set out in this report, and balance them alongside the many other factors to be taken into account, covered elsewhere on the agenda, to achieve a balanced budget that focuses the Council's resources of £1.4billion where it is most needed.

Policy & Resources Committee budget proposals 2018-2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

Lead officer – Jo Richardson, Equality & Diversity Manager, in consultation with Titus Adam, Financial Projects and Planning Manager

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For more information please contact Equality & Diversity team, email: equality@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 223816.

Contents

1.	Policy & Resources budget proposals 2018 – 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase in Council Tax of 3% for Adult Social Care precept, and inflationary increase of 2.99% in 2018-19• Reduce the budget for the Equality and Diversity Team which is spent on supporting community events• Nplaw services - external income• Coroners mortuary facilities• Coroners relocation to County Hall• Finance Exchequer Services savings• Internal Audit - income generation• Procurement - capitalisation• Finance service - vacancy review• Finance service - income generation• Use of general capital receipts in 18-19 to fund MRP• Use of airport deferred capital receipts in 18-19 to fund MRP• Second homes council tax• Second Homes Norfolk Infrastructure Fund• Increased Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation dividend• Increased NORSE dividend• Realignment of budgets to reflect new departmental structures and revised plans for savings delivery, including use of one-off reserves in 2018-2019
2.	Mitigating actions
3.	Accessibility considerations
4.	Human rights implications
5.	Evidence used to inform this assessment
6.	Further information and contact details

Policy & Resources budget proposals 2018-2019

1. Policy and Resources Committee has made 17 budget proposals for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Increase in Council Tax of 3% for Adult Social Care precept, and inflationary increase of 2.99% in 2018-19	<p>The Council is proposing to increase council tax by 5.99% in 2018/19.</p> <p>Of this proposed increase, 2.99% is for inflation. When we developed this proposal the maximum amount we could increase council tax by was 1.99% without triggering a local referendum. Subsequently, on 19 December 2017, the Government announced the provisional local government finance settlement, which gave us the discretion to increase by an additional 1% (a total of 3% before a referendum is required).</p> <p>The other 3% is money ring-fenced for adult social care. In 2016 the Government gave us the opportunity to raise council tax to help pay for adult social care services – this is called the adult social care precept. Adult social care services are those that support older people, disabled people and people with mental health problems. These services help people to stay safe in their own homes and continue to be independent. Where this is not possible adult social care can support people in residential care.</p> <p>The Government has allowed us to increase the social care precept by 6% over a three year period. Last year we increased it by 3% and this year we are proposing to do the same to help protect vulnerable people. As the money generated from this increase is ring-fenced we can only spend it on adult social care services.</p> <p>We have based our budget proposals for 2018/19 on the assumption that council tax will increase overall by 5.99%. If we do not increase council tax, then we would have to find a further £21.664m in savings.</p> <p>A 5.99% council tax increase would mean a typical Band D home would see an annual increase of £74.79, which is about £1.43 per week.</p>
2.	Reduce the budget for the Equality and Diversity Team which is spent on supporting community events.	<p>There is a small (£30k) budget held by the Equality and Diversity Team in Community and Environmental Services. This has previously been used to support some community events or equality-related projects.</p> <p>It is proposed to reduce this budget from £30k to £5k, which would result in a saving of £25k. There will be no impact on staffing levels.</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
3.	Nplaw services - external income	This proposal relates to increasing our income by expanding the range and variety of services for which we charge.
4.	Coroners mortuary facilities	Update our mortuary facilities and improve efficiency so that we can save more money in the future by streamlining our processes.
5.	Coroners relocation to County Hall	Reduce the cost of our buildings by relocating some Coroners Courts and offices to County Hall to make full use of our current facilities.
6.	Finance Exchequer Services savings	Further savings in how Finance Exchequer Services operates, including implementing new and more efficient ways of working.
7.	Internal Audit - income generation	Generate more income from our internal audit service.
8.	Procurement - capitalisation	Identify opportunities to transfer some procurement costs from revenue to our capital budget where appropriate.
9.	Finance service - vacancy review	Review current staff vacancy levels.
10.	Finance service - income generation	Generate further income from finance and commercial services.
11.	Use of general capital receipts in 18-19 to fund MRP	Use capital receipts to fund our Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) rather than setting aside funds from our revenue budget.
12.	Use of airport deferred capital receipts in 18-19 to fund MRP	Use one-off funds from our airport deferred payment to fund MRP.
13.	Second homes council tax	Cease the payment of a share of the County Council's second homes council tax to district councils.
14.	Second Homes Norfolk Infrastructure Fund	Ceasing the Council's contribution of second homes council tax income to the Norfolk Infrastructure fund, which has been wound up.
15.	Increased Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation dividend	Additional income from the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation
16.	Increased NORSE dividend	Additional income from NORSE
17.	Realignment of budgets to reflect new departmental structures and revised plans for savings delivery, including use of one-off reserves in 2018-2019	Realignment of budgets to reflect new departmental structures and revised plans for savings delivery including use of one-off reserves in 2018-2019

Potential impact

2. The proposal to increase Council Tax is the only proposal which will impact directly on residents. An assessment of this proposal is dealt with below
3. The other 16 proposals are unlikely to have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. The reasons for this are provided below:

	Title of proposal	Impact
1.	Increase in Council Tax of 3% for Adult Social Care precept, and inflationary increase of 2.99% in 2018-19	<p>This proposal will affect all residents eligible to pay Council Tax, including people with protected characteristics and in rural areas.</p> <p>At October 2017 there were 408,776 Council Tax 'chargeable dwellings' in Norfolk. Any County Council increase in Council Tax would be applied equally and proportionally to each household, meaning that higher-banded properties would pay a higher cash amount.</p> <p>Concessions for people eligible for support, reductions or exemption</p> <p>Whilst the impact of a Council Tax increase would affect almost all dwellings, concessions are in place that mean that people who are older, live on their own or who have a disability may be eligible for Council Tax support, reductions or exemption.</p> <p>The table at Annex 1 presents the proportion of people subject to some kind of reduction in each district. Demographic factors, and variations in council tax reduction schemes, will mean that the proportion of people exempt or receiving a reduction in each of Norfolk's districts differs.</p> <p>In addition to these exemptions, district councils are responsible for local arrangements to provide help with Council Tax. These responsibilities cover what was known prior to 2013 as Council Tax Benefit, and mean that reductions are in place to support vulnerable working age and older people.</p> <p>A range of factors may enable a household to qualify for discounts or exemptions. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Someone's disability status, entitlement to certain benefits and presence of accessible features in their home; • If someone is a carer who, for at least 35 hours a week, is looking after someone in the same household (not including a spouse or child) who is entitled to certain benefits;

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Households which consist only of students; and • Properties which are unoccupied for various reasons including residence in care provision. <p>These reliefs can help to alleviate Council Tax liabilities for certain households.</p> <p>Whilst the local arrangements are at the discretion of each district, and so cannot be collated simply, the number of equivalent dwellings receiving this kind of support for working age people in Norfolk last year was 23,737, and for older people was 23,063.</p> <p>District councils also have powers to reduce the amount of Council Tax payable for certain classes of dwelling including second homes, empty properties and properties undergoing major structural work, with legislation prescribing the level of discount the district council can offer. An increase in Council Tax may therefore have a reduced impact on properties within these categories, depending on the scheme adopted locally. These discounts are time limited except in the case of second homes.</p> <p>A Council Tax premium may be charged on certain empty properties, if they have been vacant for a period of more than two years. An increase in Council Tax may therefore have a greater impact on these properties.</p> <p>Other issues to take into account</p> <p>In considering an increase in Council Tax, it is pertinent to take other social factors into account, such as the impact of welfare reform. Although there is no major role for local authorities in much of the policy development and delivery of welfare reform, it continues to have a significant impact on Norfolk service users, residents and communities. Some examples include the introduction of Universal Credit and the move from Disability Living Allowance (DLA) to Personal Independence Payment. Disabled people and their carers are particularly likely to be affected, and many have reported increased financial hardship.</p> <p>The impact varies according to the circumstances of each individual, but there are obvious implications for those who are already in receipt of benefits such as DLA or Employment and Support Allowance (the benefit which has replaced incapacity benefit) and have lost their entitlement; and those who may need to move house.</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<p>Another issue to take into account is the potential impact on people in rural areas. Rural housing may be more expensive than urban properties, and may therefore tend to be in higher tax bands. However, people in rural areas would argue that being asset rich does not mean income rich, and in cash terms, rural areas may shoulder a larger percentage of the total Council Tax return.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>It is likely that the financial impact of an increase in Council Tax would be reduced for some vulnerable people and those on low incomes by existing Council Tax exemption mechanisms. It is important to note, however, that these provisions vary from district to district depending on the Council Tax support scheme provided, and will depend on people's individual circumstances.</p> <p>Overall, the impact is likely to be greatest for households on a low, fixed income, but which are not eligible for Council Tax support. This may include disabled people who are in work, and this is important to note, given that disabled people are more likely to be earning less than their non-disabled counterparts, even when they share the same qualifications and other relevant characteristics⁵. The main reason cited for this is unconscious bias or unfair discrimination in recruitment and selection processes.</p> <p>On balance, probably the greatest factor to take into account is that an increase in Council Tax will primarily benefit Norfolk's most vulnerable disabled and older people and their carers. This is because it will enable the Council to continue to protect essential adult social care services for disabled and older people in the county.</p>
2.	Reduce the budget for the Equality and Diversity Team which is spent on supporting community events.	<p>Currently, there is no evidence to indicate that reducing this budget will limit the Council's capacity to address equality issues or deliver agreed actions set out in the Council's Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Objectives.</p> <p>This is because the equality team is seeking to mitigate this proposed reduction by trading its services, to bring in additional income. A target was set to begin trading by 1 April 2018, but this has already been achieved. There will be no impact on staffing levels.</p> <p>In addition, the Council will retain a £5k budget for any key/unexpected activities and will support organisations to bid for alternative sources of funding.</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<p>To explore the potential impact of this proposal objectively, discussions took place with the chair of Norfolk's Black History Month Steering Group, and the Executive Coordinator of The Bridge Plus+, a Norwich-based Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic-led organisation, which in the past have benefited from the funding. The chair of Black History Month has agreed to work with the equality team to monitor the impact of this proposal, if it goes ahead. Any impacts will be reported to Policy & Resources Committee.</p> <p>The formal responses are attached at Annex 2.</p>
3.	Nplaw services - external income	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.</p>
4.	Coroners mortuary facilities	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.</p> <p>Any updates to coroner facilities will take full account of accessibility for disabled staff and service users.</p>
5.	Coroners relocation to County Hall	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery. • Employees' terms and conditions will be unaffected, and where employees have reasonable adjustments in place these will be unaffected. • Any new locations will be accessible for disabled staff. • Where any barriers to access emerge that it was not possible to identify at this stage, managers will discuss with the staff member options to address this through a reasonable adjustment.
6.	Finance Exchequer Services savings	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.</p>
7.	Internal Audit - income generation	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
8.	Procurement - capitalisation	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
9.	Finance service - vacancy review	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. Posts will be reviewed as they become vacant and the deletion of these posts will not lead to changes to service standards, quality or delivery.
10.	Finance service - income generation	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
11.	Use of general capital receipts in 18-19 to fund MRP	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
12.	Use of airport deferred capital receipts in 18-19 to fund MRP	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
13.	Second homes council tax	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because in October 2017 the Council wrote to District Chief Financial Officers to consult with them on this proposal. No concerns have been raised by district councils.
14.	Second Homes Norfolk Infrastructure Fund	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
15.	Increased Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation dividend	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
16.	Increased NORSE dividend	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery.
17.	Realignment of budgets to reflect new departmental structures and revised plans for savings delivery,	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to service standards, quality or delivery. There will be no impact on staffing levels.

	Title of proposal	Impact
	including use of one-off reserves in 2018-2019	

Mitigating actions

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Note the potential impact of the proposal to increase council tax, set out above.	Policy & Resources Committee	29 January 2018
2.	If the proposal to reduce the budget for the Equality and Diversity Team goes ahead, the team to work with the Chair of Norfolk's Black History Month Steering Group to monitor the impact and report back to Policy & Resources Committee if any detrimental impact is identified.	Equality & Diversity Manager	By 31 January 2019

Adult Social Care budget proposals 2018-2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

Lead officer – Jo Richardson, Equality & Diversity Manager, in consultation with Carol Rake, Client Services Exchequer Manager; Susanne Baldwin, Finance Business Partner; Adult Social Services; and Debbie Bartlett, Assistant Director - Strategy & Transformation

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. You can update this assessment at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For more information please contact Equality & Diversity team, email: equality@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

Contents

1.	Adults budget proposals 2018 – 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Capitalisation of equipment spend• Accommodation based reablement• Reduction in funding for invest to save• Prevent carer breakdown by better targeted respite• Review charging policy to align to actual disability related expenses• Strengthened contract management function• Procurement of current capacity through NorseCare at market value• Investment and development of Assistive Technology approaches• Maximising potential through digital solutions
2.	Mitigating actions
3.	Accessibility considerations
4.	Human rights implications
5.	Evidence used to inform this assessment
6.	Further information and contact details

Adult Social Care Services budget proposals 2018-2019

1. Adult Social Care Committee has put forward nine budget proposals for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Capitalisation of equipment spend	<p>Currently all assets to deliver equipment and assistive technology are purchased on an annual basis from revenue. These assets have a lifespan of a number of years and therefore it is proposed that these are accounted for and financed as capital, with a five year lifespan, which would deliver a short-term saving.</p>
2.	Accommodation based reablement	<p>Reablement is central to promoting independence. The Council already has a good track record in supporting people in their own homes, but has identified the need for a further type of reablement. This is for people who are able to leave hospital, but not quite ready to go home.</p> <p>The new service helps regain and learn practical skills so that people can build up confidence and carry out basic day to day tasks when they return home. Without this sort of service, there is a risk that people with the potential to regain independence move into residential care and lose the opportunity to stay in their own homes.</p> <p>This is an 'invest to save' proposal. Through a mix of internal and commissioned provision, the service will create additional bed capacity for a new reablement service. The savings will be delivered through reducing or delaying the demand for long term formal care by offering an alternative discharge from hospital pathway.</p> <p>The introduction of the new service is being funded through the additional monies from the Government for adults as part of the improved Better Care Fund. This saving is based on increasing the likelihood of more people being able to remain in their home long term and decrease the number of people who have no choice but to be cared for within a residential setting, which can lead to long term placement.</p>
3.	Reduction in funding for invest to save	<p>Following the introduction of the Care Act, funding was made available to support implementation. Adults chose to plan for some of this on a recurrent basis in order to support ongoing development and enable investment where needed. This was in addition to the budget identified to support the Promoting Independence programme. A review shows that this budget can be reduced without jeopardising the service's plans.</p> <p>This would require a reduction to the budget. The assessment of investment needs indicates that this will not have a negative impact on the service's planned programme of work.</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
4.	Prevent carer breakdown by better targeted respite	<p>The Council has already changed its approach to supporting carers, and a new service has been commissioned which began on 1st October 2017. Alongside this, the Council plans to strengthen its approach to respite, targeting it in a timely and effective way to prevent carer breakdown.</p> <p>Current practice is variable with some significant differences between client groups on provision of respite. The Council is proposing to implement an approach across all adult client groups which is fair and transparent and ensures equitable and consistent provision of respite for carers.</p> <p>Respite care can help to sustain caring relationships, promote good health and wellbeing, prevent a crisis situation, and reduce the likelihood of neglect and family breakdown. This proposal will help improve and sustain the wellbeing of carers and those they care for, and reduce or delay the need for formal care, including long term residential care.</p>
5.	Review charging policy to align to actual disability related expenses	<p>Norfolk County Council carries out a financial assessment to work out how much, if anything, people have to pay towards the cost of their care. In 2017-18 the Council agreed to change the charging policy to better reflect what people actually spend on disability related expenses.</p> <p>Disability related expenses are the additional expenses people face because of their disability. The Council changed the standard amount it takes into account for disability related expenditure from £15.00 a week to £7.50 a week last year. It is now proposing to consult on a further change to stop using a standard amount and instead take people's actual disability related expenses into account.</p>
6.	Strengthened contract management function	<p>Adult Social Services currently commissions some £260m of care, outside of contracts with NorseCare and Independence Matters. The commissioning and procurement teams support the development of the market, retendering and providing commissioning support for the Promoting Independence programme of work. The services have less capacity for daily contract management, which can mean that teams and providers are not supported to maximise value for money and outcomes. The proposal is an invest to save to spend more on managing contracts in order to get the most out of them and therefore save more in the long run.</p> <p>The proposal is for additional posts to support the commissioning and procurement teams to improve value for money.</p> <p>The expectation is that the new posts would target key contracts to maximise utilisation and avoid duplication,</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
		resulting in a focus on areas where contracts need to be renegotiated or alerting teams to areas where performance could be improved. Savings arising from the posts would be tracked to monitor the benefits and viability of this level of investment.
7.	Procurement of current capacity through NorseCare at market value	The Council has a contract with NorseCare for the provision of residential, dementia and housing with care services. The contract was put in place in 2011 when the company was set up and contained legacy costs due to TUPE (transfer of undertakings protection of employment) of staff and the transfer of older properties, which required investment that would otherwise have been costs to the Council. These legacy costs mean that it has not been possible to buy services from NorseCare at the same price as some of the market. However, the Council is committed to working with NorseCare to enable a model that will mean that the Council can buy services at market value, whilst recognising the legacy costs placed on the company and the work that is ongoing to reduce these. Work is continuing to set out detailed proposals, which will mean revision to the profile and value of savings estimated at this stage.
8.	Investment and development of Assistive Technology approaches	Whilst the Council already provides equipment and assistive technologies, there remains opportunities to bring about a step change in the use of assistive technology, and make it quicker and easier for people to make the most of new developments. The savings are based on early studies completed by the Local Government Association and indicative benefits from a study by the London School of Economics. Further work is needed as part of the Norfolk Futures programme to explore the opportunities available to Norfolk and the extent that people could be supported further through making better use of technology.
9.	Maximising potential through digital solutions	In November, the Council will be implementing a new social care and finance system. This provides further opportunities for developing more efficient ways to work with the provider market to share care requirements, purchase care and undertake contact management, as well as being able to provide better information to the wider population about available care across Norfolk. The potential is being explored across a number of Norfolk Futures workstreams including Smarter information and advice, Promoting Independence and Digital Norfolk.

Who is affected?

2. These proposals will affect disabled and older people and their carers, including disabled and older people with other protected characteristics and in rural areas. Staff will also be affected:

People of all ages (particularly older people)	YES
---	------------

Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with, for example, reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people on the Autism spectrum; people with learning difficulties and people with dementia)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies, Roma and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/people who identify as intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Potential impact

- Adults budget proposals for 2018/19 will impact primarily on disabled and older people and their carers – which is inevitable, because disabled and older people constitute the majority of adult social care users.
- The proposal to ‘review charging policy to align to actual disability related expenses’ may have a significant detrimental impact on some disabled and older people and people in rural areas. The reasons for this are set out later in this document.
- The other eight proposals are unlikely to have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. The reasons for this are provided below:

	Title of proposal	Impact
1.	Capitalisation of equipment spend	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to assessment processes, eligibility of needs, service standards, quality or delivery.
2.	Accommodation based reablement	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes are proposed to assessment processes, eligibility of needs, service quality or standards. Service users will continue to receive support relative to their needs. The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. The principles of promoting Independence strategy will guide the design and delivery of this proposal. Promoting independence strategy prioritises the independence, dignity and safety of disabled and

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<p>older people, and draws directly on the voices of disabled and older service users to guide service design. Disabled and older people consistently report that these are critical factors in supporting well-being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in rural and urban areas will receive the same standards and quality of services. • Opportunities for building greater levels of accessibility for disabled and older people into the design of services will be considered as part of the commissioning process.
3.	Reduction in funding for invest to save	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because no changes are proposed to assessment processes, eligibility of needs, service standards, quality or delivery.</p>
4.	Prevent carer breakdown by better targeted respite	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal seeks to address current significant differences between client groups in receipt of respite services. It is intended to implement a new approach which is fair and transparent for all adults to ensure equitable and consistent provision of respite for carers, including carers in rural areas. • The proposal may lead to some changes in how carer respite services are delivered, or who delivers them, but these are not anticipated to have any significant impact on service users. This means that service users, including service users from rural areas, will not experience any changes in the quality or standards of the services they currently receive or be disadvantaged. They will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to the assessment process or eligibility of needs. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The principles guiding design and delivery of the proposal will be Promoting Independence strategy, which prioritises the independence, dignity and safety of disabled and older people, and draws directly on the voices of disabled and older service users and their carers to guide service design. • Opportunities for building greater levels of accessibility for disabled and older people into the design of services will be considered as part of the commissioning process.

	Title of proposal	Impact
5.	Strengthened contract management function	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to service standards or quality, assessment processes or to eligibility of needs.
6.	Procurement of current capacity through NorseCare at market value	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because service users will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to service standards and quality, assessment processes or to eligibility of needs.</p>
7.	Investment and development of Assistive Technology approaches	<p>This proposal should impact positively on disabled and older people, because it will look to continue to maximise the potential of technology to keep people independent for as long as possible.</p> <p>Norfolk Futures will see the Council make much greater use of technology to serve people in their homes, at a time and place that suits them. Increasingly, digital inclusion will be a critical factor in the ability of disabled residents to live independently, access services and combat social isolation. Badly designed and implemented web technology can make it difficult or impossible for disabled people using assistive technologies like text-to-speech screen readers or magnification software to access web information and self-service.</p> <p>In March 2018, the Council's Digital Innovation and Efficiency Committee will receive a paper on digital inclusion in Norfolk, which will set out principles for ensuring that accessibility for disabled people and other vulnerable groups is 'built in' to digital inclusion strategy, rather than regarded as an extra layer of usability for a minority of users.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that the proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because service users will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to service standards and quality, assessment processes or to eligibility of needs.</p>
8.	Maximising potential through digital solutions	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that the proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because service users will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
		service standards and quality, assessment processes or to eligibility of needs. See also 7 above.

Title of proposal:	Review charging policy to align to actual disability related expenses
---------------------------	--

Analysis of proposal

Overview

1. This proposal is to stop allowing a standard amount of £7.50 for disability related expenditure for people in their own home, and instead take people's actual disability related expenses into account.
2. This follows a similar proposal last year, where Adult Social Care Committee agreed to change the amount the Council automatically allows for disability related expenditure for people in their own home from £15 a week to £7.50 a week.
3. If the proposal goes ahead, the amount that people may need to pay towards their care will change from April 2018.
4. The proposal could save £400,000 in 2018/19.

Background

5. Being disabled is expensive. Many disabled people have to pay for help with things that others take for granted. This is called 'disability related expenditure'. Disability related expenditure must be directly related to a person's disability or illness, and be greater than the average cost a person without a disability or illness spends on the same item.
6. The Council takes the amount people spend on their disability into account when it assesses them to identify how much they can afford to contribute towards their non-residential adult social care. Disability related expenditure reduces the amount that people are asked to pay towards their non-residential care. Some people do not have to pay anything towards their non-residential care, because their assessment shows that they cannot afford to do so.
7. At the moment, the Council automatically allows all service users receiving non-residential care £7.50 per week for disability related expenditure. This means that the Council automatically reduces the amount that people have to pay towards their care by £7.50 per week. This reduction is referred to as an 'allowance' or 'disregard'.
8. If people spend more than £7.50 per week, then they have to provide evidence of this (such as receipts) so that the Council can ensure that this is reflected in what they pay towards their care.
9. For many years prior to April 2017 the Council allowed a standard amount of £15.00 a week for disability related expenditure for people in their own home. However, during 2016, research was conducted that indicated that the average amount that people tended to spend on disability related costs was around £5.50 a week. In addition, more sophisticated software meant that it was easier for the Council to account for disability related expenditure. Because of this, the Council decided in February 2017 to change the amount it automatically allows for disability related expenditure from £15 a week to £7.50 a week. This sought to avoid a situation

whereby some service users were receiving an ‘allowance’ towards their care that they did not need.

What would happen if the proposal goes ahead?

10. If the proposal goes ahead, there would be no change to the policy that service users can off-set their disability related expenditure against the cost of their adult social care. The main change is that if a service user has any disability expenditure, they will need to provide evidence of this, whereas from 1 April 2017, they did not need to show evidence until their disability related expenditure reached £7.50 per week.
11. If people currently don’t have any disability related expenditure, then the proposal means they might have to start paying more towards the cost of their care – up to £9.99 per week. If people receive a direct payment to purchase their own non-residential care they may need to contribute up to an additional £7.50 to their personal direct payments account.
12. If the proposal goes ahead, the Council would have to work out how much to ask people to pay towards their care costs. To do this the Council would write to everyone affected and ask them to fill in a form to state how much they spend on disability related expenditure. Service users would be asked to provide evidence of how much they spend – this could include receipts, bills, invoices or bank statements.
13. To apply for disability related expenditure, people can telephone and ask for an application form. The Council can also complete this over the phone on their behalf. However, they will need to send in the evidence (by post or email) prior to an amount to be agreed.
14. If people’s financial circumstances change at any time, they can contact the Council and ask for a review of the amount they have to pay towards their care.
15. In future, whenever someone asks for financial help, the Council will ask them about their exact disability related expenditure in their financial assessment to get it right from the start – people can then ask for a review if their disability related expenditure increases.

Who is affected?

16. The proposal will primarily affect disabled and older service users who live in their own home. This includes people with the following protected characteristics:

Adults of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people with learning difficulties; people with dementia; people on the Autism spectrum.	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES

Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies, Roma and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/people who identify as intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

17. Service users in rural areas will be affected.
18. The proposal does not affect people who live in residential or nursing care. People with savings over £23,250 will still need to pay the full cost of their care.

Analysis of the people affected

19. This proposal affects people who receive non-residential adult social care services that are fully funded or part funded by Norfolk County Council. It also affects people who receive direct payments in order to buy services.
20. Non-residential services help meet people's social care needs in the community. These include things like help at home, getting meals, activities such as accessing local groups, help with education, and going to a day centre.

How many people would be affected if this proposal went ahead?

21. The Council currently provides non-residential adult social care services to approximately 8,200 people.
22. Currently, around 3,740 people contribute something towards the cost of their non-residential care. Around 3,760 service users don't have to make any financial contribution to their care. Around 700 people pay the full cost.
23. If the proposal goes ahead, many of the 3,760 people who currently don't have to make any financial contribution to their care may continue in this way, if their income is below the minimum amount for living expenses that the Council has to take into account, which is £189.00 a week.
24. Overall, it is estimated that around 3,872 people would be affected by the proposal and around 130 might have to start paying something towards their social care for the first time.

Potential impact

25. In considering the potential impact of this proposal, it is important to note that there will be no change to the policy that service users can off-set their disability related expenditure against the cost of their adult social care. The main change is that if service users spend anything at all on disability related expenditure, they will need to show evidence of this, whereas previously, they did not need to show evidence until their disability expenditure reached £7.50 per week.
26. On this basis, it is difficult to make a case for detrimental impact, because the Council will continue to reduce the amount that people are asked to pay towards their care

based on their disability related expenditure. In view of this, the proposal should not have a significant detrimental impact on people who are using the allowance for disability related expenditure. They will continue to be able to claim expenses to cover their costs.

27. However, it is critical to take into account that this group of users may face barriers relating to the need to evidence spending and fill in forms. This may be particularly the case for people with learning difficulties, who, without the right support, may be unable to complete paperwork. This could put them at a high risk of not claiming benefits to which they are entitled, or getting in a muddle and making incorrect claims which they then have to pay back. These barriers also apply to people who struggle with fatigue, mobility issues, confusion or other disabilities who may need additional help to fill in forms and evidence spending correctly. It will be important to continuously review the barriers to claiming for these people. A range of approaches are already available to provide appropriate support.
28. There will be a detrimental impact for people who have received the disability related allowance and used it for general living expenses, rather than for expenses incurred because of their disability. Their base allowance will change which will mean they could have to contribute more to the cost of their care – anything up to £9.99 a week out of their current income – equivalent to £39.96 every four weeks, or £519.48 a year.
29. Not all service users will have to pay this – it will depend on whether or not they are using their allowance for its intended purpose. However, given that most service users are likely to be living on a low income, this may cause financial hardship for those people who suddenly find themselves having to contribute more towards their care than they have done previously.
30. The impact of this would need to be balanced against the fact that:
 - Service users will only be asked to pay based on what the Government says they can afford.
 - The purpose of the allowance is to help people who are disabled with extra costs associated with their disability. The proposed change will mean that resources are better targeted to people who have disability related expenditure.
 - Demand for services is increasing, and the current model is not financially sustainable. There is an imperative to design a new model, in order to continue to be able to provide essential services to the most vulnerable service users.
31. If the proposal goes ahead, it will mean that service users who are using their £7.50 allowance to supplement living expenses and not for disability expenditure will have to adjust their spending, which could lead to the following impacts:
 - A reduction in standard of living, quality of life, physical wellbeing and independence because people have less money available to pay for day-to-day expenses because they have to pay more towards their care.
 - An increase in anxiety and stress (with a concomitant impact on people's emotional and mental health) due to having to live on a lower income, and deal with new expenses and tighter budgeting, alongside the need to evidence spending, fill in forms and undergo review to determine need. Many service users may be unprepared for the change in their costs, both practically and emotionally.

- Reducing people's access to services – because they have less money to spend on transport or the services themselves.
- Making people more socially isolated – because they have less money to spend on social or leisure activities.
- Increasing pressure on carers who may have to provide additional help at home.

32. These impacts may be exacerbated for disabled and older people living in rural areas, where there may be a higher cost of living, and less access to services and carer support.

Action to address any negative impact

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Continue to review whether different groups of service users (for example people with learning difficulties) face barriers to claiming and evidencing spending (noting that a range of approaches are already available to provide appropriate support). If so, develop actions for addressing any barriers.	Executive Director of Adult Social Care	From 1 April 2018
2.	If the proposal goes ahead, contact all service users affected, to offer guidance and advice on any steps they need to take – taking into account the needs of different groups of service users, such as people with learning difficulties. This will include how to complete the forms and the evidence that is required. It will also include how to ask for help to complete the forms and who to talk to if they are worried about how they will manage the impact.	Executive Director of Adult Social Care	From 1 April 2018
3.	Work with relevant stakeholders to ensure that the guidance provided is simple, clear and accessible, particularly for people with learning difficulties and people with mental health issues, and that it addresses the fact that some service users may be fearful of seeking information and advice as they may worry that current entitlements may lessen or be withdrawn.	Executive Director of Adult Social Care	From 1 April 2018
4.	If a service user expresses concern about financial austerity, offer appropriate budget planning or other relevant support to make sure people are spending as effectively as possible, and ensure transition plans are established.	Executive Director of Adult Social Care	From 1 April 2018

Children's Services budget proposals 2018 - 2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

Lead officer: Equality & Diversity Manager (Jo Richardson), in consultation with Acting Assistant Director Early Help and Prevention (Sarah Jones), and Senior Accountant - Children's Services (Bruce Connors)

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Equality & Diversity team, email: equality@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 223816.

Contents

1. **Children's Services budget proposals for 2018-2019:**
 - Reduction in legal expenses
 - Increased income received for Early Years training
 - Reduce reliance on agency social workers through improved permanent recruitment and retention
 - Reduced Looked After Children's costs through implementation of the Demand Management and Prevention Strategy transformation programme
 - Remodel the children's centre service offer
2. Mitigating actions
3. Accessibility considerations
4. Human rights implications
5. Evidence used to inform this assessment
6. Further information and contact details

Children's Services 2018-2019 budget proposals

1. Children's Services Committee has put forward five budget proposals for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Reduction in legal expenses	<p>Improvements are being made to the robustness of social work decision making, and it is expected that this will lead to social workers only engaging legal services at the most appropriate time.</p> <p>Guidance to social workers will be updated to provide clarity as to when legal advice about cases should be sought to ensure that we are getting legal advice only when we need to. Additionally, through work with legal services, Children's Services will ensure that when legal advice is needed, it is provided by a legal professional at the right level so that the Council is not paying more than needed to for legal advice.</p> <p>The cost of legal advice for the department should reduce whilst ensuring that appropriate advice is sought at the right time and provided by a legal professional at the right level.</p>
2.	Increased income received for Early years training	<p>Early years training provision has previously been reviewed with changes made to the charges for training courses that the Council sells to nurseries, pre-schools and other early years providers. The Council has the power to offer training for all early years providers and is able to impose reasonable charges when securing such services. The Council is required to secure appropriate training provision for specific groups (such as those judged less than 'good' by OFSTED) and to ensure that providers are able to access training around the Early Years Foundation Stage, SEND/Vulnerable groups and Safeguarding. The Council should enable providers to choose where and how they take up training or quality improvement.</p> <p>A review would be undertaken of the training courses that we currently sell to nurseries, pre-schools and other early year's providers, alongside a review of the charges.</p> <p>Children's Services early years training offer will be a more traded and commercialised programme. This will mean that those early years settings that choose to access the training offer will be charged more for the provision than they are currently charged, thus increasing the income received and reducing the net cost of the service to the Council.</p>
3.	Reduce the reliance on agency	<p>Children's Services currently relies significantly upon agency social workers and managers whilst work is</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
	social workers through improved permanent recruitment and retention	<p>undertaken to improve recruitment and retention of permanent staff. Additional funding has previously been allocated to offset the additional costs of agency workers.</p> <p>Actions to improve rates of recruitment and retention are already being taken, and these actions have been effective. This activity includes recruiting, inducting and supporting newly qualified social workers through the Norfolk Institute of Professional Excellence; in effect “growing our own”. These roles are supernumerary and the programme provides newly qualified social workers with additional support whilst they build up workloads and gain hands-on experience. This programme is key to the department being able to recruit and retain staff, and needs to be funded on a recurrent basis.</p> <p>As the permanent workforce increases there will be less need to use agency workers, which will reduce the additional costs currently being incurred that are over and above the normal establishment costs for social workers. This proposal is expected to make savings in 2018-19, but this initial release of funding will be utilised to provide recurrent funding for the supernumerary Norfolk Institute of Professional Excellence posts, which will ensure sustainable long-term recruitment. The remainder of the saving will be released in 2019-20.</p>
4.	Reduced Looked After Children's costs through implementation of the Demand Management and Prevention Strategy transformation programme	<p>The numbers of children who are looked after has significantly increased in recent years, along with the cost of providing appropriate care and support. We want to ensure that the right care and support is being offered at the right time to the right people. As part of the Norfolk Futures programme, Policy and Resources Committee has agreed significant one-off investment to develop earlier targeted help where needed and to re-balance the placement mix available to meet the needs of children and young people who do require care, which should result in a more sustainable system that provides better outcomes for children and families</p> <p>Investment in the Demand Management and Prevention Strategy transformation programme will be required. This will include improving support to families to prevent children and young people from coming into care, and increasing the numbers of children who are fostered, particularly by foster carers who work directly for Norfolk County Council</p> <p>Over the life of the transformation programme, it is expected that the department will see a reduction in the number of children and young people who are looked after. This will be due to families being better supported</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
		<p>to stay together and, where this not possible, there will be an increase in permanence arrangements.</p> <p>Additionally, it is expected that the placement mix for those children who do need to be looked after will change to see a shift towards foster care, particularly in-house foster care, and away from expensive, residential placements. This should lead to a reduced unit cost per child looked after.</p> <p>The reduction in numbers of children who are looked after and the reduction in unit cost will generate savings.</p>
5.	Remodel the children's centre service offer	<p>The current delivery model provides access to Children's Centre services to all families in Norfolk and is delivered from both dedicated buildings and via a number of outreach locations. There is an opportunity to consider how improved integration and collaboration between both universal and targeted support services to ensure that the appropriate response is provided to the right family at the right time.</p> <p>Remodelling of the Children's Centre service for Norfolk is part of the Local Services Strategy corporate priority work, and will look at how other properties within the public estate can be utilised to support effective delivery of the service whilst making better use of available resources.</p> <p>It is envisaged the result would be services being provided more flexibly through effective joint working, including closer alignment with the library service and Public Health commissioned Healthy Child Programme. Ensuring that appropriate provision is made available to the most vulnerable families and communities will remain the key priority of the Children's Centre Service.</p>

Who is affected?

2. The proposals will affect all children and young people and their families in Norfolk, including those with protected characteristics; it will also affect staff:

People of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with, for example, reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people on the Autism spectrum; people with learning difficulties and people with dementia).	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES

Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

3. The proposals will also affect people in rural areas.

Potential impact

4. Overall, as in previous years, Children's Services budget proposals for 2018/19 will impact primarily on children and families – which is inevitable, because children and families constitute the majority of service users.
5. However, there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that the four proposals below will have any detrimental impact on children and families, or families in rural areas. The reasons why are explained below.
6. The one exception is the proposal to remodel the children's centre service offer. This is dealt with separately later in this document.

	Title of proposal	Impact
1.	Reduction in legal expenses	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
2.	Increased income received for Early years training	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to service standards, quality or delivery. • The new approach will apply equally to settings in both rural and urban areas. • The reduced level of funding will not inadvertently lead to higher costs for settings in rural areas.
3.	Reduce the reliance on agency social workers through improved permanent recruitment and retention	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to service standards, quality or delivery. • The new approach will apply equally to operational delivery in rural and urban areas.
4.	Reduced Looked After Children's costs through implementation of the Demand Management and Prevention Strategy	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.

	Title of proposal	Impact
	transformation programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The new approach will apply equally to rural and urban areas.• The new approach will apply equally to operational delivery in rural and urban areas.

Analysis of proposal

Overview

1. This proposal seeks to remodel children's centre services in Norfolk. The aim of the proposal is to take account of demographic changes which are impacting on how children's centres are being used by families with children under five, and explore new ways of continuing to provide support and information to families at a reduced cost.
2. There are three elements to the proposal:
 - Review how children's centre services are provided in each area of Norfolk
 - Focus children's centre services on the families that need them most
 - More children's centre services and libraries to share buildings.
3. More details about these elements of the proposal are set out in the consultation document: <https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/budget2018/>
4. The proposals would save £5.5 million over the next three years.

More information about the proposal

5. If the proposal goes ahead, parents and children accessing children's centre services will continue to be able to access information, advice, guidance and support, including an increased offer from on-line support. For those in need of face to face support, this would be provided on a targeted outreach basis, as well as support being available via phone and on-line. This would apply to vulnerable families and communities living in both rural and urban areas.
6. The main change is that there may be a scaling back of the 'universal offer' from 2018/19 onwards. The 'universal offer' relates to services for all families/children, as opposed to families in need.
7. Children's centre providers already undertake a needs analysis to identify families in need, to inform the types of services which will be provided to the local community each year. The remodelled children's centre service will be more focussed on these target groups identified through the needs analysis.
8. The provision of targeted support will be determined in collaboration with the Healthy Child Programme and social care teams to ensure that each family in need receives an appropriate and effective response.

The role of Norfolk's children's centres

9. Children's centres offer all families with children under five in Norfolk a range of services, information and support in their local community. They also help some children aged 5-8 with the transition to school.

10. Most children's centres offer advice about pregnancy, parenting support, play sessions, information about children's health, training courses for adults, as well as support finding specialist groups and services. However, generally speaking, the support offered is based on the needs of the local community.
11. Some children's centre services are available to all families, such as play and stay sessions, and information, advice and guidance about parenting and other topics such as health services, training and jobs. Children's centres send information to all families registered with them about activities and services on offer locally, and this can include information about activities being run by other organisations, such as local charities and community groups.
12. Children's centres also provide some services which are for specific groups, for example sessions for new parents / carers or activities for children with disabilities. Children's centre staff plan these activities to help the families that they are working with at the time. So these activities are different depending on where people live and they change over time as the needs of families change.
13. Children's centre staff also work directly with families on a one-to-one basis. This might involve meeting with families in the children's centre or home visits. One-to-one sessions tend to be offered to families that need the most support. Sometimes this one-to-one support is used to coordinate the work of different organisations who are all supporting the same family, for example children's centres, social care teams and health visitors.

Number and location of Norfolk's children's centres

14. There are 53 children's centres in Norfolk, provided from a range of different buildings and locations. The size of the buildings and how they are used varies considerably.
15. In some areas all services are based in one children's centre building. Whilst some children's centres are in purpose built venues (there are 37 of these in total), others are on school sites and some are in buildings shared with other organisations. Most children's centres in urban areas have a dedicated building, due to their proximity to numerous families living nearby and regularly attending activities.
16. In other areas of Norfolk, children's centres have a base that they use to run activities, but they also offer services in village halls and community buildings. This approach is used to provide services to families living in some of Norfolk's market towns and their surrounding villages.
17. In some areas there is no children's centre building, instead services are offered in different community buildings, such as village halls and community buildings. This approach is used in urban and rural areas. It works well for rural communities, where families are more spread out in different villages and there isn't one obvious place to have a children's centre building that all families could easily get to.

Analysis of the people affected by the proposal

18. The proposal will primarily impact on families with children aged 0-5 in Norfolk. This is because the majority of children in Norfolk (over 93%) aged 0-5 in are currently registered with their local children's centre. This represents over 41,000 children and over 33,000 families across the county.
19. However, although most young people in Norfolk are registered with their local children's centre, usage rates vary significantly. Some families regularly go to their children's centre and use numerous services, and other families don't use children's centre services at all. Typically, three quarters of the children who are registered with their local children's centre use services on at least three different occasions.

Potential impact

20. This proposal may have some detrimental impact on families with children aged 0-5. This could include an impact on women, because women frequently (but not always) have primary responsibility for care of younger children.
21. This is because if the proposal goes ahead, some universal services for families with children 0-5 may be stopped, or some activities currently offered to parents and carers for free may be charged for. However, this detrimental impact is likely to be limited, as if the proposal goes ahead, children's centre services will continue to be provided across Norfolk. In addition, children's centre services will continue to be targeted at parents and families who need it most, which will include families with disabled children, specific needs or other vulnerabilities.
22. Because of this, there is no evidence that the proposal may have a detrimental impact on children and families who are disabled, Black, Asian or minority ethnic, or who have a religion or belief or other protected characteristic.
23. At this stage, it is not possible to identify which specific services may be stopped or charged for, or which service users may be affected, because this is not yet known. If the proposal goes ahead, work will take place to review the needs of families in each area, and as a result of the review, options will be developed on how and where services should be delivered. It is at this point that proposals could emerge to change or stop services that some service users may currently be receiving.
24. There is no risk to elected members that giving approval for the review to go ahead may lead to detrimental impacts on families, parents, women or children going undetected. This is because the review methodology is clear that at the point that *any* options emerge to change or stop services currently being received by service users, public consultation with those affected will take place, and a detailed equality and rural impact assessment will be undertaken. In the event that an impact assessment identifies any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas, this will be reported to Children's Services Committee for consideration before a decision is made.
25. Looking ahead, in a worst case scenario, if a children's centre service was changed, stopped, or delivered from a different location, the main detrimental impact this could have is:

- The family has to find an alternative, which they may have to pay for, which would have a financial impact. In some cases, an alternative may not be available.
 - Some families may decide not to find an alternative, and therefore may no longer benefit from the support they were previously receiving. However, as mentioned previously, it is important to remember that the review methodology is clear that the services affected will be universal services, not services for families in need.
 - If operations in rural centres are closed and consolidated into market towns, this may transfer the cost for travel etc. onto the user, and also assumes that there is the 'technical' ability to access the site i.e. people have a car or access to a bus route. This may not always be the case for people in rural areas, particularly disabled people. This could have an unintended consequence of preventing people accessing services. To address this, it will be important to fully risk assess access planning of potential sites, and conduct cost impact assessments on users.
 - Childrens Service's capacity to deliver on social mobility priorities may be more limited, which in turn, could put greater pressure on schools or voluntary organisations in the area. In urban areas, this may be less of an issue, but in rural areas, where there is less choice or service provision, it could create a challenge.
26. It is possible that the proposal may result in fewer dedicated children's centres and more services might be provided in community buildings. Any options to relocate services to different buildings, or to share buildings between libraries and children's centres would need to take into account the accessibility of these buildings for disabled parents/carers and children, and access to public transport and disabled parking. Where there may be greater constraints on space, it will be important to ensure that there is still sufficient space for disabled children, adults and staff to easily access all areas (for instance, when using motorised wheelchairs), and appropriate accessible toilet/changing facilities. It will also be important to ensure that consideration is given to managing noise levels – to address the needs of people who are hearing impaired or deaf.
27. Another issue to take into account is that the proposal mentions that families will be able to access more services 'on-line'. It will be important to take into account that many families in rural areas do not have good broadband access, may not be ICT literate or may require a minimum level of web accessibility in order to access ICT (eg for disabled parents). Also, families on low incomes may lack the necessary hardware and software at home to connect to online services. Online services will also have certain limits – for example, they may be limited in their potential to bring parents into contact with one another for emotional support and learning through role modelling.
28. Looking ahead, proposals to locate children centres and libraries into one location, where this is feasible and meets local need, are likely to have a positive impact on community cohesion, and could present long term opportunities to promote equality. For example, Norfolk libraries are highly regarded by diverse communities, and have a great deal of expertise in promoting accessibility and inclusion. Children's centre staff have expertise in very specialised areas, such as being ambitious for disabled young people to help them develop their full potential. Locating both teams in one building will create opportunities for pooling this wealth of ideas, knowledge and expertise, to benefit all.
29. In some cases, support for families may be better coordinated across different agencies – e.g. children's centre staff, health visitors and social care teams.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Date
1.	<p>If the proposal to remodel children's centre services goes ahead, at an appropriate stage when the review has taken place, equality/rural impact assessments to be carried out on any options to cease, stop or change a service, to identify any potential impacts on service users or communities. These assessments to include a risk assessment of access planning of potential sites, and a cost impact assessment on users.</p> <p>If any detrimental impacts are identified, they should be reported to Children's Services Committee, along with any proposed mitigating actions that could be carried out, for consideration before a final decision is made.</p>	Acting Assistant Director (Early Help and Prevention)	From 1 April 2018
2.	<p>Where service remodelling impacts on Norfolk County Council staff working patterns, line managers to consult with staff about any proposed changes, prior to them being agreed. This will enable any access issues to be highlighted. Where issues are identified, appropriate solutions should be sought e.g. reasonable adjustments.</p>	Lead HR and OD Business Partner supporting Children's Services to ensure line managers are aware of their responsibilities	From 1 April 2018
3.	<p>HR Shared Service to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures, and if so, take appropriate action.</p>	Senior HR Consultant (Workforce Insight)	From 1 April 2018

Communities Committee budget proposals 2018-2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

Lead officer – Jo Richardson, Equality & Diversity Manager, in consultation with Ceri Sumner, Assistant Director, Community, Information and Learning, and Sarah Rhoden, Head of Support and Development

Contents

1. **Communities budget proposals 2018 – 2019**
 - Capitalisation of activities to release a revenue saving
 - Changing back office processes and efficiency
 - Vacancy management and streamlined management arrangements – museums and historic environment
 - Vacancy management – customer services
 - Income generation – Norfolk Museums Service
 - Income generation – Norfolk Records Office
 - Income generation – Norfolk Community Learning Services
 - Income generation – Library and Information Service
 - Reduction in Healthwatch grant
 - Using Public Health Grant funding to support the delivery of Public Health activity throughout the Authority
 - Norfolk Community Learning Services – remodelling the staff structure, including staffing reduction
 - Providing a joined up Library and Children’s Centre Services
 - Registrars Service – external income
2. Recommended mitigating actions
3. Accessibility considerations
4. Human rights implications
5. Evidence used to inform this assessment
6. Further information and contact details

Communities budget proposals 2018-2019

1. Communities Committee has put forward 13 budget proposals for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Capitalisation of activities to release a revenue saving	The ICT equipment used by the fire and rescue service is currently leased and the lease is due to expire. Rather than lease new equipment, we will purchase it, which is the approach already taken for the rest of the Council. The purchase of new equipment is a capital cost, which means we can free up our revenue budget for the lease costs as a saving. It will not reduce the amount of equipment that we have. We have separate arrangements in place for our control room, which is not affected by this proposal.
2.	Changing back office processes and efficiency	This relates to the high volume print service in Customer Services. The lease for the high volume printers came to an end during 2017 and new arrangements have been procured. These are cheaper and so we can deliver a saving.
3.	Vacancy management and streamlined management arrangements – museums and historic environment	There are some vacancies in the Culture and Heritage portfolio. Rather than recruit to these, we are looking at how we could change arrangements to enable these posts to be deleted. They relate to the historic environment service where, for example, we are looking at closer working with the museums archaeology service.
4.	Vacancy management – customer services	This relates to the Customer Service Centre - reducing the number of posts by deleting some vacancies. The vacancies have arisen (and will continue to arise) because of efficiencies we have been able to make due to increased digitisation. This will not impact on service standards.
5.	Income generation – Norfolk Museums Service	This saving aligns to the programme/timetable for the Castle Keep development project. In addition, work is underway to identify other ways to increase income generation e.g. through other improvements to the customer offer.
6.	Income generation – Norfolk Records Office	Work is proposed to consider ways to generate income.
7.	Income generation – Norfolk Community Learning Services (NCLS)	The 2019/20 amount is about positioning NCLS so that it is able to support the delivery of apprenticeships, which will be additional funded activity. The 2010/21 amount relates to property exploitation and utilisation e.g. using fewer or cheaper buildings, improving the catering offer.
8.	Income generation – Library and Information Service	We are exploring other ways to generate income for the library service. Some existing income generation streams are already at risk and doing more of the same will not deliver a saving. We need to develop new ways to generate income.
9.	Reduction in Healthwatch grant	Healthwatch is a statutory body that works with health and social care services in Norfolk to make sure that the

	Title of proposal	Description
		views and experiences of local people can inform how services are delivered. This particularly includes people from underrepresented groups. The Healthwatch grant provided by the County Council is above the statutory minimum. This proposal means reducing the Healthwatch grant to the statutory minimum. Note that the statutory minimum amount of funding has been reduced by Government this year, and so there is a real-time reduction for Healthwatch of around £200k.
10.	Using Public Health Grant funding to support the delivery of Public Health activity throughout the Authority	We are currently looking for opportunities throughout the Authority that contribute to delivery of Public Health outcomes.
11.	Norfolk Community Learning Services – remodelling the staff structure, including staffing reduction	This involves a detailed review of the staffing structure for Norfolk Community Learning Services so that resources can be better targeted to delivery of outcomes. It is anticipated that we can reduce overall numbers without any significant impact on service delivery.
12.	Providing a joined up Library and Children’s Centre Services	This will seek opportunities to align activity and buildings across Children's Centres and libraries - discussions with Children's Services are underway on this. This is a model already in place in other councils.
13.	Registrars Service – external income	Increase our income by expanding the range and variety of services we charge for

Who is affected?

2. The proposals will affect residents, visitors and businesses in Norfolk, including people with protected characteristics and in rural areas, and our staff:

People of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with, for example, reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people on the Autism spectrum; people with learning difficulties and people with dementia).	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES

Potential impact

3. The proposal to remodel the staff structure of Norfolk Community Learning Services may have a detrimental impact on some parents of young children aged 0-3 years old. This is because the proposal will see the deletion of 2.166 full time equivalent posts, which currently provide a childcare service for adult learners. More information about this is set out later in this document.
4. The proposal to reduce the Healthwatch grant may have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics, because Healthwatch particularly works with these groups. More information about this is set out later in this document.
5. The other 11 proposals are unlikely to have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. The reasons for this are provided below:

	Title of proposal	Impact
1.	Capitalisation of activities to release a revenue saving	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
2.	Changing back office processes and efficiency	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
3.	Vacancy management and streamlined management arrangements – museums and historic environment	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because the deletion of these posts will not lead to changes to service standards, quality or delivery. Staff with protected characteristics will not be disproportionately affected compared to other staff.
4.	Vacancy management – customer services	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because any posts affected are already vacant, and the deletion of these posts will not lead to changes to service standards, quality or delivery. There is a risk that customer waiting times could increase slightly, but calls relating to vulnerable adults and children will continue to be prioritised.
5.	Income generation – Norfolk Museums Service	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
6.	Income generation – Norfolk Records Office	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.

	Title of proposal	Impact
7.	Income generation – Norfolk Community Learning Services	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to service standards, quality or delivery. • The proposal will create an opportunity to consider whether accessibility of the existing premises for disabled people can be enhanced.
8.	Income generation – Library and Information Service	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p>
10.	Using Public Health Grant funding to support the delivery of Public Health activity throughout the Authority	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p>
11.	Norfolk Community Learning Services – remodelling the staff structure, including staffing reduction	<p>The proposal to remodel the staff structure of Norfolk Community Learning Services may have a detrimental impact on some parents of very young children, 0-3 years old. This is because the proposal will see the deletion of 2.166 full time equivalent posts, which currently provide a childcare service for adult learners.</p> <p>This should not have a major impact on adult learners with children over three years of age, because these learners will be able to access free provision in the immediate area (all three to four year olds in Norfolk can get free early education or childcare – as well as some two year olds).</p> <p>However, learners with children under three will not have the same entitlement. However, where courses include skills and qualifications such as functional skills, learners will be able to access Discretionary Learner Support Funding to pay for childcare. There is also the option that when learning takes place at locations such as children’s centres, the centre will be asked to contribute in kind to the provision of childcare.</p> <p>The Council’s customer services staff will be able to advise learners of their entitlement to free childcare provision and where it can be accessed in Norfolk.</p> <p>It is possible that the greatest impact may be on parents of 0-3 year olds in rural areas, as they may have the least access to alternative provision, and have to travel further to find a suitable replacement. Some of these parents may not be able to find a suitable alternative, or may not be able to afford it.</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<p>It should be noted that a survey of other local authorities has shown that few local authorities provide childcare (crèche or similar) facilities, for financial reasons, and NCLS is one of the last remaining providers to do so.</p> <p>Other than the issues highlighted above, the deletion of these posts will not lead to changes to service standards, quality or delivery. It could improve service quality, by creating a more efficient model.</p> <p>There is no reason to expect that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately represented in any redundancy or redeployment figures. Current HR monitoring data confirms that the profile of redundancies remains in line with the overall workforce profile of the organisation.</p>
12.	Providing a joined up Library and Children's Centre Services	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any significant detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p> <p>One possible issue to take into account however is that if operations in rural centres are closed and consolidated into market towns, this may transfer the cost for travel etc. onto the user. This also assumes that users have the 'technical' ability to access a site i.e. people have a car or access to a bus route. This may not always be the case for people in rural areas, particularly disabled or older people. This could have an unintended consequence of preventing people accessing services. To address this, it will be important to fully risk assess access planning of potential sites, and conduct cost impact assessments on users.</p> <p>Another issue to take into account is that the proposal mentions that people will be able to access more services 'on-line'. It will be important to take into account that many people in rural areas do not have good broadband access, may not be ICT literate or may require a minimum level of web accessibility in order to access ICT (e.g. for disabled users). Also, people on low incomes may lack the necessary hardware and software at home to connect to online services. This issue of digital inclusion is being considered by the Council's new Digital Innovations Committee.</p> <p>The proposal may result in children's centre and library services being provided in the same or community buildings. Any options to relocate services to different buildings, or to share buildings between libraries and children's centres would need to take into account the accessibility of these buildings for disabled people, and</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<p>access to public transport and disabled parking. Where there may be greater constraints on space, it will be important to ensure that there is still sufficient space for disabled children, adults and staff to easily access all areas (for instance, when using motorised wheelchairs), and appropriate accessible toilet/changing facilities. It will also be important to ensure that consideration is given to managing noise levels – to address the needs of people who are hearing impaired or deaf.</p> <p>Looking ahead, the proposal to locate children centres and libraries into one location is likely to have a positive impact on community cohesion, and could present long term opportunities to promote equality. For example, Norfolk libraries are highly regarded by diverse communities, and have a great deal of expertise in promoting accessibility and inclusion. Children's centre staff have expertise in specialised areas, such as being ambitious for disabled young people to help them develop their full potential. Locating both teams in one building will create opportunities for pooling this wealth of ideas, knowledge and expertise, to benefit all communities.</p> <p>It is possible to confirm that overall, there are now more front-line staff in libraries available to assist service users than in 2016/2017.</p> <p>It should be noted that last year, Communities Committee requested that an additional equality impact assessment be carried out on the budget proposal relating to Library services, to ensure that every possible opportunity was being taken to minimise impact on service users. This assessment did not identify any new issues that had not previously been considered.</p>
13.	Registrars Service – external income	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.

Title of proposal:	Reduction in Healthwatch grant
---------------------------	---------------------------------------

Potential impact

6. There is evidence that the proposal to reduce the Healthwatch Grant could have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics.
7. This is because the Healthwatch grant is used to fund work to make sure that the views and experiences of local people can inform how health and social care services are delivered. This particularly includes people from underrepresented groups – such as Black, Asian and minority ethnic people, migrant workers, people with mental health issues, people on the Autism spectrum, people with other disabilities, older people, and people with long term health conditions such as cardiovascular disease - many of whom live in rural areas.
8. It should be noted that under-represented groups in health and social care may be particularly vulnerable to marginalisation because of the nuanced characteristics surrounding their circumstances. For example, Healthwatch would/could be advocating for a group of young women with breast cancer who are trying to look after their families with little support provided in terms of appropriateness of appointment times, childcare arrangements, access etc. Similarly, as is currently the case, Healthwatch is working with a range of families who have children with very special needs in relation to the autistic spectrum.
9. This highly nuanced work by Healthwatch regularly leads to improvements in social and healthcare services for people with protected characteristics. For example, recommendations in Healthwatch’s Looked After Children Report led to changes in service delivery and commissioning at a national, regional and local level. There is a clear risk that this would be lost if the proposal goes ahead.
11. If the proposal goes ahead, Healthwatch’s capacity to undertake this work will be significantly reduced. This means it will have less resources to engage with people from these groups. It will still be able to work with these groups, but not to the extent that it currently does. In particular, Healthwatch would no longer be able to be represented on a range of different bodies or attend meetings.
12. To mitigate this impact, the Council could offer assistance to Healthwatch to help determine how best to continue to engage with underrepresented groups to ensure that their views inform health and social care services, in line with reduced funding. Where possible, the Council will also highlight alternative sources of funding or opportunities that may be available to Healthwatch.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Date
1.	If the proposal to reduce Healthwatch grant goes ahead, offer assistance to Healthwatch to help prioritise activity in line with the areas of highest need for people with protected characteristics, and highlight alternative sources of funding or opportunities that may be available to Healthwatch.	Assistant Director, Community, Information and Learning	From 1 April 2018

	Action	Lead	Date
2.	If the proposal to remodel the staff structure of Norfolk Community Learning Services goes ahead, support learners who currently use the childcare service to access alternative provision, including ensuring staff are trained to be able to inform them of their entitlement to alternatives.	Assistant Director, Community, Information and Learning	From 1 April 2018
3.	If the proposal to provide a joined up Library and Children's Centre service goes ahead, at an appropriate stage when the review has taken place, equality/rural impact assessments to be carried out, to identify any potential impacts on service users. This to include a risk assessment of access planning of potential sites, and a cost impact assessment on users. If any detrimental impacts are identified, they should be reported to Children's Services Committee, along with any proposed mitigating actions that could be carried out, for consideration before a final decision is made.	Acting Assistant Director (Early Help and Prevention)	From 1 April 2018
4.	HR Shared Service to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures, and if so, take appropriate action.	Senior HR Consultant (Workforce Insight)	From 1 April 2018

Environment, Development and Transport Committee budget proposals 2018-2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

**Lead officer – Jo Richardson, Equality & Diversity Manager, in
consultation with Niki Park, Commissioning & Client Services
Manager, and Sarah Rhoden, Head of Support and Development**

Contents

1. **EDT budget proposals 2018 – 2019**
 - Vacancy management and streamlined management arrangements
 - Capitalisation of activities to release a revenue saving
 - Changing back office processes and efficiency
 - Further roll-out of street lighting LEDs
 - Succession of milder winters justifies a reduction in the winter maintenance budget
 - Improved management of on-street car parking
 - Re-profiling the public transport budget
 - Review the operation of bus services supported by the County Council
 - Reduce the number of roads gritted in winter
 - Reducing spend on non-safety critical highway maintenance
 - Change the construction and demolition waste concession at recycling centres
 - Reduce waste reduction activity
2. Recommended mitigating actions
3. Accessibility considerations
4. Human rights implications
5. Evidence used to inform this assessment
6. Further information and contact details

EDT Committee's budget proposals 2018-2019

1. EDT Committee has put forward 12 budget proposals for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Vacancy management and streamlined management arrangements	This relates to the Planning and Economy and Support and Development service groupings. We are reviewing vacancies and looking at better ways for services to be managed. Support and Development, in particular, has a relatively high turnover compared to other areas, as it is entry point into the organisation for many people. This gives us the opportunity to regularly review staffing levels, particularly as we start to benefit from efficiencies in processes etc, and delete vacancies.
2.	Capitalisation of activities to release a revenue saving	Capitalisation of some activity that is currently revenue funded, within the financial rules. Switching to this type of funding means that the revenue budget is available for saving, without the need to make any changes to the level and type of activity. This proposal relates to various elements of capitalisation in the highways service.
3.	Changing back office processes and efficiency	We are reviewing our back office spend across the whole of CES and looking to harvest all of the savings available. This proposal relates to a number of small savings including savings from telephone and printing (where new, cheaper, contracts are in place) and premises costs for the previous highways depot at Watton (where savings from the closure were higher than expected).
4.	Further roll-out of street lighting LEDs	Roll-out of more LED street lights, which enables an energy saving. This proposal is to implement on residential streets. As with previous LED rollouts, there is a need for investment to enable this to progress, on an invest to save basis, and this has been agreed.
5.	Succession of milder winters justifies a reduction in the winter maintenance budget	The budget for winter maintenance is based on the number of actions in the last five years. The recent mild winters mean the average number of actions is now lower than the budget provision, providing an opportunity to make a saving. There is a risk of overspend if there is a harsh winter, but there continues to be a £0.5m reserve that could be used if needed.
6.	Improved management of on-street car parking	In many locations around Norfolk there is not sufficient on-street parking to meet local need. There can be conflicts between residents, businesses, tourists and visitors. In addition we receive various requests for yellow lines to stop dangerous or inconsiderate parking. We will consider the full range of residents parking, payment for on-street parking and waiting restrictions. There will be a significant lead in time and some investment (e.g. to fund a project team) needed to develop and implement a suitable scheme. Any local schemes would be subject to a statutory consultation with local residents before being implemented.

	Title of proposal	Description
7.	Re-profiling the public transport budget	There is an opportunity to change the way that we account for our public transport grant allocations which can deliver a saving. This will not impact on front-line services or reduce the amount we currently use to support local bus services.
8.	Review the operation of bus services supported by the County Council	The County Council supports a range of local bus services through either providing a subsidy (£1.3m in 2017/18) or through grants to community Transport Operators. We will review this to ensure that support is targeted to delivering the most effective service.
9.	Reduce the number of roads gritted in winter	Currently 34% of the road network is on the gritting routes. This proposal will take the equivalent of two whole routes out and reduce the overall network gritted to around 30%. There will continue to be a gritted route into each town. The new NDR route will be gritted, once opened, and will not be affected by this proposal. This proposal, if implemented, would come into effect for the 2018/19 winter season.
10.	Reducing spend on non-safety critical highway maintenance	We will assess and programme the work that is carried out based on a number of factors, and high risk/emergency work will continue. Local Members will be able to use their annual budget to top-up activities in their local areas. The proposal relates to a reduction in non-safety critical spend on road signs, verges, hedges and trees, bridge maintenance and gully emptying.
11.	Change the construction and demolition waste concession at recycling centres	Change the policy on concessions for construction and demolition waste accepted at recycling centres so that it is only accepted at main sites on a pay as you throw basis.
12.	Reduce waste reduction activity	We currently undertake a number of waste reduction and minimisation activities. There is a risk that reducing this activity will negatively impact on waste volumes. However, we will continue to work with district colleagues through the Norfolk Waste Partnership to identify ways to reduce volumes. In 2015/16 the Partnership achieved Norfolk's highest ever recycling rate of 45.8%.

Who is affected?

2. The proposals will affect staff, residents, visitors and businesses in Norfolk, including people with protected characteristics and in rural areas:

People of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with, for example, reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people on the Autism spectrum; people with learning difficulties and people with dementia).	YES

Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Potential impact

3. The two proposals below may have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (particularly older and disabled people and people in rural areas, and parents with young children). Full details are set out later in this document:
 - Review the operation of bus services supported by the County Council
 - Reduce the number of roads gritted in winter
4. The proposal to change the construction and demolition waste concession at recycling centres will have a financial impact on residents who use this service, but this should not impact disproportionately on vulnerable people.
5. At this stage, there is no evidence to indicate that the proposal to reduce spend on non-safety critical highway maintenance will have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. However, this will be monitored, for reasons set out in the detailed assessment later in this document.
6. The other eight proposals are unlikely to have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. The reasons for this are provided below:

	Title of proposal	Impact
1.	Vacancy management and streamlined management arrangements	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because any posts affected are already vacant, and the deletion of these posts will not lead to changes to service standards, quality or delivery.
2.	Capitalisation of activities to release a revenue saving	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
3.	Changing back office processes and efficiency	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because the back office spend reductions will not lead to changes to service standards, quality or delivery.
4.	Further roll-out of street lighting LEDs	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with

	Title of proposal	Impact
		<p>protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p> <p>It is likely that this proposal would have a positive impact on older and disabled people, including people who are visually impaired, as LED lights provide a better quality of lighting.</p>
5.	Succession of milder winters justifies a reduction in the winter maintenance budget	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery. In the event of severe winter weather, the Council could utilise reserves to manage winter maintenance effectively and to agreed standards.</p>
6.	Improved management of on-street car parking	<p>At this stage, there is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p> <p>It is recognised that disabled residents need good access to disabled parking, in the right locations, to enable them to fully access Norfolk's city and town centres. Provision of disabled parking and its enforcement will be one of many factors informing the review.</p> <p>To ensure that all relevant issues for disabled people are fully considered as part of the review, equality impact assessments will be undertaken on any local schemes being proposed as a result of this budget proposal. In the event that an equality impact assessment identifies any detrimental impact on disabled people or people in rural areas, this will be reported to EDT Committee for consideration before a decision is made.</p> <p>The review may improve service delivery by allowing enhanced Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) operations to occur across the county further increasing Blue Badge fraud investigations, ultimately benefiting all Blue Badge holders.</p>
7.	Re-profiling the public transport budget	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p>
8.	Reduce waste reduction activity	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with</p>

	Title of proposal	Impact
		protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.

Title of proposal:**Proposal to review bus services supported by the County Council****Analysis of proposal****Overview**

1. This proposal is to review the money Norfolk County Council spends on bus subsidies and community transport grants.
2. The Council currently spends £3.1 million every year on bus subsidies and community transport grants. If the proposal goes ahead, the Council will review how this money is spent with a view to saving £0.5 million in 2018/19.
3. The review would look at whether the Council is getting the best value for money and how it could spend this money more effectively, without there being a noticeable impact on passengers. It is not anticipated that significant savings would be made from grants given to community transport operators. However in order to save £0.5 million, the Council will need to prioritise which services it continues to support. This means it is likely that some bus services may need to change or stop.
4. More information about subsidised bus services and community transport in Norfolk is set out in Annex 1, along with a list of all subsidised bus and community transport services which will be considered as part of the review.

More information about the proposal

5. If the Council goes ahead with the review, it would prioritise bus services which help people get to and from work and to essential services, such as to healthcare appointments and to go food shopping, and where there are no other transport options available.
6. In addition, the following factors would be considered:
 - The number of people using each service
 - At what times and how often people use each service
 - Whether there are other transport options available to people
 - Whether the Council could provide a transport service in another way
 - Whether there are any particular local needs that are specific to the areas served by each service
 - How much it costs the Council to subsidise each trip made by a passenger (the unit cost) and whether this represents value for money.

Which bus services would be affected, if the proposal goes ahead?

7. Without carrying out the review, it is not possible at this stage to say exactly which services could be affected. However, the proposal is clear that at the point that any options emerge to change or stop a service currently being received by service users, formal public consultation and a detailed equality impact assessment would be undertaken on the option. Where any detrimental impact is identified by this process, the findings will be reported to EDT Committee to ensure that elected members can fully take this into account before making a final decision.

Analysis of the people affected by the proposal

8. The Council subsidises about 100 bus services, which is approximately 20% of bus services in Norfolk. Alongside this, it funds 19 community transport schemes, which pick people up and drop people off at their house, or the nearest safest place.
9. The Council's monitoring data on the people who use subsidised bus services and community transport shows that:
 - The primary users of subsidised bus services are older and disabled people, parents with young children, and younger people who have no access to a car.
 - Around 88% of subsidised bus services operate within rural areas, but as they usually also serve an urban environment (e.g. coming into Norwich) some passengers will be from an urban area and may rely on the service to access services or visit family or friends in rural communities.
 - The majority of people who use community transport are disabled and older people who cannot access services by conventional public transport. These people tend to be particularly dependant on community transport to enable them to access essential services, as they may have no other viable alternative.
 - People use subsidised bus services and community transport to access food shopping, medical appointments, get to and from respite care, to colleges and educational establishments, employment, day/leisure activities, local services and places of worship.

Potential impact

10. This proposal is likely to have a disproportionate impact on older and disabled people, parents with young children and younger people with no access to a car. It will also impact on people in rural areas. This is because subsidised bus services and community transport are primarily used by people from these groups.
11. At this stage, it is not possible to quantify the extent of any detrimental impact on older and disabled people and those in rural areas. This is because it is not yet known which services may change or stop. If the proposal goes ahead, work will take place to review subsidised bus services and community transport, and as a result of the review, options will be developed on how and where services should operate. It is at this point that proposals could emerge to change or stop services that some service users may currently be receiving.
12. However, there is no risk to elected members that giving approval for the review to go ahead may lead to detrimental impacts on people in rural areas or with protected characteristics going undetected. This is because the review methodology is clear that at the point that *any* options emerge to change or stop services currently being received by service users, public consultation with those affected will take place, and a detailed equality impact assessment will be undertaken. In the event that an equality impact assessment identifies any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas, this will be reported to EDT Committee for consideration before a decision is made.

13. Looking ahead, in a worst case scenario, if a subsidised bus or community transport service was changed, stopped, or delivered from a different location, the detrimental impacts could include:
- Some disabled and older people, parents with young children, younger people with no access to a car or people in rural areas may no longer be able to access subsidised bus or community transport services. This might mean they can no longer access key local services, including health appointments, food shopping, employment, educational, leisure or social opportunities. It could increase people's dependence on families and carers and contribute to loneliness and social isolation.
 - It could increase costs for people, as people would be forced to find alternative ways to travel. For some people in rural areas who are disabled or older, they may be no viable alternatives.
 - Disabled and older people in rural areas may be the most affected, as disabled and older people in rural areas are more likely to have complex transport needs than people living in urban areas. They are likely to need to travel further or pay more to get to services than those living in urban areas. They may have limited alternative public transport options, and the public transport options available may not be fully accessible or too costly to afford.
 - Changes to service frequency may result in buses being more crowded at peak journey times, which may cause difficulties for people with learning difficulties, people with mental health issues, wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs. Some people may be very fearful that they will wait for a bus but not be able to get on it, or that crowding on a bus may increase the chance of them being bullied.
 - People may need to make changes to their patterns of travel. This might be difficult for people with learning difficulties or who are on the autism spectrum. There may be practical difficulties for people who are restricted to use buses at certain times, such as people with concessionary bus passes.
 - Consultation with disabled and older people in Norfolk consistently highlights access to transport as a major enabling factor and doorway to participation in education, employment and social opportunities. Disabled people are less likely to achieve in education or gain employment than non-disabled people and are at greater risk of social isolation. They are more likely to experience barriers to the built environment and transport and fall into low income groups.
14. One important consideration is that the service is already targeted to assist people in rural areas and disabled and older people. In order to continue to be able to provide this essential service, there is an imperative to review the current model, to maximise the resource available to operate the service.
15. In recognition of the issues highlighted in this assessment, the review methodology can consider:
- Seeking to protect the most critical journeys being made, particularly where they impact on more vulnerable groups who are more reliant on bus services.
 - Initially considering reducing services or withdrawing journeys where alternative services continue to operate at different times or on other days of the week.

Title of proposal:**Proposal to reduce the number of roads gritted in winter****Analysis of proposal****Overview**

1. This proposal is to reduce the number of roads gritted by Norfolk County Council in winter, in order to save £200,000.
2. The Council currently grits 34% of Norfolk's road network of 5,965 miles. If the proposal goes ahead, this would be reduced to 30% of roads, which would mean that less minor roads are gritted. There would however continue to be a gritted route, as far as possible, into towns and villages currently in receipt of the service.
3. If the proposal goes ahead, the Council would carry out an in-depth assessment of the road network in Norfolk in order to re-prioritise which roads should still be gritted. The changes would not be implemented until gritting routes are re-designed ready for the winter gritting season starting in October 2018. The Norwich Northern Distributor Road would be added to the gritting schedule as sections become open for general use.
4. The proposal would mean that any requests received from communities to add roads to the Council's gritting list would be unlikely to be included in the future. This proposal could result in people deciding to change their journeys to use alternative routes along treated roads.

More information about the proposal

5. The provision of a gritting service ensures the maximum possible road access is provided in Norfolk to allow people and road users to move about, across and in/out of the county to carry out their private, leisure and business related activities. By ensuring there is a clear gritting policy, that it is well publicised and operated, then the county is doing all it can with the funds it has available to ensure access to as much of the transport network as possible.
6. The Council has a legal duty for ensuring safe travel along the highway is not endangered by ice and snow. The Council cannot grit all of Norfolk's 5,965 mile road network because of the time it would take and the cost involved.
7. The Council therefore has a policy, reviewed annually, which sets out which types of road are a priority for gritting. Roads that are a priority have been identified based on their level of use and importance in the overall highways network. The Council decides where and when to grit based on this policy, and on the latest weather data.
8. The policy is available here: <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/roads-and-travel-policies/winter-maintenance-policy>
9. A map of the roads that are currently gritted is available here: <https://norfolkcc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Viewer/index.html?appid=d16d38b40a7e44b4a835d8ce168410f9>

10. The main roads are gritted before other routes. The three hour gritting runs cover a total of 2,081 miles on A, B and some C class roads - commuter and major bus routes and, as far as is possible, one route into all villages.
11. Some footways in the pedestrian areas of central King's Lynn, central Great Yarmouth and central Norwich are also treated as priority. Highways England treats 143 miles of trunk roads including the A11 and A47.

Analysis of the people affected by the proposal

12. This proposal affects all road users and the majority of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicle drivers in both private life, employment and business. This includes residents with protected characteristics and people in rural areas.
13. The proposal may particularly affect people in some rural areas, as fewer minor roads will be gritted.

Potential impact

14. There is some evidence to indicate that this proposal may have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on people in rural areas. This is because people in some rural areas may see a reduction in gritting on minor roads. People in rural areas may be more dependant than others on a good transport network, as they have the furthest to travel to access services. They may also be more at risk than others of fuel, food or medical shortages if the road network becomes snow bound during prolonged winter conditions. However, Norfolk's recent mild winters should be taken into account when considering this.
15. Depending on the types of weather conditions and other factors at play, rural areas may also be impacted upon if individuals change their routes in icy conditions, causing rat running/congestion in smaller villages.
16. There is some evidence to indicate that the proposal may have a detrimental impact on disabled and older people, and parents with young children. This is because these people are at higher risk of slip, trips and falls if roads are slippery. Older and disabled people may be more fearful of driving on a non-gritted surface, which could reduce access to essential services or increase the risk of social isolation. However, it is worth emphasising that this proposal deals only with roads, not footways, so the risk of slip, trips and falls is marginal and not a strong possibility, as in order to walk on the road, people will have been required to traverse a footway, path or forecourt that would not have been subject to gritting by the Council.
17. Overall therefore, the greatest impact may be on people in rural areas, including disabled and older people and parents with young children who live in rural areas.
18. There are some mitigating actions that the Council can take to minimise the impact on these groups. Firstly, when carrying out the in-depth assessment of the road network to re-prioritise which roads should still be gritted (see Paragraph 3 above), the assessment methodology can factor in data on rural communities and proximity of older or disabled people populations (e.g. sheltered housing). Whilst the Council may not necessarily take a decision to continue gritting these areas, it can make sure

that these groups are informed of the changes. In addition, grit bins and rock salt will continue to be deployed around the county. The Council can ensure that parish and district councils are informed of any changes to the existing policy, so that they can continue to help vulnerable communities within the county during times of severe weather.

19. Weather conditions are highly variable and some winter periods are more severe than others. There is always a learning exercise following each winter as to what could have been done more efficiently and better to keep the county moving. Norfolk's winter maintenance policy is reviewed annually, so any learning regarding the needs of rural communities and people with protected characteristics following the winter of 2018/2019 can be taken into account to inform gritting policy in subsequent years.

Title of proposal:**Proposal to reduce how much we spend on non-safety critical highway maintenance****Analysis of proposal****Overview**

1. The Council is proposing to reduce how much it spends on non-safety critical highways maintenance to save £300,000. If the proposal goes ahead it would mean that during 2018/19 the amount of non-safety critical highway maintenance carried out across Norfolk is reduced.
2. The Council would continue to carry out all urgent works and any works that are high risk. For instance, if branches were to block roads, footways, cycle-ways and road signs, these would be dealt with. Road signs would continue to receive maintenance when damaged.
3. However, the Council would not be able to fund some 'cosmetic' (lower category) work it has done in the past. This could mean:
 - It may take longer for some damaged verges and vegetation to be repaired; these damages would be considered 'cosmetic' such as churning-up of a verge caused by the tyres of a large vehicle, although it will not affect scheduled grass and verge cutting.
 - Some bridge maintenance work such as making good damaged paintwork may be postponed.
 - It may take longer to clean road signs.
4. The Council is also looking at reducing the frequency of gully emptying in non-critical areas, for example, when cleaning gullies there may be areas when there is little material being removed and in these circumstances gully emptying could be reduced.

More information about the proposal

5. The Council has a legal duty to maintain the highway and this includes roads, footpaths and verges, making them safe for road users. This duty is met through a range of activities. Highway maintenance work is prioritised by looking at the strategic importance of a road and how severe the maintenance problem is. This process is set out in the Norfolk's Transport Asset Management Plan, approved by elected members and updated every year. The Plan is available here:

www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/roads-and-travel-policies/transport-asset-management-plan.

Analysis of the people affected by the proposal

6. The highways network is a universal service. Therefore this proposal affects all road users and the majority of residents as pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicle drivers in both private life, employment and business. This includes residents with protected characteristics and in rural areas.

Potential impact

7. At this stage, there is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas.
8. This is because although there would be some *visual* impact around verge aesthetics in local communities, there would not be any physical impact on paths or walkways that could restrict access for disabled people, older people or parents with prams. The impact will be the same for both rural and urban areas. Safety work will continue to be carried out to agreed standards.
9. It is also worth noting that flexibility will remain for visual impacts to be addressed in local communities. For example, the Rangers service will continue to operate, and parish councils can influence the type of work that rangers carry out in their area. In addition, local members have access to their local member budget, and could use this to address issues in the local community if this was felt to be a priority.
10. However, it should be noted that this is a considerable sum to remove from the highways maintenance budget. Although at this stage, management data indicates that it should be possible to make this saving without impacting on safety-critical works, this will have to be closely monitored.
11. There is a high level of officer confidence that the £200k saving proposed to Committee in October will not have an impact. The Committee decided in October to increase this amount to £300k. There is a lower level of officer confidence in the additional £100k as there has been less opportunity work through the associated data in as much detail.
12. If at any stage it appears that there is an impact on safety, a report will be brought to EDT Committee setting out the specific issues and seeking a decision on next steps.

Title of proposal:**Proposal to change the construction and demolition waste concession at recycling centres****Analysis of proposal****Overview**

1. This proposal seeks to change the Council's construction and demolition waste policy so that from 1 April 2018, people will no longer be able to dispose of DIY type construction and demolition waste free of charge.
2. At the moment, each household in Norfolk can dispose of one large item or the equivalent of an 80 litre sack amount of construction and demolition waste a week for free. If the proposal goes ahead people would have to pay to dispose of this waste.
3. If the proposal goes ahead, the Council would publicise the date of the change widely and give clear information about what recycling centres will accept for free, what the Council will charge for and how much the charges would be.

More about the proposal

4. Currently, householders can dispose of the equivalent of one 80 litre sack (the size of a standard black bin bag) or one large item of DIY type construction and demolition waste per household every week for free. For example one door, a bath tub, a toilet or one fence panel, or the equivalent of one 80 litre sack of tiles, bricks, or soil/turf.
5. People can dispose of any larger amounts using the Council's Pay As You Throw service available at any of the eight main 'plus' sites across the county at Caister, Dereham, Hempton, Ketteringham, King's Lynn, Mayton Wood, Mile Cross and Thetford. If the proposal goes ahead, the Council will look at the option of extending this Pay As You Throw service to all recycling centres, ensuring that the charges for any roll out would cover the costs across all sites.
6. The Council calculates prices based on the costs of dealing with the material and the amount of waste people bring. Householders pay less if they separate their waste – this is because separated materials are charged at a lower rate than mixed loads as they cost less to deal with. Each load is assessed by site staff and rates are non-negotiable.
7. Currently the costs of disposing of a large item or the equivalent of an 80 litre sack using the Pay As You Throw service are:
 - Unsorted/non-recyclable DIY type construction and demolition waste - £7.20
 - Flat glass - £5.20 (not recyclable at Mile Cross Recycling Centre)
 - Rubble - £4.70
 - Plasterboard - £7.60 (£12.60 at Mile Cross Recycling Centre)
 - Timber - £6.40
 - Scrap metal - £6.00.

8. The Council does not accept asbestos construction and demolition waste at any of its recycling centres, for example asbestos sheets from a shed roof. This is because it is hazardous waste.

Analysis of the people affected by the proposal

9. Waste and recycling centres are a universal service used by all residents. Therefore this proposal potentially affects all residents in Norfolk.
10. A map and further details of Norfolk County Council's 20 waste and recycling centres is available [here](#).

Potential impact

11. There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas.
12. This is because if the proposal goes ahead, it will not result in the closure of any recycling centres, and recycling centres will maintain the same opening hours. Residents will continue to be able to dispose of household waste. Disabled and older residents, who may need help disposing of waste, will continue to be able to access the same support that they currently get to assist with this. The main impact is that people will no longer be able to dispose of DIY type construction and demolition waste free of charge.
13. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposal may lead to an increase in fly tipping. The Council has analysed local statistics and spoken to other authorities about their experiences on fly tipping. It is evident from this that the majority of incidents of illegally dumped waste relate to household waste that either local councils would collect for free or a fee or that the County Council accepts from householders for free at our Recycling Centres in unlimited quantities, such as sofas, white goods and other electrical items and garden waste or bags of waste. In terms of the data the Council has on public land, less than 5% of incidents of illegally dumped waste relate to construction or demolition waste such as rubble, and previous changes to the Recycling Centre service, such as making sites part time, has not shown an increase in illegal dumping of waste.
14. It could be argued that some people with protected characteristics, particularly disabled and older people, as well as Black, Asian and minority ethnic people, tend to be in lower income groups. This could mean that there is a slightly greater financial impact on people from these groups. However, this has to be balanced alongside the fact that the proposal only seeks to charge for DIY-related construction waste, not for normal waste collection services.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Date
1.	If the proposal to improve management of on-street car parking goes ahead, equality impact assessments to be undertaken on any local schemes being proposed as a result of the review. In the event that an assessment identifies any	Assistant Director Planning and Economy	From 1 April 2018

	Action	Lead	Date
	detrimental impact on disabled people or in rural areas, this to be reported to EDT Committee for consideration before a decision is made.		
2.	<p>If the proposal to review the operation of bus services supported by the County Council goes ahead, at an appropriate stage when the review has taken place, equality/rural impact assessments to be carried out on any options to cease, stop or change a service, to identify any potential impacts on service users.</p> <p>If any detrimental impacts are identified, they should be reported to EDT Committee, along with any proposed mitigating actions that could be carried out, for consideration before a final decision is made.</p>	Assistant Director Planning and Economy	From 1 April 2018
3.	If the proposal to reduce the number of roads being gritted goes ahead, the assessment methodology to take into account data on rural communities and proximity of older or disabled people (e.g. sheltered housing). The Council to make sure all relevant community groups including parish and district councils are informed of any changes to the policy, so that they can continue to help vulnerable communities within the county during times of severe weather.	Assistant Director- Highways	From 1 April 2018
4.	If the proposal to reduce how much the Council spends on non-safety critical highway maintenance goes ahead, closely monitor the impact of this, and if at any stage it appears that there may be an impact on safety, a report to be brought to EDT Committee setting out the specific issues and seeking a decision on next steps.	Assistant Director- Highways	From 1 April 2018
5.	HR Shared Service to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures, and if so, take appropriate action.	Senior HR Consultant (Workforce Insight)	From 1 April 2018

Business & Property Committee budget proposals 2018-2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

Lead officer – Bev Herron, Equality Officer

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Equality & Diversity team, email: equality@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

Contents

1. **Business & Property Committee's budget proposals 2018 – 2019:**
 - Property – centralisation of budgets – further centralisation of existing property budgets in Services will allow maximisation of savings opportunities – savings estimated at 5% of current budget each year
 - Property – reducing fees – seeking opportunities to reduce fees paid to NPS
 - Property – reducing facilities management costs
 - Property – return from property development company – Repton Property Developments Ltd
 - Economic Development - Closer/joint working with New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
2. Accessibility considerations
3. Human rights implications
4. Evidence used to inform this assessment
5. Further information and contact details

Business & Property Committee's budget proposals 2018-2019

1. Business & Property Committee has put forward five budget proposals for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Property – centralisation of budgets – further centralisation of existing property budgets in Services will allow maximisation of savings opportunities – savings estimated at 5% of current budget each year	The proposal will continue existing work to ensure that costs associated with property are managed in an efficient and consistent manner. This allows us to make the most of economies of scale and to ensure that our estate is managed in the most efficient way.
2.	Property – reducing fees – seeking opportunities to reduce fees paid to NPS	Money is currently paid to NPS property design and management consultants to assist with property related issues on the NCC estate. This proposal will seek ways in which this can be reduced, linking to work being carried out to rationalise the NCC estate by reducing the number of buildings owned and maximising potential income generation.
3.	Property – reducing facilities management costs	The ongoing programme to rationalise the NCC estate will continue to see a reduction of facilities management costs through a) reduction in physical number of buildings and b) more efficient use of the remainder of the estate – this includes refurbishment where necessary in order to maximise building efficiency
4.	Property – return from property development company – Repton Property Developments Ltd	In June 2017 it was agreed to set up a wholly-owned Limited Company that would undertake property development using land identified as surplus to County Council use with the aim of taking profits that would otherwise be taken by a private developer and others involved in the process, including financiers. This proposal is in reference to the return from this Company once established.
5.	Economic Development - Closer/joint working with New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership	The proposal will identify areas where the Economic Development team and New Anglia can work closely on projects in order to work more efficiently.

Potential impact

2. There is no evidence to suggest that Business & Property Committee's budget proposals for 2018/19 will have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas.

3. A summary is provided here:

	Title of proposal	Impact
1.	Property – centralisation of budgets – further centralisation of existing property budgets in Services will allow maximisation of savings opportunities – savings estimated at 5% of current budget each year	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
2.	Property – reducing fees – seeking opportunities to reduce fees paid to NPS	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
3.	Property – reducing facilities management costs	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.</p> <p>As part of ongoing work to review property, consideration will continue be given to enhancing accessibility for disabled people. There is no risk that a reduction in the number of premises will have a detrimental impact on disabled people in any way, e.g. by increasing pressure on disabled parking spaces, or by limiting the physical space available in offices, which could cause difficulties for people who need more room to move around, e.g. users of large electric wheelchairs.</p>
4.	Property – return from property development company – Repton Property Developments Ltd	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
5.	Economic Development - Closer/joint working with New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards, quality or delivery.

Digital Innovations Committee budget proposals 2018-2019

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2018

Lead officer – Bev Herron, Equality Officer

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Equality & Diversity team, email: equality@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

Contents

1. **Digital Innovations Committee’s budget proposals 2018 – 2019:**
 - Information Management Team (IMT)– various savings within IMT including:
 - Exit from the HPE contract
 - Restructuring and headcount reduction (management and technical support costs)
 - Income generation, particularly services for schools
2. Accessibility considerations
3. Human rights implications
4. Evidence used to inform this assessment
5. Further information and contact details

Digital Innovations budget proposal 2018-2019

1. Digital Innovations Committee has put forward one budget proposal for 2018-2019:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	<p>Information Management Team (IMT)– various savings within IMT including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exit from the HPE contract • Restructuring and headcount reduction (management and technical support costs) • Income generation, particularly services for schools 	<p>The exit from the HPE (Hewlett Packard) contract will allow savings opportunities in a number of ways including provision of more efficient data storage facilities, a rolling programme of more efficient device replacement, and the continued development of in house data analysis capabilities.</p> <p>Restructuring and headcount reduction will be carried out with staff consultation where necessary and where possible will be delivered through vacancy management.</p> <p>Additional income generation particularly in relation to fully costed services provision to schools will build upon services already delivered and will continue to seek the most cost effective form of delivery.</p>

Potential impact

2. There is no evidence to indicate that this budget proposal will have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:

- There will be no change to service standards, quality or delivery.
- Deletion of any posts will not disproportionately impact on staff with protected characteristics or in rural areas.

Accessibility considerations for the budget proposals 2018/19

1. Accessibility is a priority for Norfolk County Council. Norfolk has a higher than average number of disabled and older residents compared to other areas of the UK, and a growing number of disabled young people.
2. Proposals relating to business process re-engineering will take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service planning and design.
3. Proposals relating to contract review will take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service design.
4. Accessibility considerations are taken into account as part of day-to-day processes and working. Because of the importance of ensuring that accessibility is integrated into ongoing service planning and commissioning of public services, consideration will continue to be given to opportunities for maximizing this in 2018.

Human rights implications

5. Public authorities in the UK are required to act compatibly with the Human Rights Act 1998. There are no human rights issues arising from the proposals.

Evidence used to inform these assessments

- Norfolk budget proposals 2018/19 – consultation documents and background papers: <https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/budget2018/>
- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Business intelligence and management data, as quoted in this report.
- In 2013, 2014 and 2015, the Council considered proposals to reduce spend on highways and gritting. Further details, including the views of residents consulted on the proposal, are covered in the consultation documents available [here](#).
- In 2015, the Council reviewed waste and recycling services. Further details, including the views of residents consulted on the proposal, are covered in the consultation documents available [here](#).
- Consultation documents regarding the Council's consultation in 2016 to reduce disability related expenditure.

Further information

6. For further information about this equality impact assessment please contact Jo Richardson, Equality & Diversity Manager, Email jo.richardson@norfolk.gov.uk

Annex 1 (Proposal to increase Council Tax)

Table: The number of dwellings on the Council Tax valuation list, and percentages of Council Tax exemptions, by Norfolk district (October 2017)

	Total chargeable dwellings on valuation list	% Dwellings paying full Council Tax	% Dwellings subject to some kind of reduction in Council Tax
Breckland	59,117	68.54%	31.46%
Broadland	56,515	69.19%	30.81%
Great Yarmouth	47,104	59.96%	40.04%
Kings Lynn & West Norfolk	70,179	67.87%	32.13%
North Norfolk	53,512	58.48%	41.52%
Norwich	63,187	55.57%	44.43%
South Norfolk	59,162	67.08%	32.92%
Norfolk Total	408,776	63.99%	36.01%

Annex 2

Response from: The Bridge Plus+, a BAME led Community organisation's response to proposed changes to the Council's equality budget.

Since Norfolk & Norwich Race Equality Council (NNREC) was dissolved in 2011, there was serious concern amongst BAME communities in Norfolk that race equality would no longer be a priority area of work in Norfolk. That for many, was perceived to mean that there will be an increase in hate crime and discrimination without the presence of a BAME led community based champion for race equality work. The county equality budget has however enable The Bridge Plus+ to work collaboratively with the County council equality team to continue to make race equality work relevant in Norfolk.

In 2012, The Bridge Plus+ led on the implementation of a BAME Action Plan work (through the Norfolk Race Equality Pilot Project), co-produced with Norfolk County Council to identify the priority needs of BAME residents. 26 BAME resident participated in the project and their finding were reproduced in a report that was used to inform the count's equality strategy for the 5 years ending 2017.

The equality budget has also enabled us to work with the County Council to identify BAME community groups active in Norfolk, which saw us lead on a mapping exercise which identified over 46 BAME community groups based in Norfolk. The findings were published in the B-Me Voices magazine which in itself has been part funded through the equality budget.

The B-Me Voices magazine has helped to promote knowledge and understanding of culture in Norfolk, reduce barriers that prevent people participating fully in community life and accessing information about local services and/or the services and has provided opportunities for BME community members' views to be heard on issues that affect them directly.

We strongly believe that without source funding such as the county equality budget to support equality work in Norfolk, the County will be worst placed in identifying and communicating with its resident BME communities, and could risk failing in meeting its public sector duty under the Equality Act 2010, in particular to eliminate discrimination, harassment, and victimisation which are particularly relevant to BAME communities.

One other example of how BAME communities have been supported by this fund is through the annual Black History Month (BHM) events funding which gives BAME community groups an opportunity to celebrate their culture and diversity around Norfolk. Through this project work, Norfolk has been recognised as presenting some of the best BHM events nationally.

By Pa Musa Jobarteh
Executive Coordinator
The Bridge Plus+

21 December 2017

Response from: The Chair of Norfolk's Black History Month Steering Group

Norfolk County Council's support to Black History Month in Norfolk through the bursary scheme is critical in Norfolk. This small equality budget has been very successful in supporting different generations across the county to come together to learn more about Norfolk's unique Black history and celebrate the contribution of Black men and women. Norfolk's Black history is interwoven into the county's history, spanning hundreds of years and both world wars.

The bursary scheme has not only had a significant impact on positive community cohesion in the county, it has also made sure that Black young people in Norfolk have ready access to local inspiring Black role models across science, education, the arts, culture, politics and sport. The fact that the County Council puts its name to Black History Month also gives credibility to the local programme of events, and makes it easier for our volunteers to engage with organisations that don't yet understand the value or importance of celebrating Black History Month. Norfolk is a vibrant and diverse county, but many Black, Asian and minority ethnic residents experience day-to-day discrimination, and it is critical that public bodies recognise this, and play their part in working with all their communities to make equality a given for everyone.

We welcome the Equality Team's aspiration to become more commercial, and to offset the reduction of this budget by trading its services to bring in income to support equality initiatives. We are aware that they have already achieved success in doing this, and are also happy to volunteer our services to support this work, where appropriate opportunities arise.

We have agreed to work closely with the team over the course of the year and in relation to this year's Black History Month in October, and will review the impact of this proposal at the end of the year, to monitor any impact or emerging issues. If we identify any issues, we will highlight these to the Council before it considers its budget for 1 April 2019, so that this can be fully taken into account by the County Council's elected members.

Danny Keen
Chair of Norfolk's Black History Month
5 January 2018

Annex 3

Subsidised bus routes

1. Most bus routes in Norfolk operate on a commercial basis. This means that they have enough passengers to run the service. The County Council has no say over the routes, timetables or fares of these bus services.
2. However some bus services with fewer passengers, such as many of those that operate at the weekend, during the evenings or on quieter roads, do not raise enough money from the tickets they sell to cover the costs of running the bus. The bus companies can't afford to run these services at a loss and so the Council gives them some money so that the services continue to run.
3. The Council funds these bus services because they are important to the communities and passengers who use them, to get:
 - to and from work
 - to and from doctors, hospital and other healthcare appointments
 - to do essential food shopping
 - to and from leisure and social activities.
4. The Council currently gives £2.7 million every year to bus companies to subsidise specific bus routes. This money subsidises about 100 services, which is approximately 20% of bus services in Norfolk. Normal practice is to review how each service is operating every five years. We look at each service individually, rather than review all the services in one go.

Community transport

5. The Council also gives £400,000 to community transport operators. We currently fund 19 community transport schemes, which pick people up at their house, or the nearest safest place and provide a door-to-door service.
6. They are set up for a variety of reasons. The majority of people who use this type of service are either disabled or they are older people, but they can be used by anyone who otherwise would not be able to get to services by conventional public transport.
7. Community transport schemes are run on a not for profit basis, often involving volunteers to manage and run the service, for example volunteer driver schemes.
8. Here are the criteria we use when deciding whether or not to fund a community transport scheme:
 - There has to be a benefit to the community
 - The scheme must help people where there are no other transport options available
 - Residents would find it difficult to access services using conventional public transport.
9. A list of the bus services the Council subsidises and the community transport schemes grant funded is set out below.

List of bus services subsidised by Norfolk County Council

N.B. We updated this list on 21 November 2017 to add Konect 4, Konect 11 and Konect 21 services.

Operator	Service
Anglian/Konect	Service 50 and 50A, Norwich Eaton Park - City Centre - Gertrude Road
Anglian	Service 83, Harleston - The Pulhams - Norwich
Anglian	Service 84, Harleston via Topcroft to Norwich
Anglian	Service 85, Rockland to Norwich
Anglian	Service 87, Norwich to Poringland and Bungay, evenings
Anglian	Service 87, Norwich to Bungay, Sundays and bank holidays
Borderbus	Service 580, Great Yarmouth to Beccles, 17.15 departure
Breckland Taxis	Lyng and Elsing, transport you have to pre-book for mid Norfolk Villages to Costessey and Dereham
Beccles and Bungay Community Transport	Service 581, village feeder to Beccles and Bungay
Carters of Litcham	Service 1, Mileham to Dereham, Service 2, Mileham to Dereham, and Service 10, Sporle to Dereham,
Carters of Litcham	Services 8 and 9, Tittleshall and Litcham to Norwich, Wednesdays only
Lynx/Coastal Red	Service 39, Marham to King's Lynn
Lynx/Coastal Red	Service 67, Three Holes to King's Lynn
Lynx/Coastal Red	Service 37, Southery - Downham Market - King's Lynn
Lynx/Coastal Red	Service 48, King's Lynn - Grimston circular
Coach Services	Service 12, Foulton to Kings Lynn Tuesdays only
Coach Services	Services 25 and 26, Feltwell - Brandon - Shropham – Norwich, 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of each month
Coach Services	Service T1, Thetford Town
Coach Services	Service T2, Thetford Town
Coach Services	Service 40, Thetford - Brandon - Methwold - King's Lynn
BorderHoppa	Rushall - Dickleburgh - Pulham Market surgery feeder, which helps people to get to GP appointments
Eagles	Services 52 and 53, Downham Market to Marham and Methwold
Eagles	Service 18, Swaffham to King's Lynn
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Services 30A and 30B, Hercules Road and Mill Corner to Norwich
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Services 11/13A, City Centre and Colney – Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Sundays and bank holidays
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Service 30, Drayton - Taverham - Norwich (parts of the service)
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Service 2, Great Yarmouth to Barrack Estate, Sundays and bank holidays
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Service X2/X22, Beccles - Loddon - Norwich, Sundays, bank holidays and evenings
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Great Yarmouth area, Services 1/1A/6/7, evenings Sundays and bank holidays

Operator	Service
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Service 15, Acle and Broadland Business Park via Brundall to Norwich
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Service 36, Norwich - Horsford Sunday
First Norfolk and Suffolk	Service 21/22, Monday to Saturday evenings
Fenland Taxis	Marshland St James to Wisbech Taxibus
Fenland Taxis	The Walpoles to Wisbech Taxibus
Konect	Service 9 Silfield, Wymondham - Hethersett - Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital
Konect	Service 5C, Little Plumstead to Norwich
Konect	Service 5B, Wroxham - Norwich, Sundays and bank holidays
Konect	Service 12, Dereham Town Service
Konect	Service 17, Bradenham - Hingham - Dereham
Konect	Service 3, Watton – Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital – Norwich, Monday to Friday in the school holidays, Saturdays and Sundays
Konect	Service 5A, Norwich to Blofield and Brundall, Sundays and bank holidays
Konect	Service 5B, Norwich to Stalham - Sundays and bank holidays
Konect	Service 21, Dereham - North Elmham – Fakenham, Saturdays only
Konect	Service 21, Dereham - North Elmham - Fakenham Monday – Friday, school holidays only
Konect	Service 4, Swanton Morley - Dereham - Mattishall - Norwich
Konect	Service 11, Watton to Dereham, Monday to Saturday
Konect	Service 11, Watton to Dereham, Sundays and bank holidays
Norfolk Coachways	Service 1, Old Buckenham to Diss, Saturdays only
Norse	Foulsham Village and Beetley shuttle feeder to X29 and 21 bus services
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service 46, Kings Lynn - Wisbech college, in the school holidays
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service 60, Three Holes - Wisbech
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service X8, 17.45 Kings Lynn - Fakenham
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service X8, King's Lynn – Fakenham, off-peak journeys (we provide funding so that the service runs throughout day, not just at peak times)
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service X29, Holt - King's Lynn
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service 4 and 5, Kings Lynn to Pandora Meadows and Gaywood Park
Stagecoach in Norfolk	King's Lynn town services evenings and Sundays
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service 55, Wisbech to King's Lynn
Stagecoach in Norfolk	Service 29, Fakenham to Wells
North Norfolk Community Transport	Various - North Norfolk and Broadland local bus services
Our Bus	Acle Flexibus

Operator	Service
Our Bus	Service 291, Wroxham-Reepham to Wroxham, Thursdays only
Our Bus	Service 292, Reedham-Brundall to Wroxham, Tuesdays only
Our Bus	Service 293, Beighton-Filby-Scratby to Wroxham, Mondays only, excluding bank holidays
Our Bus	Service 294, Ormesby to Norwich, Fridays only, excluding bank holidays
Our Bus	Service 730, Reedham-Filby to Yarmouth, Wednesdays and Saturdays
Our Bus	Service 32, Sprowston to Norwich via Thorpe Hamlet, and Service 157 - Bishopgate
Our Bus	Service 86, Beccles-Loddon-Poringland
Our Bus	Service 271, Hemsby to Great Yarmouth and Beccles Road Bradwell to Great Yarmouth
Our Bus	Service 33 and 33A, Cromer - Southrepps - North Walsham and North Walsham town service
Peelings	Service 1, Tittleshall - Castle Acre - Leziate - Kings Lynn, Tuesdays and Fridays only
Sanders	Service 210, North Walsham - Frettenham - Norwich, Saturdays only
Sanders	Service 210, Norwich - North Walsham, in the school holidays
Sanders	Service 80, Aylsham - Reepham – Dereham, Fridays only
Sanders	Service 98, Cawston - Reepham – Fakenham, Thursdays only
Sanders	Service 6, North Walsham - Stalham - Great Yarmouth, in the school holidays and on Saturdays
Sanders	Services 5 & 5A, Cromer - North Walsham – Norwich, Sundays & bank holidays
Sanders	Service 44, Sheringham - Cromer – Norwich, Monday to Saturday evenings, and Hainford & St Faiths diversion
Sanders	Service 9, Fakenham – Holt, Monday to Saturday in the school holidays
Sanders	Service 9, Fakenham – Holt, Sundays and bank holidays
Sanders	Service 24, Fakenham – Norwich, Tuesdays only
Sanders	Service 25, Fakenham to Dereham, Fridays and service 26, Fakenham to Kings Lynn, Tuesdays
Sanders	Service 34, North Walsham – Bacton - Stalham
Sanders	North Norfolk Local bus services - Services 16, 17, 18, 18A, 19, 20, 65 and 79
Sanders	Service 27, Fakenham - The Creakes, and 28 Fakenham Town
Sanders	Service 45, Holt to Norwich
Sanders	Service 46, Blakeney Circular - Holt
H Semmence and Co.	Service 10A, East Harling - The Buckenhams - Norwich
H Semmence and Co.	Service 584, Pulham Market to Diss, and Service 17 Diss Town Service
H Semmence and Co.	Services 805 and 806 Wymondham Circulars, Fridays only

Operator	Service
H Semmence and Co.	Service 15, Shipdham to Norwich, Wednesdays only
H Semmence and Co.	Service L1, Longwater Feeder Service
Simonds	Service 581, Diss to Beccles
Simonds	Service 1 Diss - Long Stratton – Norwich, Monday to Saturday
Simonds	Service 40, Fressingfield - Harleston - The Pulhams - Norwich
Simonds	Service 118, Long Stratton to Norwich, Sundays and bank holidays
West Norfolk Community Transport	Services 10, 12, 31 Swaffham Town Service and local services
West Norfolk Community Transport	Services 61, 62 and 47 Downham Market area services
West Norfolk Community Transport	Service 22, Harpley and Massingham
West Norfolk Community Transport	Swaffham Area Flexibus
West Norfolk Community Transport	Service 3, Emneth Hungate & Marshland St James to King's Lynn
West Norfolk Community Transport	Service 22, Kiptons and West Raynham to Fakenham
West Norfolk Community Transport	Flexibus, South Norfolk and Breckland Flexibus service
West Norfolk Community Transport	Service W471, Wimbotsham to Downham Market
West Norfolk Community Transport	Service 38, Fair Green to King's Lynn

List of community transport schemes we grant fund

Scheme name
Bawburgh Community Car Scheme
Beccles and Bungay Community Transport
Burnham Market Community Car Scheme
Castle Acre Community Car Scheme
Centre 81 - Community Transport in the Greater Yarmouth Area
BorderHoppa / Diss and District Community Transport
Gt Ryburgh Taxi Scheme
Heacham & District Car Scheme

Scheme name
Hingham Community Car Scheme
Holt Area Caring Society - Volunteer Car Scheme
Kickstart Norfolk - Moped Loan scheme
Great Massingham Area Community Car Scheme
Necton Community Car Scheme
Norwich Door to Door
North Norfolk Community Transport
Sporle Community Car Scheme.
Surlingham Parish Transport Scheme (Taxi voucher Scheme)
West Norfolk Community Transport
Thetford Dial-a-Ride - Operated by West Norfolk Community Transport

¹ Prohibited conduct:

Direct discrimination occurs when someone is treated less favourably than another person because of a protected characteristic they have or are thought to have, or because they associate with someone who has a protected characteristic.

Indirect discrimination occurs when a condition, rule, policy or practice in your organisation that applies to everyone disadvantages people who share a protected characteristic.

Harassment is “unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual”.

Victimisation occurs when an employee is treated badly because they have made or supported a complaint or raised a grievance under the Equality Act; or because they are suspected of doing so. An employee is not protected from victimisation if they have maliciously made or supported an untrue complaint.

2 The protected characteristics are:

Age – e.g. a person belonging to a particular age or a range of ages (for example 18 to 30 year olds).

Disability - a person has a disability if she or he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

Gender reassignment - the process of transitioning from one gender to another.

Marriage and civil partnership

Pregnancy and maternity

Race - refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.

Religion and belief - has the meaning usually given to it but belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (such as Atheism).

Sex - a man or a woman.

Sexual orientation - whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes.

3 The Act specifies that having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity might mean:

- Removing or minimizing disadvantages suffered by people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of others;
- Encouraging people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such people is disproportionately low.

4 Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between people and communities involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.

5 The same is also true for women, and some Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) people— particularly BAME women.