

Norfolk County Council

Date: **Tuesday, 21 February 2023**

Time: **10 am**

Venue: **Council Chamber, County Hall, Martineau Lane,
Norwich NR1 2DH**

To: All members of the Council. You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Council for the purpose of transacting the business set out in this agenda.

Advice for members of the public:

This meeting will be held in public and in person.

It will be live streamed on YouTube and members of the public may watch remotely by clicking on the following link: [Norfolk County Council YouTube](#)

We also welcome attendance in person, but public seating is limited, so if you wish to attend please indicate in advance by emailing committees@norfolk.gov.uk.

We have amended the previous guidance relating to respiratory infections to reflect current practice but we still ask everyone attending to maintain good hand and respiratory hygiene and, at times of high prevalence and in busy areas, please consider wearing a face covering.

Please stay at home if you are unwell, have tested positive for COVID 19, have symptoms of a respiratory infection or if you are a close contact of a positive COVID 19 case. This will help make the event safe for attendees and limit the transmission of respiratory infections including COVID-19.

Prayers

AGENDA

1 Apologies

2 Minutes

- **To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2023** **Page 4**
- **To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2023** **Page 19**

3 To receive any announcements from the Chair, Leader or Head of Paid Service (maximum of 15 minutes)

4 Members to declare any interests

If you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is on your Register of Interests you must not speak or vote on the matter. It is recommended that you declare that interest but it is not a legal requirement. If you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is not on your Register of Interests you must declare that interest at the meeting and not speak or vote on the matter.

In either case you may remain in the room where the meeting is taking place. If you consider that it would be inappropriate in the circumstances to remain in the room, you may leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

If you do not have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest you may nevertheless have an Other Interest in a matter to be discussed if it affects to a greater extent than others in your division:

- Your wellbeing or financial position, or
- that of your family or close friends
- Any body –
 - Exercising functions of a public nature.
 - Directed to charitable purposes; or
 - One of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union);

of which you are in a position of general control or management.

If that is the case then you must declare such an interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

5	Norfolk County Council Revenue and Capital Budget 2023-24 to 2026-27	Page 58
	Briefing for all Councillors from the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services	Page 63
	• Annexe 1 – 2023-24 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27	Page 67
	• Annexe 2 – Capital Strategy and Programme 2023-24	Page 579
	• Annexe 3 – Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24	Page 626

6 Questions on notice under Rule 9.3

Tom McCabe
Head of Paid Service
County Hall
Martineau Lane
NORWICH
NR1 2DH

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tom McCabe', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Agenda Published: 13 February 2023

Norfolk County Council
Minutes of the Meeting Held at 10am on Tuesday 17 January 2023

Present:		
	ADAMS Tim	KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark
	ANNISON Carl	LONG Brian
	AQUARONE Steffan	MACKIE Ian
	BENSLY James	MAXFIELD Ed
	BIRMINGHAM Alison	MORIARTY Jim
	BLUNDELL Sharon	MORPHEW Steve
	BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	NEALE Paul
	CARPENTER Graham	OSBORN Jamie
	CARPENTER Penny	PECK Greg
	COLMAN Ed	PENFOLD Saul
	COLWELL Robert	PLANT Graham
	CONNOLLY Ed	PRICE Ben
	CORLETT Emma	PROCTOR Andrew
	DALBY Michael	RICHMOND Will
	DARK Stuart	REILLY Mathew
	DAWSON Christopher	ROPER Dan
	DEWSBURY Margaret	SANDS Mike
	DUFFIN Barry	SAVAGE Robert
	EAGLE Fabian	SHIRES Lucy
	ELMER Daniel	SMITH Carl
	FISHER John	STONE Barry
	FITZPATRICK Tom	STOREY Martin
	GRANT Andy	THOMPSON Vic
	GURNEY Shelagh	VARDY Eric
	HEMPSALL Lana	VINCENT Karen
	HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	WALKER Colleen
	JAMIESON Andrew	WARD John
	JERMY Terry	WATKINS Brian
	JONES Brenda	WEBB Maxine
	KEMP Alexandra	WHYMARK Fran
	KIDDIE Keith	

Present: 61

1 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Tony Adams, Cllr Stephen Askew, Cllr Lesley Bambridge, Cllr David Bills, Cllr Bill Borrett, Cllr Claire Bowes, Cllr Stuart Clancy, Cllr Nick Daubney, Cllr Nigel Dixon, Cllr Phillip Duigan, Cllr Jane James, Cllr Julian Kirk, Cllr Kay Mason-Billig, Cllr Judy

Oliver, Cllr Rhodri Oliver, Cllr Richard Price, Cllr Steve Riley, Cllr Chrissie Rumsby, Cllr David Sayers, Cllr Mike Smith-Claire, Cllr Alison Thomas, Cllr Tony White and Cllr Martin Wilby.

2 **Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 Cllr Fran Whymark declared an “other interest” in item 3 as he was the designated new Chair of the People and Communities Committee.
- 2.2 Cllr Ed Connolly declared an “other interest” in item 3 agenda as he was the designated new vice-Chair of the People and Communities Committee.
- 2.3 In reply to a question, after taking the advice of the Monitoring officer, the Chair said that it would not be necessary for County Councillors who were District Councillors to declare this matter in relation to item 4.

3 **Proportional Allocation of Places on Committees and Appointment of Chair/Vice Chair for Committee**

- 3.1 The Leader moved the recommendations contained in the report, seconded by Cllr Brian Watkins.
- 3.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **AGREE** unanimously on a show of hands.
 - 1. **To approve the revised allocation of committee places and note that the Conservative Group has given up one place on the People and Communities Select Committee to the Liberal Democrat Group.**
 - 2. **To approve the appointment of a new Chair and Vice Chair for the People and Communities Select Committee.**
Chair: Cllr Fran Whymark
Vice Chair: Cllr Ed Connolly

4 **A Deal for Norfolk**

- 4.1 At the start of Council’s consideration of this item the Chair moved and Council **AGREED unanimously on a show of hands:**

That there should be recorded votes on all the motions for this item.

- 4.1 Cllr Andrew Proctor seconded by Cllr Graham Plant moved the recommendations contained in the report. In doing so Cllr Proctor referred to the many positive comments about the proposed deal that could be found in the executive summary of the report. He said that there was a clear desire on the part of the Government to work with all Councils in Norfolk on the delivery of devolution; the deal was consistent with deals elsewhere in the country and would provide new opportunities for the people who lived and worked in Norfolk. Under the deal Norfolk’s Councils would not lose any of the powers or statutory duties that they currently had. The deal was not intended to resolve the Council’s budgetary difficulties but it would help met policy priorities in Norfolk that could not otherwise be met. The deal was expected to be the first step in a process of further devolution that paved

the way to further powers, funding and influence. Section 3 of the report explained how the deal would require a change of governance and how this would be a matter for Full Council to decide on at a later date.

- 4.2 The Chair then invited each of the other Group Leaders to speak on the matter.
- 4.3 Cllr Steve Morpew, Leader of the Labour Group, said that he wanted Norfolk to enter a devolution deal but not the current divisive devolution deal that was put together entirely by the Government and which lacked the support of many Councillors in Norfolk from across the political divide. He said the deal on the table lacked structure and a clear route to the governance arrangements. Many of the promises that were part of the Government's deal did not require a change of governance. The flaws in the deal were illustrated by the way in which the Leader wanted to limit the discussion on its most important aspects to just members of his Cabinet. The deal offered no inflation protection and did nothing to address the key issue of social care. The £20m of additional money a year was less than one third of next year's budget gap and a fraction of the money that had been lost from the revenue support grant over the last decade. In real terms, the deal was worth less than a four percent increase in council tax.
- 4.4 Cllr Brian Watkins, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, said that the deal could only work if there was consensus across the business and political spectrum and most importantly amongst Norfolk people themselves. He said the deal was known to have gone down badly amongst some Conservative Councillors around the county and there was no proper mechanism or structure built into the deal to ensure that all Norfolk's Councils were active partners. There was likely to be a legal challenge from four of Norfolk's district councils. The document did not explain how a directly elected leader would be more accountable to the people of Norfolk. The amount of money included in the deal was not transformative and did nothing to tackle issues of social care. There needed to be a contingency plan because there was no guarantee that the deal would exist in its current form in years to come.
- 4.5 Cllr Ben Price, Leader of the Green Group, said that he did not support the deal. He said the deal took no account of the comments and commitments that this Council had made to achieve carbon neutrality. He asked if it was right for Councillors who were "twin hatters" to vote in support of a deal at this meeting only to then support legal action that might be taken by their District Council. The additional money contained in the deal did not take account of inflation and did little to refocus and transition the Norfolk economy towards Norfolk's green policy priorities. The governance arrangements would give the Government a direct controlling voice on what happened in Norfolk while at the same time disenfranchising the Districts and the Parishes. A referendum was required of those who lived in Norfolk to provide the deal with legitimacy.
- 4.6 Cllr Ed Maxfield, Leader of the Independent Group, said that he hoped that the Council would vote in favour of the recommendations, but he could only speak for himself on this issue. He said that if Norfolk did not get "on the

bus” at this time then it would end up missing this devolution opportunity for decades to come. There was a possibility that the devolution deal would open the door to further powers and influence in other areas of Government policy such as the location of doctors’ surgeries and other medical necessities which should be welcomed.

- 4.7 In response to a procedural issue raised by Cllr Alexandra Kemp, the Monitoring Officer said that the Council was not being asked at this meeting to make changes to the County Council’s constitution and therefore there was nothing to prevent the Council considering the deal in the way that it had started.
- 4.8 Cllr Steve Morphew moved as an amendment seconded by Cllr Emma Corlett to read:

This Council:

- 1) Considers the full text of the in principle ‘Deal for Norfolk’
- 2) Notes that proceeding with the Deal is an executive decision and requests the Monitoring Officer to bring a report to council on 28 March with suggestions for amending the constitution to provide that full council is the decision making body in approving the substance as well as the governance provisions of any deal.
- 3) Notes that it will be asked to consider the governance arrangements required by this Deal in or around December 2023
- 4) Agrees that to be acceptable any deal must meet the following minimum thresholds
 1. Include devolution of adult social care
 2. Include an agreed exit mechanism should government policy change during the deal period
 3. Be supported by an affirmative resolution by the full council of no less than two thirds (5) of the district councils in Norfolk
 4. Be demonstrably supported by a majority of all those residents in Norfolk age 16 and over.
 - 5) Approved in total by a full county council meeting once the thresholds in 1-4 have been met.

- 4.9 The Chair said that she had agreed with the mover of the amendment that it would be voted on in two parts. The first vote would be on paragraph 2 of the amendment and the second vote would be on paragraph 4 of the amendment.
- 4.10 Following a full debate on the detail of the amendment the amendment was put to the vote in two parts.
- 4.11 When paragraph 2 of the amendment was put to a recorded vote (Appendix A) there were 22 votes in favour, 37 votes against and 1 abstention, and this part of the amendment was **LOST**.
- 4.12 Paragraph 4 of the amendment on the table was then put to a recorded vote (Appendix B) and with 22 votes in favour, 37 votes against and 1 abstention this part of the amendment was **LOST**.

4.13 Cllr Ben Price then moved as an amendment seconded by Cllr Jamie Osborn to read:

This Council:

1. Considers the full text of the in principle 'Deal for Norfolk' and asks Cabinet, before agreeing the County Deal, to bring a report to Full Council demonstrating how the County Deal supports the recommendations of the Government's advisory body the Climate Change Committee regarding local authorities' delivery of Net Zero ambitions as follows:
 - a. Framework: An agreed framework for delivery for Net Zero incorporating local and national climate action.
 - b. Financing: Appropriate long-term financing to support local authorities in delivering Net Zero
 - c. Flexibility: Local operational flexibility around how local areas address climate change.
 - d. Facilitation: coherent policy and powers for the facilitation of delivery.
2. Notes that proceeding with the Deal is an executive position and asks the cabinet, in the interests of democracy, to commission a county-wide referendum asking residents of Norfolk whether or not they agree to accept the 'Deal for Norfolk', and giving them the final say.
3. Notes that it will be asked to consider the governance arrangements required by this Deal in or around December 2023 after the conclusion of the referendum in point 2.
4. Agrees Recognising that Norfolk, like the rest of the world, is facing a climate emergency, and that Norfolk lacks an areawide climate action plan more than three years after committing to work towards carbon neutrality areawide by 2030, ask Cabinet to immediately forward an areawide carbon reduction plan to its next meeting and demonstrate how the County Deal will support this with evidence-based targets.
5. Recognising that Britain has lost nearly half of its biodiversity since the Industrial Revolution and that continued biodiversity loss will have catastrophic consequences for Norfolk, commit to an evidence-based target for biodiversity restoration to be supported by the County Deal and ask Cabinet to bring forward a report demonstrating how that is to be done.

4.14 The Chair said that in accordance with paragraph 13.7.1 of the constitution in order for the word "referendum" to be included in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the amendment and considered at this meeting (which was similar to a motion considered at an earlier meeting) this would require the support of 21 Councillors.

4.15 On being put to the vote on a show of hands this was **LOST** (there being 7 votes in favour).

4.16 Cllr Ben Price then moved the amendment seconded by Cllr Jamie Osborn to read:
This Council:

1. Considers the full text of the in principle 'Deal for Norfolk' and asks Cabinet, before agreeing the County Deal, to bring a report to Full Council demonstrating how the County Deal supports the recommendations of the Government's advisory body the Climate Change Committee regarding local authorities' delivery of Net Zero ambitions as follows:
 - e. Framework: An agreed framework for delivery for Net Zero incorporating local and national climate action.
 - f. Financing: Appropriate long-term financing to support local authorities in delivering Net Zero
 - g. Flexibility: Local operational flexibility around how local areas address climate change.
 - h. Facilitation: coherent policy and powers for the facilitation of delivery.
2. Notes that proceeding with the Deal is an executive position.
3. Notes that it will be asked to consider the governance arrangements required by this deal in or around December 2023.
4. Agrees recognising that Norfolk, like the rest of the world, is facing a climate emergency, and that Norfolk lacks an areawide climate action plan more than three years after committing to work towards carbon neutrality areawide by 2030, ask Cabinet to immediately forward an areawide carbon reduction plan to its next meeting and demonstrate how the County Deal will support this with evidence-based targets.
5. Recognising that Britain has lost nearly half of its biodiversity since the Industrial Revolution and that continued biodiversity loss will have catastrophic consequences for Norfolk, commit to an evidence-based target for biodiversity restoration to be supported by the County Deal and ask Cabinet to bring forward a report demonstrating how that is to be done.

4.17 Following debate, the amendment on the table was put to a recorded vote (Appendix C) and with 22 votes in favour, 35 votes against and 1 abstention the amendment was **LOST**.

4.18 There then followed a debate on the substantive motion (the recommendation) after which this was put to a recorded vote and it was **RESOLVED** (Appendix D) with 37 votes in favour 22 votes against and 1 abstention:

This Council

1. considers the full text of the in principle 'Deal for Norfolk'
2. notes that proceeding with the deal is an executive position
3. notes that it will be asked to consider the governance arrangements required by this deal in or around December 2023.

The meeting ended at 12.30 pm

Chair



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX A

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Labour Amendment – ITEM
NUMBER: 4, paragraph 2**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	x			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed		x	
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham		x		PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael		x		RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher		x		SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy		x		THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana		x		VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	37
Against	22
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX B

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Labour Amendment – ITEM
NUMBER: 4, paragraph 4**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	x			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed		x	
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham		x		PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael		x		RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher		x		SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy		x		THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana		x		VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	37
Against	22
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX C

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Green Amendment – ITEM
NUMBER: 4**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	x			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham		x		PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael		x		RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher		x		SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy		x		THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana		x		VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	x		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	35
Against	22
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX D

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Substantive motion – ITEM
NUMBER: 4**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy		x		KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan		x		MACKIE Ian	x		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed	x		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim		x	
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve		x	
BIRMINGHAM Alison		x		NEALE Paul		x	
BLUNDELL Sharon		x		OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie		x	
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie		x		PECK Greg	x		
CARPENTER Graham	x			PENFOLD Saul		x	
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham	x		
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben		x	
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew	x		
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will	x		
CORLETT Emma	Absent			Reilly Matthew		x	
DALBY Michael	x			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan		x	
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	x			SANDS Mike		x	
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert	x		
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy		x	
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl	x		
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry	x		
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin	x		
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy	x			THOMSON Vic	x		
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric	x		
HEMPSALL Lana	x			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen		x	
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John	x		
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian		x	
JERMY Terry		x		WEBB Maxine		x	
JONES Brenda		x		WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra		x		WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	37
Against	22
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Minutes of the Meeting Held at 10am on Tuesday 24 January 2023

Present:		
	ADAMS Tony	JONES Brenda
	ANNISON Carl	KEMP Alexandra
	AQUARONE Steffan	KIDDIE Keith
	ASKEW Stephen	KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark
	BAMBRIDGE Lesley	LONG Brian
	BENSLY James	MASON BILLIG Kay
	BIRMINGHAM Alison	MORPHEW Steve
	BLUNDELL Sharon	NEALE Paul
	BORRETT Bill	OSBORN Jamie
	BOWES Claire	PECK Greg
	BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	PENFOLD Saul
	CARPENTER Penny	PLANT Graham
	CLANCY Stuart	PRICE Ben
	COLWELL Robert	PROCTOR Andrew
	CONNOLLY Ed	RICHMOND Will
	CORLETT Emma	REILLY Mathew
	DARK Stuart	ROPER Dan
	DEWSBURY Margaret	SANDS Mike
	DIXON Nigel	SAVAGE Robert
	DUFFIN Barry	SAYERS David
	DUIGAN Phillip	SHIRES Lucy
	EAGLE Fabian	SMITH Carl
	ELMER Daniel	SMITH-CLARE Mike
	FISHER John	STONE Barry
	FITZPATRICK Tom	THOMAS Alison
	GURNEY Shelagh	VARDY Eric
	HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	VINCENT Karen
	JAMES Jane	WALKER Colleen
	JAMIESON Andrew	WARD John
	JERMY Terry	WATKINS Brian
		WHYMARK Fran

Present: 61

1 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Timothy Adams, Cllr David Bills, Cllr Graham Carpenter, Cllr Ed Colman, Cllr Michael Dalby, Cllr Nick Daubney, Cllr Christopher Dawson, Cllr Andy Grant, Cllr Lana Hempsall, Cllr Julian Kirk, Cllr Ian Mackie, Cllr Ed Maxfield, Cllr Jim Moriarty, Cllr Judy Oliver, Cllr Rhodri Oliver, Cllr Richard Price, Cllr Steve Riley, Cllr

Chrissie Rumsby, Cllr Martin Story, Cllr Vic Thomson, Cllr Maxine Webb, Cllr Tony White and Cllr Martin Wilby.

2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the County Council meeting held on 13 December 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to at page 9 Cllr Kemp said the County Deal was worth £600m over 30 years and the cost of a QEH rebuild was £862m and at page 27 the QEH motion was moved by Cllr Kemp seconded by Cllr Long and page 29, the West Winch bypass motion, was moved by Cllr Kemp seconded by Cllr Sayers.

3 To receive announcements from the Chair, Leader or Head of Paid Service

- 3.1 The Leader paid tribute to the work of Dr Louise Smith, the Director of Public Health, who would shortly be leaving the County Council after 7 years of service to join the UK Health Security Agency. The Chair and all Members of the Council joined the Leader in placing on record thanks to Dr Smith for her reassuring presence during the pandemic, and exceptional professionalism and hard work during her time working for the Council.
- 3.2 The Chair said that while all her engagements could be found on the County Council website under the Chairman's page, she wished to highlight some recent events. Firstly, to thank all those who joined the Norfolk Youth Strategy Workshop held last week which engaged with several people from the Norfolk Youth Parliament, DRAGONS and the Youth Advisory Board and heard about their personal experiences. Secondly, to congratulate Children's Services on the publication of an amazing Ofsted report. The Ofsted inspectors had judged the Authority as good in all areas and had highlighted areas of exemplary and good practice which marked significant progress since the last inspection. The Chair drew attention to the exceptional support given to children in care and to care leavers. Members joined the Chair in placing on record thanks to all in Children's Services in achieving such an amazing outcome.

4 Declarations of Interest

- 4.1 Cllr Fabian Eagle declared an "other interest" in the fifth motion on the agenda in that he owned a business in Norfolk.
- 4.2 Cllr Alison Thomas declared an "other interest" in the first motion on the agenda in that she was directly affected by the flooding in 2020.
- 4.3 Cllr Lesley Bambridge declared an "other Interest" in item 8 as a Trustee of West Norfolk Carers.
- 4.4 Cllr Carl Annison declared an "other interest" in the fifth motion on the agenda in that he owned a business in Norfolk.
- 4.5 Cllr Graham Plant declared an "other interest" in the fifth motion on the

agenda in that he owned a business in Norfolk.

4.6 Cllr Tom FitzPatrick declared an “other interest” in the fifth motion on the agenda in that had several business interests in Norfolk.

4.7 Cllr James Bensly declared an “other interest” in the fifth motion on the agenda in that he owned a business in Norfolk.

4.8 Cllr Andrew Jamieson declared an “other interest” in the fifth motion on the agenda in that he owned a business in Norfolk.

5 Petitions presented to Council

5.1 There were no items of petition for Council to consider.

6 Business (if any) remaining from the last Council meeting.

6.1 There were no outstanding business items.

7 Questions to the Leader

7.1 Question from Cllr Emma Corlett

Cllr Emma Corlett said that the University of East Anglia was a key civic institution for the county. Did the Leader share her concern about the impending substantial and unpalatable redundancies which were causing huge uncertainty and harm to staff and students. Has the Leader had contact with the Vice-Chancellor and would he urgently lobby local MPs and the Higher Education Minister on this matter, which would be catastrophic for Norfolk?

In reply, the Leader said that he was aware of what was happening at the UEA which had been well publicised. He had not been in contact with the UEA. They were going through the same process as other businesses in having to look at costs and income and make sure that they had the right kind of organisation in place to support them in the future.

7.2 Question from Cllr Saul Penfold

Cllr Saul Penfold said that this Conservative Administration had a debt crisis of staggering proportions. Adult social care and foster care were both in severe crisis, as was recruitment, school transport, dentistry and the housing of people seeking asylum. On top of this we faced a wider cost of living crisis and a climate crisis that this Administration refused even to acknowledge. His question to the Leader was “how many crises did it take to make a catastrophe?”

In reply, the Leader said that the word “crisis” had become somewhat overused; there was a danger that the overuse of the words “care crisis” might demotivate those working in the care industry. The Council was able to repay its loans; they were used to fund major projects which would not otherwise have got the go ahead.

7.3 **Question from Cllr Ben Price**

Cllr Ben Price said that the University of East Anglia (UEA) was set to make compulsory redundancies after suffering a £13.9m loss. In a statement, the university said that it was "currently experiencing significant cost challenges, driven by the effects of Covid, the tuition fee freeze, pressures on student numbers and rising costs for energy, pay and pensions". The university currently employed over 3,700 staff. Did the Leader agree with him that UEA was an important local employer, was helping to develop a workforce that would help take Britain forward, that it was still suffering the financial impacts of Covid, and would he agree to writing a joint letter from group leaders of this council to the Secretary of State and local MPs calling for more financial support to safeguard these important jobs?

In reply, the Leader referred to the answer that he had given to the question asked earlier by Cllr Emma Corlett and added that the UEA had to follow the same business principles as those of any other business.

7.4 **Question from Cllr Carl Smith**

Cllr Carl Smith said that there had been a lot of negative comments about the state of the care market in Norfolk. Could the Leader tell him what was going on?

In reply, the Leader said that he wanted to provide Council with a full and detailed answer and in so doing pay tribute to the independent care providers and to our social workers who were critical to the health and social care system in Norfolk. He said we should celebrate the work they did every day as it made a real difference to people's lives. The Leader said that he had personally met with care sector leaders to understand the issues and challenges and their representatives had joined with him and the Cabinet Member when they met in Westminster with Norfolk MPs and the Health Minister about health and social care pressures. The Leader said he had been a strong advocate over the past 5 years for more investment in social care; writing to the Secretary of State, taking the issue up with the media, and locally through the work of the Administration. Like all businesses, the impact of the current economic situation was putting added financial pressures on care providers through costs such as wages, inflation, increased insurance and utility costs.

The Leader said that the Council was proposing to increase funding to the care sector by an additional £30m, supporting providers at this time of increased pressure. Provided this was agreed by Cabinet next week, it would be the biggest increase the Council had made and equivalent to an overall 9% uplift. Social Care was an important part of the Norfolk economy; some 26,000 jobs and growing depended on it.

The Leader said that Government had asked the County Council to prepare for social care reform. Using a national framework, a Fair Cost of Care exercise had been undertaken with residential providers to find out what funding would be required to 'level up' prices in readiness for implementation of the government's plans to support all people with care

costs. The Council had published this and it showed in common with the rest of the country that considerable additional funding would be required to achieve this aim. The Council did not shy away from the need to address this in line with the government's timetable.

The Leader also said that there were too many providers in Norfolk and Waveney who were judged as poor or requiring improvement. The reasons behind this were examined by the Council through Scrutiny and through the People and Communities Select Committee. It was not just about the price being paid for care. The reasons included challenges around recruiting and retaining staff, giving staff a clear professional career route, investing in leaders of care providers, improving digital capabilities, as well as continuing to increase our fees within the funding available to us.

Helping to drive this improvement was the sector itself through the Norfolk Care Association who were partners with us in our improvement programme. The Leader said that we needed to be careful about the language we used when we referred to social care. There were significant challenges in social care; the costs and the need for reform, the recruitment challenge, the rising demands for assessments and discharges, and the need for people to get the best quality of service.

The Leader said that he did not think it was helpful to continually refer to this as "a care crisis." There was a risk that people would see this as criticism of social care staff. We needed to present a positive image and value what social care did for people. Those positives would help attract people into jobs, and they would motivate our own staff at NCC.

7.5 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

Cllr Alexandra Kemp asked about the Council's leadership role in relation to the integrated care system. Cllr Kemp said the Leader had set up a special team that comprised of himself and other leaders following the motion on the QEH that had been previously agreed by Council. What was happening with this team to get the QEH rebuilt and how was the Leader advocating that the QEH must be rebuilt?

In reply, the Leader said that a large amount of work was being done on this issue and cited the work of Cllr Dark as leader of the Borough Council and of others. Patricia Hewitt was involved in the Government review of the ICS along with Cllr Borrett and helping to identify good practice.

7.6 Question from Cllr Steve Morphew

Cllr Steve Morphew said that he was delighted to see that, following the recent extraordinary meeting of the Council, the Cabinet had taken on board the need for an exit strategy. Cllr Morphew noted that we had on today's agenda reference to a devolved hardship fund. It looked like the Leader was going back to the Government for amendments to the devolution deal. Would the Leader confirm this to be the case and what else he was likely to go back to the Government for? Cllr Morphew suggested that on the back of the answer he had given to the previous question the Leader should go back through the early devolution of social care because we needed a proper social workforce strategy and a proper structure for social care and to look at the 400 providers that we were providing with

management and transaction costs as well as supporting them in the quality of the care they were producing. When the Leader went back to negotiate the exit strategy with the Government what else would be included in those discussions?

In reply, the Leader said that the County Council had helped put in place a good deal for Norfolk. There was a large amount of work still to be done on the implementation of the devolution deal which would be achieved through working with partners and this work would continue. There were plans for the Council to spend additional money in support of the care market.

7.7 Question from Cllr Dan Roper

Cllr Dan Roper asked who should the public blame if the Council tax goes up to 5%, your leadership or the decisions of the Conservative Government?

In reply, the Leader said that the huge cost pressures on the Council were set out in the agenda papers for next week's meeting of Cabinet. The Council needed to be very careful how it levied taxes on anyone in the current circumstances however the Administration would achieve a balanced budget that allowed for investment in Norfolk.

7.8 Question from Cllr Paul Neale

Cllr Paul Neale said that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services had repeatedly claimed that the NHS crisis was mainly due to covid, including in his Chair role in NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care Partnership. Yet while Covid has had an impact, the reality was the crisis was mainly down to gross underfunding by your government, slashing of council funding grants impacting care, reducing staff wages in real terms and the B word, Brexit, cutting out a large sector of the work-force available. Could the Leader of the Council admit what his Cabinet Member cannot, and acknowledge these problems, as a step towards seriously dealing with them?

In reply, the Leader said that NHS funding was decided at the national level. The Leader referred to the answer that he had given to the question from Cllr Smith about the support available for adult social care and added that the Administration was doing all that it could to help those in need of assistance.

8 Recommendations to Council from Cabinet

- 8.1.1 There were no recommendations from the Cabinet meeting held on 11 January 2023.

9. Cabinet Report (Questions to Cabinet Members)

- 9.1.1 Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader and Chair of Cabinet, moved the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 11 January 2023.

Council **RESOLVED** to **AGREE** the report.

9.1.2 **Question from Cllr Matthew Reilly to Cllr Graham Plant, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport**

Cllr Matthew Reilly said that last week Norfolk missed out on levelling up funding that would have seen Norwich City Centre taxi rank relocated to between City Hall and the Forum which would have enabled the creation of a new pedestrianised area below the Guildhall and provided a new location for the taxi rank, much needed for the pedestrianisation of Exchange Street. Would the Cabinet Member agree to meet with black cab drivers to discuss Exchange Street in the light of the fact that this funding had not been secured?

In reply, Cllr Graham Plant said that Norwich City Council had received a great deal of Government funding in the last year. He would look at the city centre scheme to which Cllr Reilly referred and provide him with an answer after the meeting.

9.1.3 **Question from Cllr Brian Watkins to Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention**

Cllr Brian Watkins said that the growing crisis in our hospitals was being exacerbated by the lack of available care packages for those patients fit for medical discharge. We had recently been told that the Council was arranging for 10 housing with care flats across Norfolk to be used to support their recovery for up to four weeks. With huge pressure remaining on availability of hospital beds during this cold winter, was there scope for this scheme to be extended if needs be?

In reply, Cllr Bill Borrett said that huge progress was being made in getting agreement across the three acute hospitals and social care as to the reasons why people remained in hospital and were placed on different pathways. The aim was to achieve a single strategy for addressing the problems which were previously unresolvable due to the way in which the system was constructed. Norfolk County Council had done all that it could to support the acute hospitals with discharges by example making housing with care beds available to support the system, placing teams of social workers in hospitals and supporting the funding of rehabilitation centres to prevent people being readmitted to hospital. The Council had moved resources and people and shaped strategies to help address the issue.

9.1.4 **Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn to Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.**

Cllr Jamie Osborn said that last Friday, the Conservatives in Westminster blocked Zarah Sultana's Free School Meals for All bill from being debated. The Bill would resolve gaps in FSM provision and make sure that more than 3 million children who are at risk of going hungry get the provision they need. Will the Leader write Norfolk's Conservative MPs and call on them at the very least to give the Bill a fair debate?

In reply, Cllr John Fisher said the while he felt that the Council should concentrate on local political issues he would take up Cllr Osborn's suggestion to write to Norfolk MPs.

9.1.5 Question from Cllr Carl Annison to Cllr Margaret Dewsbury, Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships

Cllr Carl Annison said that he had heard of a home office proposal to remove funding from the Urban Search and Rescue Team for Norfolk. Could the Cabinet Member outline what the County Council was doing in response?

In reply, Cllr Margaret Dewsbury said that the County Council had sent a letter to the Home Office objecting to this proposal. A presentation was put together for Norfolk MPs and they were asked to write to the Home Office asking them to reconsider their decision. Cllr Dewsbury explained the important role of the Urban Search and Rescue Team, how it was funded and the role that it had in supporting other public services. Cllr Dewsbury said that the Home Office was not doing away with all Urban Search and Rescue Teams across the country but they were trying to save money by withdrawing money from five teams and Norfolk was one of them.

9.1.6 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp to Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention

Cllr Alexandra Kemp said that the County Council had pledged to set up the Coalition for Change, groups of people with learning difficulties and autism who would be able to shape services and be their voice but since then there had been three or four care homes in Norfolk which were judged to be at risk of causing avoidable harm and peoples' independence was not supported and their lives were affected. Cllr Kemp asked how was the Coalition for Change making a difference, how had it been set up, how many people were a part of it and did it represent people in care homes across Norfolk with learning difficulties and autism and was it shaping services for the better?

In reply, Cllr Bill Borrett said that the County Council hosted the safeguarding boards for adults and children and had pulled in experts from health to look at the appalling state of affairs at Cawston Park (which was not a County Council responsibility). There were a number of recommendations that arose from this work. The details were available from looking back at papers that were presented to the Adult Safeguarding Board.

9.1.7 Question from Cllr Mike Smith-Claire to Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.

Cllr Mike Smith-Claire said that while everyone supported the recent good Ofsted report what did the Cabinet Member say to the Norfolk Foster Carers who had lost up to £5,000 a year in their carers allowance because of foster care being incorrectly identified as standard placements?

In reply, Cllr John Fisher said that Ofsted had identified that the Council were on the right track although we still had some way to go in certain areas; he would look into the comments that Cllr Mike Smith-Clare had made.

9.1.8 Question from Cllr Steffan Aquarone to Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.

Cllr Steffan Aquarone said that it was recently revealed that the Council was having problems with recruiting new foster carers to replace those that left in significant numbers following the recent review of the fee structure. How was this problem being addressed, and in hindsight should more have been done to retain the services of those carers who did so much to bring a safe, secure and reassuring environment to our looked after children?

In reply, Cllr John Fisher said that did not agree with the comment that many carers had left the Council because of the restructuring of fees. Some had left to join independent foster agencies however some had come back to the Council. The feedback from carers about the new terms and conditions had shown some carers to be in favour of the changes. This showed that the County Council was right to have made those changes. There were recruitment issues with carers across the county and a lack of face-to-face opportunities during the pandemic had not helped however the County Council had begun a new recruitment drive to increase the numbers.

9.1.9 Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn to Cllr Eric Vardy, Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste

Cllr Jamie Osborn said that on current trends, Norfolk was set to exceed its carbon budget in 6-7 years. Time was running out, yet more than three years after committing to get to carbon neutrality by 2030, there was still no plan and no measurement for how the County Council was delivering on that commitment. Could the Cabinet Member provide him with quantifiable targets for when and how the County Council intended to reduce carbon emissions county-wide, together with details of funding for achieving this?

In reply, Cllr Eric Vardy said that the target of getting to carbon neutrality by 2030 was written into County Council policies and drew attention to a new dashboard which showed that the County Council was making good progress.

9.1.10 Question from Cllr John Ward to Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.

Cllr John Ward asked if the Cabinet Member would join him in thanking all involved in the magnificent extension to Sprowston Community Academy, in his division, which was completed on time and to a very high standard.

In reply, Cllr John Fisher said that he had attended the opening and would like to endorse the comments made by Cllr Ward.

9.1.11 Question from Cllr Colleen Walker to Cllr Graham Plant, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

Cllr Colleen Walker said that with the ongoing work on the third river crossing residents had raised concerns about the problems that were caused by heavy lorries using Queens Road. Did the Cabinet Member know when there would be an end to this problem?

In reply, Cllr Graham Plant said that this issue had been raised with Great Yarmouth Borough Council as well as at the County Council. Discussions had been held with the lorry drivers, lorry operators and others who were asked not to use lorries on Queens Road and to show empathy with the residents. The temporary lights at the junction were to be replaced by permanent lights and using Queens Road was not acceptable.

9.1.12 Question from Cllr Rob Colwell to Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Governance

Cllr Rob Colwell said that King's Lynn Food Bank recently stated that this was "the worst we've ever seen it" after helping over 800 people in the town alone in the month of December. Did the Leader truly believe that the Council was doing enough to help the vulnerable?

In reply, Cllr Andrew Proctor said that he applauded the work that was being done by all the food banks in Norfolk. He explained the work that was done as part of the Nourishing Norfolk Programme which included £5,000 of Council money to help the Norfolk Community Foundation get that programme off the ground. There were 15 food hubs across the county selling food at reduced prices, some 5,000 households had signed up for support and 15,000 people were accessing healthy food choices on their doorstep. This issue was about providing people with dignity and choice while at the same connecting them with the support they needed to move on with their lives.

9.1.13 Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn to Cllr Eric Vardy, Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste

Cllr Jamie Osborn said that over the last year and a half, he had repeatedly asked what action the County Council was taking to support the economic, skills and investment framework needed to upgrade Norfolk's housing - making our homes more energy efficient, saving on bills, and benefitting the environment. He was delighted to hear that Norfolk CC was now partnering with the Retrofit Academy to roll out skills training for retrofitting. But there was also a need to work with district councils, national Government, the LEP and others to make sure there were financial options available for retrofitting. Could the Cabinet Member tell him what he had personally done to engage with district council peers, with Government and with the LEP to try and scale up retrofitting across

the county?

In reply, Cllr Eric Vardy said that he was working with the Norfolk District Councils to come up with a retrofitting strategy for the whole county. This matter was primarily the responsibility of the District Councils. This work was in progress and a document would be produced in due course.

- 9.1.14 At this point in proceedings, Cllr Alexandra Kemp provided a personal explanation to elaborate on the question that she had asked at minute 9.1.6.

10 Recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee and Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 10.1 There were no recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee and Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

11 Recommendations from Committees

- 11.1 There were no recommendations from Committees.

12 Specific Business Items

- 12.1 There were no specific business items.

At this point in the proceedings, the Chair said that items 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 related to reports from Committees. Under rule 9.3 any questions for Committee chairs should be questions on notice, and no such questions were received.

13 Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 14 December 2023

- 13.1 Cllr Steve Morpew, Chair, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

14 Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 14.1 There was no report from the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

15 Reports from other Committees

15.1 Pensions Committee

- 15.1.1 In the absence of Cllr Judy Oliver, the Chair of the Pensions Committee, who had given her apologies for today's meeting the report of the Pensions Committee held on 6 December 2023 was moved by Cllr Will Richmond. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

16 Reports from Select Committees

- 16.1 There were no reports from the Select Committees.

17 **Reports about the business of Joint Arrangements and External Organisations**

17.1 There were no reports from Joint Arrangements and External Organisations.

18 **Notice of Motions**

18.1 **Motion 1 - Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance**

18.1.1 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Alison Thomas and seconded by Cllr Brian Long. In moving the motion Cllr Thomas said that Cllr Steve Morphew had raised an amendment with her before the meeting which she would be happy to accept. The motion read:

The Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance (NSFA) was founded in February 2021. It was founded after significant surface water flooding issues in December 2020, led to:

- Over 350 properties being flooded in Norfolk
- 120 settlements being affected

The NSFA, chaired by General Lord Richard Dannatt, has brought together all agencies and partners involved in planning for and responding to flooding in Norfolk.

The NSFA's vision, objectives, approach and structure, are detailed in the NSFA strategy, which are designed to enable countywide responses to flooding across all agencies involved.

This has ensured that Norfolk residents can have confidence that flood risks are as low as reasonably practicable and will be well managed. This is important as Norfolk has suffered from repeated flood events as well as being prone to drought.

The strategy has been accompanied by an action plan, which has identified steps for the NSFA and its members to take to address the risk of flooding. This includes:

- Work on individual sites across Norfolk
- Looking at working out costed solutions to address flood risk and identifying potential funding for each site

This Council recognises the excellent work of Lord Dannatt and the significant progress that this body has made in progressing schemes to prevent flooding in communities across Norfolk.

This Council resolves to:

- Write to Lord Dannatt to thank him for Chairing the Alliance.
- Welcome the role of the NFSA in embedding the strategies to reduce flooding across Norfolk.
- Continue to promote the NFSA and to continue to work with partners to ensure its legacy is maintained.

18.1.2 Cllr Steve Morphew moved as an amendment (which had been accepted by the mover of the motion) to read:

The Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance (NSFA) was founded in February 2021. It was founded after significant surface water flooding issues in

December 2020, led to:

- Over 350 properties being flooded in Norfolk
- 120 settlements being affected

The NSFA, chaired by General Lord Richard Dannatt, has brought together all agencies and partners involved in planning for and responding to flooding in Norfolk.

The NSFA's vision, objectives, approach and structure, are detailed in the NSFA strategy, which are designed to enable countywide responses to flooding across all agencies involved.

This has ensured that Norfolk residents can have confidence that flood risks are as low as reasonably practicable and will be well managed. This is important as Norfolk has suffered from repeated flood events as well as being prone to drought.

The strategy has been accompanied by an action plan, which has identified steps for the NSFA and its members to take to address the risk of flooding. This includes:

- Work on individual sites across Norfolk
- Looking at working out costed solutions to address flood risk and identifying potential funding for each site

This Council recognises the excellent work of Lord Dannatt and the significant progress that this body has made in progressing schemes to prevent flooding in communities across Norfolk.

This Council resolves to:

- Write to Lord Dannatt to thank him for Chairing the Alliance.
- Welcome the role of the NFSA in embedding the strategies to reduce flooding across Norfolk.
- Continue to promote the NFSA and to continue to work with partners to ensure its legacy is maintained.
- **Urge Cabinet to adopt the recommendation from Scrutiny Committee on 23 November 2022 'That Cabinet lobby directly with the Government, and through the work of the Norfolk MPs, for the implementation of Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and for a direct and adequate funding stream for the work of the Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance'.**

Note that Anglian Water has accepted an invitation from Scrutiny Committee to attend their meeting in March to discuss sewage and stormwater overflow issues

- 18.1.3 Following debate, the amendment which had become the substantive motion was put to a recorded vote (Appendix A) and with 59 votes in favour,

0 votes against and 0 abstentions the substantive motion was **AGREED unanimously**.

At this point in the proceedings Council took a break of 30 minutes.

18.2 Motion 2- Norfolk; A County of Sanctuary

18.2.1 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Emma Corlett and seconded by Cllr Colleen Walker:

This Council upholds the principles of dignity and respect for all by encouraging and promoting Norfolk's compassionate and welcoming response to people seeking asylum, refugees and all migrants. We want Norfolk to be a County of Sanctuary; a safe and welcoming place for all.

We recognise the excellent work to welcome and support new arrivals by Norfolk's voluntary, community and religious organisations, foster carers and the Council's own People from Abroad team. We thank individual Norfolk residents who have offered their own homes as a place of safety, made donations or shown small acts of kindness that shows Norfolk at its best.

This Council commits to:

1. Appoint a Councillor to join the Migrant Champions Network, to attend regular meetings of the Network and report back to People & Communities committee, in order to assist the Council with best practice in safeguarding migrants' rights and improving their lived experience and integration.
2. Ensure all councillors have up to date information so they can confidently and accurately signpost residents approaching them for help to the appropriate service for support to ensure their rights are upheld eg. the excellent voluntary & community organisations that support people seeking asylum, refugees and migrants and the People from Abroad Team.
3. Listen to people seeking asylum, refugees and migrants via existing community networks and use what they tell us to improve our services.
4. Use our influence to encourage all Norfolk MPs to sign up to the "MPs not border guards" "place of safety" pledge, to ensure everyone is able to seek confidential advice and representation without fear.
5. Encourage all councillors to sign the open letter to Government demanding adequate funding and resources for accommodation and support for people seeking asylum, refugees and migrants.

6. Continue to lobby government for resources so that all residents can access voluntary and statutory services to meet their needs, and to ensure that we are able to fulfil our duties under the Equality Act.
7. Reaffirm commitments made in the July 2020 Black Lives Matter motion to continue work to address disadvantage, promote equality and eradicate racism; to tackle discrimination and prejudice in all of its forms and recognise our collective responsibility to lead by example.
8. Regrets the drift and delay in implementation of several aspects of the Black Lives Matter motion, in particular a training package on unconscious/structural bias for elected members and learning and development on white privilege and racism as part of engaging all staff and elected members.
9. Commit that none of the Council's own services will directly or indirectly participate in maintaining the Hostile Environment, and will not provide data that we hold, unless legally compelled, to the Home Office for detention and deportation purposes. We will use our influence to encourage our partners to do the same, and note the positive and principled stance taken by many of our voluntary sector advice and support organisations already.

18.2.2 Following discussion, on being put to the vote the motion was **LOST** (Appendix B), there were 21 votes in favour 31 votes against and 1 abstention.

18.3 **Motion 3- Ambulance Waiting Times**

18.3.1 The following motion was proposed by Cllr David Sayers and seconded by Cllr Lucy Shires:

1. Council notes with concern the increase in average Ambulance Response times in East of England – which in the last quarter of 2022 consistently failed to meet target response times.
2. Council would like to record its gratitude to local ambulance staff – who work flat out to keep our community safe every day of the year. However, Council believes the Government has failed to act on warnings that ambulance services are struggling to maintain a safe and timely service.
3. The target response time for a 'Category 1' incident (immediately life threatening) is 7 minutes and within 15 minutes at least nine out of ten times. However, the latest figures from November 2022 showed the average response time in East of England for Category 1 callouts is 10 minutes 29 minutes and missed the nine out of ten times target with 19 minutes 26 Seconds.

4. The target response time for a 'Category 2' incident (major incidents such as strokes or potential heart attacks) is 18 minutes and within 40 minutes at least nine out of ten times, but in November 2022 the average response time in East of England for a Category 2 callout was 1 hour 2 minutes and missed the nine out of ten times target with 2 hours 18 minutes.
5. Compounding this are ambulance handover delays. The NHS standard contract requires handovers should take place within 60 minutes, with 95% taking place within 30 minutes and 65% taking place within 15 minutes. These targets, having been relaxed in March 22. However, the latest figures from December 2022 showed the handover delays in East of England; 36% of handovers failed to meet the 60-minute target and just 43% took place within 30 minutes.
6. Council believes the response times for Category 2 callouts are particularly concerning. Those who suffer serious emergencies such as strokes, severe chest pains and severe burns need to be treated urgently.
7. Council also believes the failure to meet handover targets are particularly concerning. Those who are urgently conveyed to hospital should expect the required care and treatment within a reasonable period.
8. Council instructs the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to commission the CQC, under powers laid out in Section 48 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to conduct an urgent investigation into the causes and impacts of ambulance service delays.
9. Council further agrees for a report to be brought to the next Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting to provide further analysis of:-
 - Ambulance response times in Norfolk
 - Causes of response targets not being met,
 - Causes of handover targets not being met,
 - What support the Council can give local NHS services to improve local ambulance response rates and handover delays.

18.3.2 During discussion, Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention, asked for it to be recorded that while he would be voting against the motion he had a lot of respect for the hard work that was done by ambulance crews during these difficult times.

18.3.3 The Chair took advice from the monitoring officer on a procedural technicality regarding the motion after which Cllr Steve Morphew moved that the motion be referred to the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their consideration (under rule 11.1 d of the constitution).

18.3.4 Cllr Alison Thomas said that the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny

Committee were already due to look at this issue and she would be happy to see the matter moved higher up in their forward work programme.

- 18.3.5 The procedural motion to refer the matter to the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee was then put to the vote and **AGREED** (Appendix C), there were 24 votes in favour 20 votes against and 2 abstentions.

18.4 **Motion 4- Eating Disorders in Norfolk**

- 18.4.1 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Jamie Osborn and seconded by Cllr Alison Thomas:

Eating disorders affect people from all backgrounds, of all genders, and at all ages. In the UK, approximately 1.25 million people have an eating disorder.

The covid pandemic has had a severe impact on people vulnerable to eating disorders in Norfolk. The number of referrals for children and young people with eating disorders doubled during the pandemic, and the number of acute referrals quadrupled. The number of adults with eating disorders in Norfolk is not reported.

Research by the eating disorder charity Beat shows that on average it takes 3½ years for someone to get treatment for an eating disorder. That time is significantly longer for adults, and for males (who make up 25% of those affected). The sooner someone gets treatment for an eating disorder, the more likely they are to make a full recovery, so early intervention is vital.

While clinical guidelines for eating disorder treatment are set nationally, commissioning decisions made by local bodies including the Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care Board can have huge impacts on capacity of NHS services and therefore the quality and effectiveness of treatment. The Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee has carried out some excellent work on scrutinising eating disorder treatment pathways; however delay and drift remains in the system and improvements are therefore needed.

Council resolves to:

1. Support Eating Disorders Awareness Week, including providing information to council employees and supporting public awareness campaigns and sharing information from the NHS and eating disorder charities like Beat. This would include less well-known presentations including binge eating disorder.
2. Investigate options for training of county council employees, eg: social care workers, to spot the signs of eating disorders, what support is available, and where to make appropriate referrals.
3. Continue to work with schools and education providers to ensure that staff in educational settings can spot the signs of eating disorders, what support is available, and make referrals as appropriate.
4. Ask HOSC to scrutinise and challenge the Integrated Care Board and NHS commissioners to:

- a. Review the transition between CAMHS (child and adolescent mental health services) or CYP (children and young people) and adult services for eating disorder patients as this can be a key risk time for patients.
 - b. Identify investment needed to reduce the number of out-of-area placements that can cause significant distress for eating disorder sufferers and their families.
 - c. Review the responsiveness of the referral process from primary care to specialist services, and access to direct referral (including self-referral and referral via the voluntary sector).
 - d. Review the appropriateness of pathways for all presentations of eating disorder, including bulimia, binge eating disorder, OSFED, ARFID, and other presentations.
5. Write to the Government and NHS leaders to call for:
- a. The introduction of waiting times targets for adults in England to ensure that waiting times are monitored and can be improved.
 - b. The scrapping of BMI thresholds for access to eating disorder treatment, which can lead to sufferers not getting treatment or making themselves more ill.
 - c. Measures to improve early intervention, including more in-depth and specialist training for primary care services and GPs; ensuring that services have the capacity to utilise funding to its fullest extent through national workforce planning; investing in CAMHS and adult mental health services to reduce pressure and ensure that patients do not reach crisis care services and GPs; ensuring that services have the capacity to utilise funding to its fullest extent through national workforce planning; investing in CAMHS and adult mental health services to reduce pressure and ensure that patients do not reach crisis point.

18.4.2 Following discussion, the motion was put to the vote and **AGREED** (Appendix D), there were 50 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions.

18.5 **Three-hour meeting time elapses**

At this point in the proceedings the Chair pointed out that the 3 hours for the meeting had elapsed and council had not agreed to extend the meeting.

18.6 As a result, Council moved to the part of the meeting where all remaining business be they motions or amendments to motions would be considered moved and seconded in line with procedure rule 4 (iv).

18.7 The Chair said that she would deal with each motion in turn. Initially she would ask the proposer of the motion if they wanted the motion to go ahead or be withdrawn. If the motion was withdrawn Council would continue through the motions in the order they appeared on the agenda, which was by reference to the size of the group. If the motion was not withdrawn, the Chair would consider if there were amendments. If there were, then Council would vote on those first and then, when those were completed, Council would vote on the substantive motion.

- 18.8 The Chair said that she would like to propose the possibility of all the votes in this section being taken as recorded votes. The Chair then asked for a singular decision to do this, to extend to all votes taken in this section of the meeting and to have a proposer for doing this. This was then proposed by Cllr Long seconded by Cllr Kemp and **AGREED** unanimously.

18.10 **Motion 5- VAT support for Norfolk Business**

The following motion moved by Cllr Carl Annison was deemed moved and seconded.

- 18.10.1 **For the last six years the VAT threshold for businesses has been £85,000 p.a, during which time the level of inflation has been around the Bank of England's target of 2% p.a. However, as a consequence of the illegal invasion of Ukraine and other global economic factors, the current levels of inflation seen across the world has meant that this threshold will be surpassed by many local businesses in the forthcoming year.**

As Norfolk is home to numerous smaller businesses in the leisure, tourism and hospitality sector, this threshold must be modified to address these changes. This Council welcomes the £35bn of support given to these sectors in grants, loans and tax breaks during the pandemic and the recognition of their value to their local communities and the nation as a whole, but now the situation has changed.

This Council resolves to:

- **Support Duncan Baker MP after he raised this in Parliament and write a letter to Government outlining the current situation and seeking support, either through increasing the VAT threshold and/or reducing the VAT rate for the leisure, tourism and hospitality sectors.**

- 18.10.2 On being put to a recorded vote (Appendix E), the motion was **AGREED**, with 32 votes in favour, 9 votes against and 10 abstentions.

18.11 **Motion 6- Support for small businesses**

- 18.11.1 The following motion moved by Cllr Rob Colwell was deemed moved and seconded

This Council acknowledges that small businesses are the lifeblood of many rural economies, and this is particularly so in Norfolk where 90% of businesses fall into this category. Their success matters not just to them but to the Norfolk economy as a whole.

This Council recognises that businesses are aware that they must adjust and reset to market conditions. However, the energy and supply side inflation issues of the last year have been truly exceptional, and businesses have also had to endure two years of operating within a pandemic environment which has drained them of all important cash reserves.

This Council notes that we are currently experiencing one of the harshest winters for some time, and the Government's intention to pull the plug on support comes at the worst possible time. No business would have planned for the huge increases in energy costs that we have seen in the past year.

This Council notes the recent survey by the Federation of Small Businesses which shows that up to a third of businesses plan to scale back, reduce hours or close for good in the coming months. A reduction in energy support by the Government at the end of March means local businesses face another cliff-edge situation, when real, meaningful and lasting support is clearly needed.

This Council notes that wholesale energy prices are now falling, which will reduce the impact on the cost to Government. However, continued help for businesses beyond the end of March will provide them with the certainty that they need, as they will almost inevitably need to pass on the increased energy costs to customers.

This Council resolves to request the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer asking for a reconsideration of changes to the Energy Bill Relief Scheme and its continuation at the current level for a further six months.

The following amendment moved by Cllr Fabian Eagle was deemed moved and seconded.

This Council acknowledges that small businesses are the lifeblood of many rural economies, and this is particularly so in Norfolk where 90% of businesses fall into this category. Their success matters not just to them but to the Norfolk economy as a whole.

This Council recognises that businesses are aware that they must adjust and reset to market conditions. However, the energy and supply side inflation issues of the last year have been truly exceptional, and businesses have also had to endure two years of operating within a pandemic environment. ~~which has drained them of all important cash reserves.~~

This Council notes that we are currently experiencing one of the harshest winters for some time, ~~and the Government's intention to pull the plug on support comes at the worst possible time. No business would have planned for the huge increases in energy costs that we have seen in the past year.~~

This Council notes the recent survey by the Federation of Small Businesses which shows that up to a third of businesses plan to scale back, reduce hours or close for good in the coming months. ~~A reduction in energy support by the Government at the end of March means local businesses face another cliff-edge situation, when real, meaningful and lasting support is clearly needed.~~

This Council notes that wholesale energy prices are now falling, which will reduce the impact on the cost to Government. However, continued help for businesses beyond the end of March will provide them with the certainty that they need, as they will almost inevitably need to pass on the increased energy costs to customers.

This Council resolves to request the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer ~~asking for a reconsideration of changes to the Energy Bill Relief Scheme and its continuation at the current level for a further six months.~~ asking for a hardship fund to be devolved to the County Council to enable Norfolk to best direct support to those businesses most in energy needs

- 18.11.2 On being put to a recorded vote (Appendix F), the amendment was **CARRIED** and became the substantive motion, with 38 votes in favour, 11 votes against and 1 abstention.

The substantive motion then was **AGREED unanimously** (Appendix G) with 51 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions.

18.12 **Motion 7- Norwich Western Link**

- 18.12.1 This motion was withdrawn.

18.13 **Motion 8- Carer's Leave Bill**

The following motion proposed by Cllr Brian Watkins was deemed moved and seconded.

- 18.13.1 1.This Council notes:

- a) The growing care crisis in our country. There are over 2 million employees (Family Resources Survey 2019-20) providing unpaid care to friends and families, such as providing personal care, arranging medical and social support, and attending appointments. As the population ages and with more people staying in work longer, these numbers will only increase.
- b) The pressure on people as they balance their work with caring for loved ones or friends. Carers are often required to use their own annual leave allowances to meet their caring responsibilities, risking burn-out.

- 2.This Council believes that more action is needed to support people in work with caring responsibilities.

- 3.Council therefore proposes to support the Carer's Leave Bill being brought through Parliament by Liberal Democrat MP Wendy Chamberlain who will, for the first time, create a statutory entitlement

to offer unpaid leave for employees with caring responsibilities.

- a) The objective of the Bill will be to support carers to juggle work and care and for employers to maximise retention and wellbeing.
- b) It is expected to provide for up to one week's unpaid leave per year and would provide flexibility for carers to take smaller amounts of leave from half days up to one week, making things more flexible for employees and employers. The right would be intended to apply to all employees, effectively starting from day one of employment.
- c) Eligibility for the leave would be clearly defined in the Bill, taking a broad approach to reflect the wide range of caring relationships and responsibilities.

4. Council therefore:-

- a) resolves for the Leader/Chief Executive to write to our local MP(s) asking them if they will support the Carer's Leave Bill.
- b) resolves to review its own communications and support for local advice services for carers, to see if there is any support that can be given locally.

18.13.2 On being put to the vote the motion (Appendix H) was **LOST**, there being 18 votes in favour, 30 votes against and 1 abstention.

18.14 **Motion 9- Plant-based food**

18.14.1 This motion was withdrawn.

19 **To answer questions under Rule 9.3 of the Council Procedure Rules (if any received).**

19.1 None were received.

20 **Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees (Standard item).**

20.1 None were received.

The meeting ended at 1.46 pm

Chair



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2024 APPENDIX A

RECORDED VOTE Motion 1 - Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance
(substantive motion)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	x			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	x			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	x			MAXFIELD Ed		x	
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	x			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	x			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	x			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed	x			RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	x			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	x			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	x			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	59
Against	0
Abstentions	0

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX B

RECORDED VOTE Motion 2- Norfolk; A County of Sanctuary (Labour motion)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley		x		MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill		x		OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire		x		OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart		x		PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	x		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip		x		SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	x		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison		x	
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	x		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	21
Against	31
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX C

RECORDED VOTE Motion 3- Ambulance Waiting Times (Liberal Democrat motion) -vote on procedural motion to refer the matter to the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill		x		OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire		x		OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	x			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma	Absent			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	x		
DUFFIN Barry	Absent			SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison			x
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	Absent			WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	x			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	Absent			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	24
Against	20
Abstentions	2

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX D

RECORDED VOTE Motion 4- Eating Disorders in Norfolk (Green motion)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	x			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	x			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	x			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg	Absent		
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham	x		
CLANCY Stuart	x			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew	x		
CONNOLLY Ed	x			RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert	x		
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	x			SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry	x		
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	x		
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric	x		
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen	x		
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	x			WARD John	x		
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	50
Against	0
Abstentions	0

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX E

**RECORDED VOTE Motion 5- VAT support for Norfolk Business
(Conservative Motion)**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan			x	MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	x			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve		x	
BIRMINGHAM Alison		x		NEALE Paul			x
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	x			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	x			OSBORN Jamie			x
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie		x		PECK Greg	x		
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul			x
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham	x		
CLANCY Stuart	x			PRICE Ben			x
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert			x	PROCTOR Andrew	x		
CONNOLLY Ed	x			RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma		x		Reilly Matthew		x	
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan			x
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike		x	
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert	x		
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy			x
DUIGAN Phillip	x			SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry	x		
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	x		
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric	x		
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	x			WARD John	x		
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian			x
JERMY Terry		x		WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda		x		WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra		x		WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	32
Against	9
Abstentions	10

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX F

**RECORDED VOTE Motion 6- Support for small businesses
(Conservative amendment)**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan		x		MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	x			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul		x	
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	x			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	x			OSBORN Jamie		x	
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg	x		
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul		x	
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham	x		
CLANCY Stuart	x			PRICE Ben		x	
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert		x		PROCTOR Andrew	x		
CONNOLLY Ed	x			RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma	Absent			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan		x	
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert	x		
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy		x	
DUIGAN Phillip	x			SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry	x		
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	x		
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric	x		
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	x			WARD John	x		
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian		x	
JERMY Terry		x		WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra		x		WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	38
Against	11
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX G

**RECORDED VOTE Motion 6- Support for small businesses
(substantive motion)**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	x			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	x			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	x			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg	x		
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham	x		
CLANCY Stuart	x			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew	x		
CONNOLLY Ed	x			RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert	x		
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	x			SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry	x		
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	x		
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric	x		
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen	x		
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	x			WARD John	x		
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	51
Against	0
Abstentions	0

Norfolk County Council
Date: 24 January 2023 APPENDIX H

RECORDED VOTE Motion 8- Carer's Leave Bill (Liberal Democrat motion)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	Absent			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian	Absent		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley		x		MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	Absent		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	Absent			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill		x		OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire		x		OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham	Absent			PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart		x		PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed	Absent			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will	Absent		
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael	Absent			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	Absent			SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret	Absent			SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip		x		SMITH Carl	Absent		
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin	Absent		
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison		x	
GRANT Andy	Absent			THOMSON Vic	Absent		
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane		x		WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	Absent		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith				WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	18
Against	30
Abstentions	1

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

21 February 2023
Item No 5

Norfolk County Council Revenue and Capital Budget 2023-24 to 2026-27

To enable Members to reach agreement about the Council's Revenue and Capital Budget 2023-27, there are a suite of papers contained here which cover the following:

- **Briefing for all Councillors from the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services** setting out the latest financial position for the Council;
- **Annexe 1 – Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27 report** [as presented to Cabinet 30/01/2023 and amended as detailed in the Briefing report below]:
 - Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24
 - Appendix 2: Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-24 to 2026-27
 - Appendix 3: Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-24 to 2026-27
 - Appendix 4: Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-24 to 2026-27
 - Appendix 5: Findings of Public Consultation
 - Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment
 - Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service
- **Annexe 2 – Capital Strategy and Programme 2023-24 report** [as presented to Cabinet 30/01/2023], including:
 - Appendix A: Capital strategy 2023-24
 - Appendix B: Capital bids prioritisation
 - Appendix C: Capital programme 2022-27 – existing schemes summary
 - Appendix D: New and extended capital schemes
- **Annexe 3 – Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 report** [as presented to Cabinet 30/01/2023], including:
 - Appendix 1: Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2023-24
 - Appendix 2: Ratings comparative analysis
 - Appendix 3: Indicative List of Approved Counterparties for Lending
 - Appendix 4: Time and monetary limits applying to investments
 - Appendix 5: The Capital and Treasury Prudential Indicators
 - Appendix 6: Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) – Credit and counterparty risk management
 - Appendix 7: Approved Countries for Investments
 - Appendix 8: Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation
 - Appendix 9: The Treasury Management Role of the Section 151 Officer
 - Appendix 10: Non-treasury investments

The Cabinet meeting on 30 January 2023 received reports relating to the Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2023-24. The original versions of these are available in the [meeting](#)

[papers](#)¹. As set out in the Executive Director's briefing, no material changes have arisen since the Cabinet papers were considered. As a result, other than the corrections detailed below in relation to table 31 and Appendix 7 of Annexe 1, the annexed technical budget papers have **not** been updated from the versions considered by Cabinet.

Further details are set out in the following briefing.

¹<https://norfolkcc.cmis.uk.com/norfolkcc/CalendarofMeetings/tabid/128/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/496/Meeting/1905/Committee/169/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

Recommendations to County Council

The County Council is recommended to:

In respect of the Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24 and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27 report (Annexe 1):

The Cabinet recommendations to County Council in respect of the Budget are shown below. As part of considering the proposed Revenue Budget on 30 January, Cabinet also resolved to:

To consider the statements regarding the uncertain planning environment, robustness of budget estimates, assumptions and risks relating to the 2023-24 budget, and authorise the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance, to make any changes required to reflect Final Local Government Finance Settlement information (if available), or changes in council tax and business rates forecasts from District Councils, in order to maintain a balanced budget position for presentation to Full Council. In recognition of the budget gap forecast for 2024-25, and to enable a final balanced Budget position to be recommended to County Council, Cabinet agreed the following principles:

- a) that any additional resources which become available should be used to delay the use of one-off funding from reserves from 2023-24 to 2024-25, or*
- b) that any income shortfall should be addressed from the Corporate Business Risk Reserve (to the extent possible). Where the Corporate Business Risk Reserve is insufficient, to note that the ultimate source of funding to balance the Budget will be the General Fund.*

ALL REFERENCES IN THE RECOMMENDATIONS RELATE TO THE ANNEXED REPORTS

Cabinet RESOLVED to:

1) Recommend to County Council:

- a) The level of risk and budget assumptions set out in the Robustness of Estimates report (Appendix 4 of the report), which underpin the revenue and capital budget decisions and planning for 2023-27.**
- b) The general principle of seeking to increase general fund balances as part of closing the 2022-23 accounts and that in 2023-24 any further additional resources which become available during the year should be added to the general fund balance wherever possible.**
- c) The findings of public consultation (Appendix 5 of the report), which should be considered when agreeing the 2023-24 Budget (Appendix 1 of the report).**
- d) To note the advice of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services (Section 151 Officer), in Section 5 of Appendix 1 of the report, on the financial impact of an increase in council tax and the sustainability of the Council's medium term position.**
- e) That the Council's 2023-24 Budget will include a general council tax increase of 2.99% and a 2.00% increase in the Adult Social Care precept, an overall increase of 4.99% (shown in Section 5 of Appendix 1 of the report), as recommended by**

the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, and resulting in an increased overall County Council Net Revenue Budget of £493.707m for 2023-24, including budget increases of £169.523m and budget decreases of -£139.939m as set out in Table 15 of Appendix 1 of the report, and the actions required to deliver the proposed savings, subject to any changes required in line with recommendation 1 above to enable a balanced budget to be proposed. This would result in a budget gap of £45.920m [*£46.216m as updated following Final Settlement*] to be addressed for 2024-25, and £124.127m [*£126.522m as updated following Final Settlement*] over the life of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

- f) The budget proposals set out for 2024-25 to 2026-27, including authorising Executive Directors to take the action required to deliver budget savings for 2024-25 to 2026-27 as appropriate.
- g) With regard to the future years, that further plans, including phase two of the Strategic Review, to meet the remaining budget shortfalls in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 are developed and brought back to Cabinet during 2023-24 in line with the proposed timetable and that a report on the next steps of the Strategic Review will be brought to the March Cabinet meeting.
- h) Noting Government's assumptions that local authorities will raise the maximum council tax available to them, and that the final level of council tax for future years is subject to Member decisions annually (informed by any referendum principles defined by the Government), to confirm, or otherwise, the assumptions set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS Table 2 in Appendix 2 of the report) that the Council's budget planning for 2024-25 will include for planning purposes:
 - i) general council tax increases of 2.99% (1.99% from 2025-26);
 - ii) Adult Social Care precept increases of 2.00% (1.00% 2025-26 and 0.00% 2026-27); and
 - iii) that if the referendum threshold were increased in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 to above 2.99%, or any further discretion were offered to increase the Adult Social Care precept (or similar), the Section 151 Officer would recommend the Council take full advantage of any flexibility in view of the overall financial position.
- i) That the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services be authorised to transfer from the County Fund to the Salaries and General Accounts all sums necessary in respect of revenue and capital expenditure provided in the 2023-24 Budget, to make payments, to raise and repay loans, and to invest funds.
- j) To agree the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27 as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, including the two policy objectives to be achieved:
 - i) Revenue: To identify further funding or savings for 2024-25 to 2026-27 to produce a balanced budget in all years 2023-27 in accordance with the timetable set out in the Revenue Budget report (Section 4 of Appendix 1 of the report).
 - ii) Capital: To continue to provide a framework for identifying and prioritising capital requirements and proposals to ensure that all capital investment is targeted at meeting the Council's priorities.
- k) The mitigating actions proposed in the equality impact assessments (Appendix 6 of the report).
- l) Note the planned reduction in non-schools earmarked and general reserves of 48.94% over five years, from £182.994m (March 2022) to £93.441m (March 2027) (Section 6 of Appendix 3 of the report);
- m) Note the policy on reserves and provisions in Section 3 of Appendix 3 of the report;
- n) Agree, based on current planning assumptions and risk forecasts set out in Section 5 of Appendix 3 of the report:
 - i) for 2023-24, a minimum level of general balances of £25.340m, and

- ii) a forecast minimum level for planning purposes of
 - 2024-25, £26.590m;
 - 2025-26, £27.840m; and
 - 2026-27, £29.090m.as part of the consideration of the budget plans for 2023-27 and supporting these budget recommendations;
- o) Agree the use of non-school Earmarked Reserves, as set out in Section 6 of Appendix 3 of the report.

In respect of the Capital Strategy and Programme 2023-24 report (Annexe 2):

Cabinet RESOLVED to:

- 2) To refer the programme to the County Council for approval, including the new and extended capital schemes outlined in Appendix D of the report;
- 3) To recommend to County Council the Council's Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy for 2023-24 as set out in Section 5 of the report.

In respect of the Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 report (Annexe 3):

Cabinet RESOLVED to:

- 4) Endorse and recommend to County Council the Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy for 2023-24 as set out in Annex 1 of the report, including:
 - The Capital Prudential Indicators included in the body of the report
 - The Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2023-24 in Appendix 1 of the report
 - The list of approved counterparties at Appendix 4 of the report
 - The Treasury Management Prudential Indicators detailed in Appendix 5 of the report

For inclusion within the policy framework.

BRIEFING FOR COUNCILLORS FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES

1. Revenue Budget 2023-24

- 1.1. Since the preparation of the budget reports for the Cabinet meeting on 30 January 2023, no changes have been received from District Councils in respect of Council Tax tax base and collection fund positions.
- 1.2. Final information in relation to forecast Business Rates for 2023-24 is still to be confirmed in respect of District Council NNDR1 returns. Returns to date indicate that there will be additional funding from business rates in 2023-24 compared to the Cabinet position, but this will not be fully confirmed until all District forecasts are received. As a result, there may be in-year adjustments to business rates income for 2023-24 and these will be reported as part of normal financial monitoring during the year.
- 1.3. Shortly ahead of the publication of these papers, on 6 February 2023, the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities published details of the [final Local Government Finance Settlement 2023-24](#)². The Settlement makes limited changes to the previously announced provisional allocations but does **provide an additional £0.740m of funding for Norfolk County Council for 2023-24**. The changes include:
 - An increase in Rural Services Delivery Grant by £10m nationally (11.8%), bringing the total to £95m – in “*recognition of specific cost pressures in rural areas*”. Additional **£0.492m** grant for Norfolk County Council.
 - An increase in New Homes Bonus by £0.63m reflecting updated data. No change for Norfolk County Council.
 - An increase in Services Grant by £19.1m due to funding previously held as contingency being distributed and the 3% minimum funding guarantee being recalculated. Additional **£0.248m** grant for Norfolk County Council.
 - Bespoke council tax flexibilities for Croydon, Slough and Thurrock – Croydon will be allowed an additional 10%, whilst Slough and Thurrock an additional 5% – meaning potential total increases of 15% and 10% respectively. No change for Norfolk County Council.
- 1.4. At its meeting 30 January 2023, Cabinet agreed “*that any additional resources which become available should be used to delay the use of one-off funding from reserves from 2023-24 to 2024-25.*” Accordingly, the additional funding of £0.740m announced at the Final Settlement has been used to reduce the planned draw on the Business Rates Risk reserve to support 2023-24 revenue budget.
- 1.5. Outside of the Settlement, the Government has also announced:

²<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/final-local-government-finance-settlement-england-2023-to-2024>

- £100m nationally is to be returned to local authorities from the accumulated surplus held in the business rates levy account. This will be distributed on a one-off basis in line with each local authority's 2013-14 Settlement Funding Assessment. For Norfolk County Council this amounts to **£1.300m**.³ The Levy Account surplus relates to 2022-23 and it is therefore anticipated that it will be recognised in the 2022-23 financial position (i.e. although announced as part of the Settlement it does not form part of the 2023-24 Budget).
- 1.6. Public Health Grant allocations for 2023-24 remain to be confirmed at the time of writing.
- 1.7. **For the purposes of setting the 2023-24 Budget, there were no further substantive changes following the [parliamentary debate](#), which took place 8 February 2023.**
- 1.8. Any future variations arising within the 2023-24 Budget will be reported to Members as part of the usual monitoring processes through the year. Please note that due to the timing of the Government announcement, the appended technical papers have **not** been updated to include the final Settlement. However, two amendments have been made to the appended Annexe 1 paper to reflect:
- A correction to the Finance General budget shown in Table 31 of Annexe 1, Appendix 1 (page 336 of [published Cabinet papers](#)) where the figure for pay contingency had not been correctly carried through from Table 14. The correct figure should be £6.766m and the Finance General budget in Table 31 should therefore have shown a total net budget of -£214.029m (as shown correctly elsewhere in the Budget papers presented to Cabinet).
 - An amendment to information supporting the mobile library proposal (Annexe 1, Appendix 7), as follows:
 - As part of the proposed change for the mobile library service we published (Appendix 7.2 of the papers considered by Cabinet on 30 January) a list of the stops that would be removed from existing routes as part of the proposal to ensure that the immediate impact could be understood. Since the time the list was originally compiled, we have identified a small administration error in the list. We have also received further information about some of these stops from key stakeholders. As a result, the list has been amended to reflect an up to date position on the impact of the proposal.
 - This means that the total number of stops that would cease under this proposal has reduced from 242 to 221, a reduction of 21 stops. Those stops removed from the list are highlighted on the amended version.
 - The remainder of the proposal is unchanged. We have reviewed the findings of the equality impact assessment and, with the exception of the change in the number of stops, the assessment remains accurate and the conclusions on the impact of the proposal remain the same.
- 1.9. As set out elsewhere, apart from these corrections, the technical reports considered by Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee have **not** been updated to reflect the financial impacts of any final changes for 2023-24 as set out in this paper. The changes in the final budget position for County Council are set out within this briefing and relate to:

³https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1134313/SFA_Levy_Allocations.xlsx

- Final inflation estimates for future years (2024-25 onwards).
- Additional funding announced at the final Settlement which has been used to reduce the call on reserves in 2023-24.

1.10. The net effect of these changes is **nil** in relation to the overall 2023-24 Budget as considered and proposed by Cabinet. Based on District forecasts, as reported to Cabinet, the overall increase of 4.99%, as recommended by Cabinet, will result in an **overall County Council Net Revenue Budget of £493.707m for 2023-24**, including budget increases of £169.523m and budget decreases of -£139.939m. The revision of inflation figures, means that **the overall gap position for future years has increased by £2.395m to £126.522m**, with a budget gap of **£46.216m** to be addressed for 2024-25 as summarised in the tables below.

Table 1: Technical adjustments to proposed Revenue Budget since 30 January 2023 Cabinet

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Budget gap at 30 January 2023 Cabinet	0.000	45.920	35.491	42.716	124.127
Final inflation adjustments	0.000	1.035	1.035	1.065	3.135
Change in Rural Services Delivery Grant at Final Settlement 2023-24	-0.492	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.492
Additional 2023-24 Services Grant funding at Final Settlement 2023-24	-0.248	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.248
Reduction in draw on reserves to support 2023-24 revenue budget	0.740	-0.740	0.000	0.000	0.000
Final proposed Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy gap as at 21 February 2023 County Council	0.000	46.216	36.526	43.781	126.522

Table 2: Proposed Net Budget by Department

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Adult Social Services	249.481	256.498	269.273	282.599
Children's Services	232.593	248.053	258.194	268.118
Community and Environmental Services	177.109	184.900	192.139	198.818
Strategy and Transformation	12.761	13.112	13.872	14.573
Finance and Commercial Services Department	35.793	36.518	37.319	38.266
Finance General	-214.029	-171.745	-145.985	-117.466
Total Net Budget	493.707	567.337	624.811	684.908
Council Tax	493.707	521.121	542.070	558.386
Budget Gap (cumulative)	0.000	46.216	82.742	126.522

2. Capital Programme

- 2.1. There have been no changes to the proposed capital programme since 30 January 2023 Cabinet.

3. Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24

- 3.1. There have been no changes to the proposed Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 since 30 January 2023 Cabinet.

4. Summary

- 4.1. The technical Budget papers annexed to this briefing reflect the position recommended to County Council by Cabinet 30 January 2023. The original versions of all reports, including covering reports, can also be found [here](#). The final budget for approval by County Council includes the technical adjustments described within this briefing note in respect of changes for 2023-24 and final inflation estimates from 2024-25 onwards as set out in Table 1. Any subsequent changes, for example in respect of further business rates forecasts, will be reported as part of in-year monitoring during 2023-24.

Simon George
Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Cabinet

Item No: 5. Annexe 1

Decision making report title: 2023-24 Revenue Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27

Date of meeting: 30 January 2023

Responsible Cabinet Member: Cllr Andrew Jamieson (Cabinet Member for Finance)

Responsible Director: Simon George (Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services)

Is this a key decision? Yes/No

If this is a key decision, date added to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions: 31 March 2022

Introduction from Cabinet Member

I am pleased that this report sets out a balanced Budget proposal for 2023-24 in spite of a budget process which has been extremely challenging this year as a result of a number of complex, interrelated issues. At the very outset, the MTFS position agreed in February 2022 anticipated a budget gap for 2023-24 of almost £60m, by far the largest recurrent gap this administration has ever had to tackle. Since that time, as the budget setting process progressed, a number of external factors have combined to worsen the position. These included the Russian invasion of Ukraine, which has clearly had very significant international and humanitarian implications as well as driving up energy prices and contributing to the wider cost of living crisis in a variety of ways. The cost of living crisis itself at a more local level has resulted in increased demand for some Council services, but has also been characterised by unusually high levels of inflation compared to those experienced in recent years, which have themselves placed considerable pressure on the Council's budgets for both 2022-23 and 2023-24. We have therefore seen very significant additional cost pressures emerge during the year, including (for example) the local government pay award for 2022-23 and the level of the National Living Wage agreed for 2023-24, all of which have needed to be addressed within the 2023-24 Budget.

Alongside these issues, the domestic national political and economic climate has resulted in challenges both directly in terms of higher interest rates and more indirectly in relation to increased levels of uncertainty within the Council's planning assumptions. One direct impact was the repeated uncertainty and delay around Government fiscal announcements, including the Autumn Statement, which had a knock on effect in terms of the publication of the Provisional Settlement very late in December 2022. As a result

of all these pressures and uncertainties, the balanced Budget presented in these papers inevitably includes some difficult decisions.

These core risks and uncertainties were precisely why the Council responded so promptly to the challenge of setting the 2023-24 Budget, developing a two-pronged approach to tackling the substantial Budget gap. This was based on an early start to the Council's usual robust budget and savings development process, alongside in parallel a more fundamental Strategic Review of the whole organisation, intended to both deliver £15-20m in savings and ensure that the Council is fully fit for the future. Details of the implications of the Strategic Review for the Budget are set out elsewhere in this report.

When they eventually came, the Autumn Statement (and the Provisional Settlement in its turn) set out a slightly better funding position for local authorities than many had perhaps anticipated. However, this additional funding has unfortunately been accompanied by the material new pressures referred to previously. It therefore remains the case that the Council must work exceptionally hard even to simply keep pace with the ever increasing inflationary and demand pressures which are being experienced across so many areas of service delivery.

Taking the above into account, I am therefore pleased to be able to confirm that as a result of all these activities, the Council has risen to the challenge of addressing the £60m Budget gap for 2023-24. The papers attached to this report set out the details of a balanced Budget for 2023-24, based on a gross total of £53.519m of new savings (including £17.063m relating to the Strategic Review). I am also pleased to note that the percentage of savings that can be broadly badged as 'doing things better for less', or 'transformation', is a significant proportion of the total. This is not to gloss over the fact that these proposals require making some very difficult decisions including material savings across all services, and proposing that Cabinet recommend that Full Council agree a 4.99% council tax increase for 2023-24, and also assume the same level of increase for 2024-25 planning purposes.

However these decisions will enable the recommendation of a robust and sustainable budget to Full Council, one which delivers on our key priorities for the County:

1. A vibrant clean and sustainable economy
2. Better opportunities for children and young people
3. Healthy, fulfilling and independent lives
4. Strong, engaged and inclusive communities
5. A greener, more resilient future

Moreover this is a Budget which will:

- Protect our vital public services including Adults and Children's social care;
- Invest in our local economy through the establishment of a £2.000m fund to include the delivery of projects via the Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF);
- Support the delivery of the County Deal to unlock future investment (if it is ultimately agreed through local-decision making processes);

- Minimise any reductions in the services we deliver which are valued by so many across the County, instead targeting efficiency savings and transformation as a priority;
- Deliver a robust platform on which to develop a sustainable Budget for future years; and
- Put continuing transformation of the way we deliver our services at the heart of our cost control initiatives.

Executive Summary

Appended to this report are a set of papers which support the Council's Revenue Budget decisions for 2023-24.

- [Appendix 1](#): Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24
- [Appendix 2](#): Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-24 to 2026-27
- [Appendix 3](#): Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-24 to 2026-27
- [Appendix 4](#): Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-24 to 2026-27
- [Appendix 5](#): Findings of Public Consultation
- [Appendix 6](#): Equality Impact Assessment
- [Appendix 7](#): Review of Mobile Library Service

Collectively, these papers provide an overview of the Council's strategic and financial planning for 2023-24 to 2026-27 and set out the detailed information to support Cabinet's Revenue Budget and council tax recommendations to the County Council, including the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' (s151 Officer's) statutory assessment of the robustness of the overall budget. In particular, the papers:

- explain the background to planning for the 2023-24 Revenue Budget, including the wider funding context for the County Council;
- set out the growth and savings proposals for budget planning in both the 2023-24 Revenue Budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2024-25 to 2026-27;
- recommend the overall level of council tax in 2023-24 based on a 4.99% increase, and future year council tax assumptions including 4.99% for 2024-25, setting out the implications of these for the MTFS position;
- set out forecasts of the level of reserves and provisions across the life of the MTFS;
- provide the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' view on the robustness of the estimates used in the preparation of the 2023-24 Budget; and
- outline the findings of public consultation and equality impact assessment, along with proposed mitigations.

Recommendations:

- 1) To consider the statements regarding the uncertain planning environment, robustness of budget estimates, assumptions and risks relating to the 2023-24 budget, and authorise the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial**

Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance, to make any changes required to reflect Final Local Government Finance Settlement information (if available), or changes in council tax and business rates forecasts from District Councils, in order to maintain a balanced budget position for presentation to Full Council. In recognition of the budget gap forecast for 2024-25, and to enable a final balanced Budget position to be recommended to County Council, Cabinet is asked to agree the following principles:

- a) that any additional resources which become available should be used to delay the use of one-off funding from reserves from 2023-24 to 2024-25, or
 - b) that any income shortfall should be addressed from the Corporate Business Risk Reserve (to the extent possible). Where the Corporate Business Risk Reserve is insufficient, to note that the ultimate source of funding to balance the Budget will be the General Fund.
- 2) To review the findings of public consultation as set out in [Section 13 of Appendix 1](#), in full in [Appendix 5](#), and in [Appendix 7](#) in relation to Mobile Libraries, and consider these when recommending the budget changes required to deliver a balanced budget as set out in [Appendix 1](#).
 - 3) To consider and comment on the findings of equality impact assessments, as set out in [Appendix 6](#) to this report (also [Appendix 7](#) in relation to Mobile Libraries), and in doing so, note the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
 - 4) To note that the Council has responded to the consultation undertaken on the Provisional Local Government Settlement for 2023-24 as detailed in [Section 3 of Appendix 1](#).
 - 5) To note that the Council will continue to operate a Business Rates Pool for 2023-24 in partnership with Norfolk District Councils on the same terms as the existing 2022-23 Pool and as set out in [Section 6 of Appendix 1](#), and approve the use of 2022-23 Pool funds as set out.
 - 6) To agree to recommend to County Council:
 - a) The level of risk and budget assumptions set out in the Robustness of Estimates report ([Appendix 4](#)), which underpin the revenue and capital budget decisions and planning for 2023-27.
 - b) The general principle of seeking to increase general fund balances as part of closing the 2022-23 accounts and that in 2023-24 any further additional

resources which become available during the year should be added to the general fund balance wherever possible.

- c) The findings of public consultation ([Appendix 5](#)), which should be considered when agreeing the 2023-24 Budget ([Appendix 1](#)).
- d) To note the advice of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services (Section 151 Officer), in [Section 5 of Appendix 1](#), on the financial impact of an increase in council tax and the sustainability of the Council's medium term position.
- e) That the Council's 2023-24 Budget will include a general council tax increase of 2.99% and a 2.00% increase in the Adult Social Care precept, an overall increase of 4.99% (shown in [Section 5 of Appendix 1](#)), as recommended by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, and resulting in an increased overall County Council Net Revenue Budget of £493.707m for 2023-24, including budget increases of £169.523m and budget decreases of -£139.939m as set out in [Table 15 of Appendix 1](#), and the actions required to deliver the proposed savings, subject to any changes required in line with recommendation 1 above to enable a balanced budget to be proposed. This would result in a budget gap of £45.920m to be addressed for 2024-25, and £124.127m over the life of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- f) The budget proposals set out for 2024-25 to 2026-27, including authorising Executive Directors to take the action required to deliver budget savings for 2024-25 to 2026-27 as appropriate.
- g) With regard to the future years, that further plans, including phase two of the Strategic Review, to meet the remaining budget shortfalls in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 are developed and brought back to Cabinet during 2023-24 in line with the proposed timetable.
- h) Noting Government's assumptions that local authorities will raise the maximum council tax available to them, and that the final level of council tax for future years is subject to Member decisions annually (informed by any referendum principles defined by the Government), to confirm, or otherwise, the assumptions set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy ([MTFS Table 2 in Appendix 2](#)) that the Council's budget planning for 2024-25 will include for planning purposes:
 - i) general council tax increases of 2.99% (1.99% from 2025-26);
 - ii) Adult Social Care precept increases of 2.00% (1.00% 2025-26 and 0.00% 2026-27); and
 - iii) that if the referendum threshold were increased in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 to above 2.99%, or any further discretion were offered to increase the Adult Social Care precept (or similar), the Section 151 Officer would recommend the Council take full advantage of any flexibility in view of the overall financial position.
- i) That the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services be authorised to transfer from the County Fund to the Salaries and General Accounts all sums necessary in respect of revenue and capital expenditure provided in the 2023-24 Budget, to make payments, to raise and repay loans, and to invest funds.
- j) To agree the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27 as set out in [Appendix 2](#), including the two policy objectives to be achieved:

- i) **Revenue:** To identify further funding or savings for 2024-25 to 2026-27 to produce a balanced budget in all years 2023-27 in accordance with the timetable set out in the Revenue Budget report ([Section 4 of Appendix 1](#)).
- ii) **Capital:** To continue to provide a framework for identifying and prioritising capital requirements and proposals to ensure that all capital investment is targeted at meeting the Council's priorities.
- k) The [mitigating actions](#) proposed in the equality impact assessments ([Appendix 6](#)).
- l) Note the planned reduction in non-schools earmarked and general reserves of 48.94% over five years, from £182.994m (March 2022) to £93.441m (March 2027) ([Section 6 of Appendix 3](#));
- m) Note the policy on reserves and provisions in [Section 3 of Appendix 3](#);
- n) Agree, based on current planning assumptions and risk forecasts set out in [Section 5 of Appendix 3](#):
 - i) for 2023-24, a minimum level of general balances of £25.340m, and
 - ii) a forecast minimum level for planning purposes of
 - 2024-25, £26.590m;
 - 2025-26, £27.840m; and
 - 2026-27, £29.090m.

as part of the consideration of the budget plans for 2023-27 and supporting these budget recommendations;

- o) Agree the use of non-school Earmarked Reserves, as set out in [Section 6 of Appendix 3](#).

1. Background and Purpose

1.1. Norfolk County Council's robust and well-established approach to medium term service and financial planning is based on the preparation of a rolling Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), with an annual budget agreed each year.

1.2. The County Council agreed the 2022-23 Budget and MTFS to 2025-26 at its meeting 21 February 2022. Cabinet has since received reports through the year on the emerging 2023-24 Budget position and related matters. This report now sets out the final 2023-24 Budget proposals and associated MTFS to 2026-27 for Cabinet consideration and recommendation to Full Council. The report brings together a range of information to support Cabinet's consideration of how the proposals contribute to delivering an overall balanced budget for the whole Council, and all relevant factors to inform recommendations. To enable discussion of the budget position it:

- Summarises details of Cabinet decisions to date;
- Provides a summary of announcements made at the Autumn Statement 2022, and the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement for 2023-24.

- Summarises the latest position in relation to some of the significant uncertainties facing local government finances.
- Sets out details of risks to the MTFS position for 2023-24 onwards.
- Provides an overview of some of the key issues facing services in relation to their financial strategy, pressures, risks and uncertainties and details the saving proposals identified by each Service in order to contribute to setting a balanced Budget for 2023-24.
- Details the outcomes of Service Department and Corporate planning, the input from Scrutiny Committee and Select Committees during the year, and the results of public consultation and equality impact assessments.

1.3. During the budget setting process, Scrutiny Committee has considered the development of the budget. The Council's three Select Committees have also received reports on the broad approach to developing budget proposals for the services within their remit at meetings held in May, and detailed proposals at meetings in November. Select Committee comments on the Budget process are set out in Section 11.

2. Proposals

2.1. This report and its appendices now set out the latest information on the financial and planning context for the County Council for 2023-24 to 2026-27. They summarise the pressures, changes and savings proposals for 2023-24 for all Departments, in order to present the proposed cash limited revenue budget of £493.707m, based on a 4.99% increase in council tax. The Budget report to Cabinet includes the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' advice about the implications of a 4.99% council tax increase for the robustness of the Council's MTFS position. The budget setting process undertaken throughout the development of the 2023-24 budget, including work delivered via the Strategic Review, has enabled the identification of robust savings. Simultaneously the proposed Budget reflects a significant investment in key service areas to address the cost pressures they face, including the addition of pressures associated with new funding announced as part of the Autumn Statement 2022. Taken together, the proposed changes are expected to enable the Council to set a realistic, deliverable and balanced budget for 2023-24. Norfolk County Council is due to agree its new Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2023-24 to 2026-27 on 21 February 2023.

3. Impact of the Proposals

3.1. The recommendations set out in this report are intended to enable Cabinet to recommend to Full Council a balanced budget, and the level of council tax for 2023-24. The proposals, in line with organisational ambitions and priorities, will impact on the nature and type of services provided by the Council. In addition the Strategic Review, and wider saving proposals will support the delivery of transformation to underlying Council structures and operating models. In particular, the Budget will:

- provide for growth and investment in key services, and the implementation of budget savings across Council departments, which will help to shape service and financial activity for the year to come;
- position the Council to respond positively to the announcements made in the Autumn Statement 2022 and Provisional Settlement for 2023-24;
- contribute to the Council setting a balanced budget for 2023-24; and
- inform future development of the 2024-25 budget and the MTFS beyond 2026-27.
- put continuing transformation of the way we deliver our services at the heart of our cost control initiatives.

3.2. Success in operating within the approved budget for the year and the achievement of identified savings will both be monitored throughout the year and reported to Cabinet as part of regular financial reporting. The budget setting process for 2024-25 will also be reported to Cabinet in line with the timetable set out in the appended papers.

4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision

- 4.1. The County Council continues to engage with Government, MPs and other stakeholders to campaign for adequate and sustainable funding for Norfolk to continue to deliver vital services to residents, businesses and visitors. The Government has confirmed that potentially significant funding reforms, including long-delayed social care reform, the Fair Funding Review, and Business Rates reset, have been delayed until at least the 2025-26 financial year.
- 4.2. Government announcements, including increased funding allocations for 2023-24 have informed financial planning assumptions, and supported the preparation of a robust budget, but concerns remain about the level of pressure in the system driven by inflation, energy costs and levels and complexity of demand. The Council's MTFS planning builds on the baseline position agreed in February 2022 and this has been continually updated as more reliable information about cost pressures and funding impacts has emerged through the process. It is noteworthy that the level of additional pressures throughout the budget setting process for 2023-24 has been exceptional, reflecting a range of factors and in particular the cost of living crisis and its associated impacts, inflation, and the level of the 2022-23 pay award agreed nationally.
- 4.3. The full suite of information and evidence to support the Council's 2023-24 budget proposals is laid out in the appended papers. The Cabinet needs to recommend a budget in order for the Council to fulfil the legal requirement to set a balanced budget for 2023-24 and determine the level of council tax for the year. This year the need to identify savings has been fundamentally driven by service cost pressures as set out elsewhere in the appended papers.
- 4.4. The proposals in this report are informed by the Council's constitution, local government legislation, best practice recommendations for financial and strategic planning including the CIPFA Financial Management Code, and feedback from residents and other stakeholders via the public consultation on

the 2023-24 Budget as detailed within this report. The proposals in the report reflect a prudent response to the challenges and uncertainties present in the 2023-24 planning process and ultimately will support the Council to agree a robust budget for the year.

5. Alternative Options

5.1. The papers appended to this report represent the culmination of the process to develop detailed budgets and savings proposals for 2023-24 to be recommended to Full Council and therefore forms a key part of the framework for developing the annual budget. At this stage no proposals have been agreed, meaning that a range of alternative options remain open.

5.2. In particular, there are a number of areas where Cabinet could choose to consider different parameters for both the Budget and associated recommendations to Full Council, such as:

- Varying the level of council tax and/or Adult Social Care precept for 2023-24, in the context of the referendum principles for the year, and the implications for the level of savings to be found and the overall budget position;
- Considering alternative saving proposals, taking into account the time constraints required to develop proposals, undertake public consultation (where necessary), and meet statutory deadlines for the setting of council tax.
- Changing other assumptions within the MTFS (including reducing assumptions about budget pressures or varying the level of council tax) and therefore altering the level of savings required in future years.

The deliverability of the overall budget and saving proposals are kept under review by the Section 151 Officer in order to advise on final budget setting proposals. Final decisions on the Budget need to be taken by the County Council in February 2023 informed by final Local Government Finance Settlement figures, forecasts supplied by District Councils, and the findings of EQIA and public consultation activity.

6. Financial Implications

6.1. Financial implications are discussed throughout the report. The budget papers appended to this report set out details of proposals which will contribute to the Council's long-term financial sustainability and enable the setting of a balanced Budget for 2023-24. This includes the level of council tax for the year, and the savings which will need to be delivered by each department, subject to formal approval by Full Council in February 2023. If ultimately approved in the Budget, the proposals in this paper will require departments to deliver further significant savings.

6.2. The Council is legally required to set a balanced Budget annually and should plan to achieve this using a prudent set of assumptions. In the event that additional budget pressures, or any removal of savings for 2023-24 were

identified by Cabinet or Full Council, there would be a requirement to identify equivalent further savings or increased income for 2023-24 to maintain a balanced Budget position.

6.3. A number of significant financial implications have been described in this report and the supporting papers. As highlighted in the report and the appendices, there has been a high level of uncertainty throughout the budget process about both the impact of the Local Government Finance Settlement for 2023-24 and other Government decisions and fiscal announcements. The provisional Settlement was announced 19 December 2022, but final figures remain to be confirmed in January or February 2023. The implications of funding reform changes for future years, now expected to be implemented in 2025-26 (including a longer term funding settlement, social care reform, and funding reforms potentially including the long-delayed Fair Funding Review), remain the subject of very considerable uncertainty and although they have been reflected as far as possible in the Council's 2023-24 planning processes, these impacts will need to be refined as further information is made available by Government.

6.4. In this context, the Government's decisions about Council funding for 2024-25 and beyond will be hugely significant. The continuing course of the national economy, annual Government budgets, local government funding reform and others may all offer opportunities to adequately fund local authorities to provide vital services and contribute towards the national recovery. However, although Government has given some indications about the direction of travel and underlying approach to funding for 2024-25 in the recent Policy Statement, significant uncertainty remains. In particular, the future prospects for Social Care funding reform, now delayed until at least October 2025, remain to be fully detailed. Any changes in Government funding could have a material impact on both the level of savings to be identified, and the Council's wider budget process in future years. While the Local Government Settlement in recent years has begun to provide an improved level of funding for local authorities, fundamentally there remains a need for a larger quantum of funding to be provided to the sector to achieve a sustainable level of funding for future years given the types of cost pressures faced.

7. Resource Implications

7.1. **Staff:** A number of the specific proposals set out in this report have various staffing implications and staff consultation will therefore need to be undertaken as appropriate as the proposals are further developed and implemented following approval by the County Council. In particular, proposals developed within the Strategic Review as well as departmentally led organisational change will have an impact on organisational structures, management lines, individual roles, and wider ways of working. Where relevant, staff consultation on proposals under the first round of Strategic Review activity are due to commence during February and March 2023. Departmental led change will be staggered across 2023-24

- 7.2. **Property:** The budget will have various property implications including the further disposal and rationalisation of certain properties. Consultation and engagement will therefore need to be undertaken as appropriate as the proposals are further progressed through to implementation following approval by the County Council. In addition, existing saving plans include activities linked to property budgets. The Budget includes some assumptions about the levels of capital receipts which will need to be achieved from property asset disposals to support proposals. The 2023-24 Budget includes activities which will be capitalised under the Government's flexible use of capital receipts policy¹.
- 7.3. **IT:** A number of the specific proposals set out in this report will have various IT implications, including the development, implementation and exploitation of new systems and approaches, which contribute to Smarter Working and transformational activity across the organisation. Both the 2022-23 and 2023-24 Budgets include significant savings to be delivered through the implementation of the HR and Finance System replacement project (MyOracle). The timeframe for delivery of these planned savings has been reassessed in light of the progress of system implementation. Existing saving plans include activities linked to IMT budgets.

8. Other Implications

- 8.1. **Legal Implications:** None specifically identified. This report forms part of the process to enable the Council to set a legal and balanced budget for 2023-24. Specific legal considerations apply to the requirements around the setting of council tax and undertaking public consultation and these are addressed within the appended papers.
- 8.2. **Human Rights implications:** No specific human rights implications have been identified.
- 8.3. **Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA):** None.
- 8.4. **Health and Safety implications (where appropriate):** None.
- 8.5. **Sustainability implications (where appropriate):** At its meeting 15 April 2019, the County Council recognised the serious impact of climate change globally and the need for urgent action, committing to cut down unnecessary resource use and waste, reducing its impact on the world, and shaping a more efficient, sustainable and competitive economy. Following this, on 25 November 2019, the County Council approved its [Environmental Policy](#). Since that time, Cabinet has received updates on the progress of delivery of commitments relating to the Environmental Policy at meetings in November 2021 ([item 9](#)) and April 2022 ([item 11](#)), and as a consequence in November 2021, the Corporate Select Committee ([item 12](#)) recommended amendments

¹ In February 2021, Government announced a three-year extension from 2022-23 onwards of the existing flexibility for councils to use capital receipts to fund transformation projects that produce long-term savings or reduce the costs of service delivery: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/final-guidance-on-flexible-use-of-capital-receipts>

to the Financial Regulations to support the establishment of a financial and procurement framework for carbon reduction.

Underlying budget plans include funding for activities which are intended to have an impact on the environmental sustainability of the County Council through the delivery of the Environmental Policy. The MTFS currently assumes that cost pressures and capital schemes to achieve 2030 carbon neutrality detailed in the Environmental Policy are sufficient, however as set out in the reports to Cabinet in November 2021 and April 2022, proposals to support the Council's move towards decarbonisation will potentially have further financial implications for the County Council. Therefore as far as possible, any cost pressures linked to environmental policy and carbon reduction activities are reflected in this Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy presented to Cabinet in January 2023, but future investments will need to be considered as part of individual programmes and activities and will be reported to Cabinet. The 2023-24 Budget includes additional growth provided for environmental policy delivery of £0.150m in both 2023-24 and 2024-25. The Capital Programme elsewhere on this agenda includes a number of schemes which will contribute to sustainability including £4m for decarbonisation studies across the County's estate – representing an initial investment into the design and development of initiatives to reduce carbon emissions of Council properties.

Individual elements within the 2023-24 Budget may also have an impact on the environmental sustainability of the County Council, particularly the ongoing provision of additional resources to respond to flooding, and assumptions relating to changed ways of working (smarter working) – such as increased remote working, better utilisation of our property estate, measures intended to promote reduced and greener business mileage (including promoting improved travel choices, better use of technology and flexible working approaches), and digitisation of paper, print, and physical record storage (with associated reductions in courier activity). In line with the updates to the Council's Financial Regulations made in November 2021, where individual budget proposals relate to (re)procurement activity, the council will also review contracts as they become due for renewal, both to identify opportunities for direct carbon reduction and with regard to any indirect impacts of the supply chain.

Sustainability issues in relation to any new 2023-24 budget proposals will need to be further considered once initiatives are finalised as part of budget setting in February 2023.

Further details of sustainability issues and progress towards 2030 carbon neutrality commitments are detailed within the MTFS.

8.6. Any other implications: Significant issues, risks, assumptions and implications have been set out throughout the report.

9. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

- 9.1. When exercising public functions, the Council must give due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- 9.2. In total, 93 equality impact assessments have been carried out on all budget proposals for 2023-24. This includes the proposal to increase council tax and the Adult Social Care precept.
- 9.3. Based on the evidence available, it is possible to conclude that most proposals will likely have no significant adverse impact on people with protected characteristics.
- 9.4. Where there is a potential for adverse impact, this is always clearly described in each individual assessment.
- 9.5. The assessments are set out in [Appendix 6](#).
- 9.6. The Cabinet is advised to take these impacts into account when deciding whether or not the proposals should go ahead, in addition to the mitigating actions recommended.
- 9.7. The task for decision-makers is to consider these impacts alongside the other factors to be taken into account to achieve a balanced budget that focuses the Council's resources where they are most needed.
- 9.8. As in previous years, the findings of public consultation (set out in [Appendix 5](#)) are part of the core evidence base informing the equality assessments and must be read alongside [Appendix 6](#).
- 9.9. Equality issues in relation to brought forward saving proposals were considered in the Equality Impact Assessment of the 2022-23 Budget.

10. Risk Implications/Assessment

- 10.1. A number of significant risks have been identified throughout the papers appended to this report. Uncertainties remain which could have an impact on the 2023-24 Budget and the 2024-25 position. These include:
 - The significant impacts of the “cost of living” crisis, exceptional inflationary pressures and the wider (longer term) impact of the invasion of Ukraine on the economy. All of these have the potential to drive further cost pressures (either through increased demand for services, or as a result of the increased price of delivering service provision) and may also lead to reductions in overall income due to the wider economic impacts. The MTFs approved by Full Council in February 2022 did not provide for (and could not have anticipated) the current extreme levels of inflation which are being experienced this financial year, and are expected to continue to a slightly lesser degree into 2023-24. This means that the 2023-24 Budget has to address both the level of inflation experienced in 2022-23 (providing for an

element of “catch up” in relation to the actual exceptional inflation in 2022-23) and also to make provision for the anticipated levels of inflation in the next financial year. These inflationary pressures have the potential to impact on the Council’s budget in a range of ways:

- Pay pressures in 2023-24 if they are in excess of the 5% provided for in the Council’s planning assumptions.
- Pressures associated with increase in the National Living Wage, particularly in relation to services contracted by the Council. Within Adult Social Care, every 1p increase in the NLW equates to a pressure of approximately £0.270m. In April 2023 the NLW will increase from £9.50 to £10.42, an increase of £0.92 or 9.7%. This follows a rise of 6.6% in 2022. The rates for 2024 have not been announced but are likely to be on a similar trajectory to 2022.²
- Further spikes in energy inflation, to the extent these are above budgeted amounts and/or are not mitigated by Central Government interventions.
- Higher rates of general inflation measures (CPI and RPI) directly impact on the Council’s contractual costs which are set with reference to these indicators. Government has indicated that there is limited scope within the existing spending review envelope to address these exceptional inflationary pressures in future years. Although forecasts are for inflation to return to the target 2% over the medium term, this implies a permanent increase in the Council’s cost base caused by the current extreme rates (i.e. inflationary pressures are not being taken back out of the system by negative inflation in future).
- Ongoing uncertainty around local government (and wider public sector finances) including:
 - the need for a long term financial settlement for local government. Autumn Statement and Settlement announcements in 2022 covered one year only, with broad indications given for 2024-25. As a result there remains high uncertainty about the levels of funding for 2024-25 and beyond.
 - It remains of major concern that Government continues to place significant reliance and expectations on locally raised income. If this trend persists, the financial pressures for 2024-25 and beyond may become unsustainable. The Government has indicated that the council tax referendum limit for 2024-25 will be 5% as for 2023-24 but has given no insight into the rate for later years. Regardless of the level at which the referendum limit is set, the achievability of continued significant increases in council tax, which put the burden of funding key services onto local taxpayers may be limited. The

² The Low Pay Commission remit is to “*put the NLW on a path to reach two-thirds of median hourly pay (of those aged 21 and above) by 2024.*” The LPC has commented “*nominal pay growth and forecasts for future pay growth have strengthened, increasing our projection of the 2024 target from £10.70 to £11.08. We project that a smaller increase will be needed next year (6.3 per cent, £0.66) to reach the 2024 target.*” However, the LPC’s range for the target rate in 2024 spans from £10.82 to £11.35. See: “*The path of the National Living Wage*” page 6:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1116992/LPC_short_report_2022_FINAL.pdf

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

issue of sustainable funding for social care is a national one, which will require national funding solutions. Without a national approach, there is a high risk of an unsustainable fragmented system of local social care provision, which is wholly dependent on local council tax raising ability that bears no link to local needs.

- There remains a specific risk in relation to longer term reform of local government funding and the planned funding review, in that a failure by the Government to provide adequate resources to fund local authorities could lead to a requirement for further service reductions, particularly where these result in a redistribution between authority types or geographical areas. Changing Government policies around the nature, role, responsibilities and requirements of Local Government may also represent an area of risk, as will changing expectations of the public, taxpayers and service users.
- The Policy Statement set out funding expectations for 2024-25 and confirms that fundamental reform of the local government funding system will not progress until at least 2025-26 and possibly later.³ Linked to this are risks around delivery of reforms to local government funding including actions to deliver “Levelling Up”, the funding review, the detailed implications of Adult Social Care reform, reforms to the Business Rates system, and changes to other funding streams including the New Homes Bonus.
- In respect of Adult Social Care reform, the Government has “repurposed” the funding earmarked for implementation, meaning there is significant uncertainty about how reforms will be funded in future and how social care funding as a whole will be addressed.
- Risks around the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) deficit position. The Policy Statement has confirmed that the “government will be extending the Statutory Override for the Dedicated Schools Grant for the next 3 years from 2023-24 to 2025-26.”⁴ The County Council is participating in the ‘safety valve’ intervention programme with the DfE in the 2022-23 financial year, which aims to agree a deliverable local package of reforms to the high needs system in order to eliminate the in-year DSG deficit over the medium term. This agreement is a pre-requisite in order to access financial support from the DfE to eliminate the historic deficit over the period of the agreement. Agreeing the DSG management plan is therefore a high priority to reduce and mitigate the financial risk associated with the DSG deficit position, the proposed 2023-24 Budget makes provision for the Council’s local contribution to this.
- Any further impact of the legacy of COVID-19 on the budget in 2023-24, including any ongoing cost pressures within service delivery, future

³ “In the longer-term, our ambitions for Levelling Up the country require us to assess our commitments to update local government funding. The government had previously committed to carry out a Review of Relative Needs and Resources and a reset of accumulated business rates growth. Whilst we can confirm that these will not be implemented in this Spending Review period, the government remains committed to improving the local government finance landscape in the next Parliament.”

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-finance-policy-statement-2023-24-to-2024-25/local-government-finance-policy-statement-2023-24-to-2024-25>

⁴ Ibid.

pressures on income; and the implications of any central Government measures implemented.

- Increasing levels of demand and complexity of need, and the resulting pressure on services.

10.2. At the time of preparing budget papers, the final Local Government Finance Settlement for 2023-24 remains to be confirmed and the overall level of government funding for next year therefore remains an area of limited risk. Subject to the final details of the Local Government Finance Settlement and any other associated announcements, there may be a need for further actions to be taken in response to maintain a balanced budget position for 2023-24, and this position will need to be kept under careful review throughout the remainder of the budget setting process.

10.3. The Council's Corporate Risk Register provides a full description of corporate risks, including corporate level financial risks, mitigating actions and the progress made in managing the level of risk. A majority of risks, if not treated, could have significant financial consequences such as failing to generate income or to realise savings. These corporate risks include:

- RM002 – Income streams
- RM006 – Service Delivery
- RM022b – EU Transition
- RM031 – NCC Funded Children's Services Overspend
- RM035 – Adverse impact of significant and abnormal levels of inflationary pressure on revenue and capital budgets

10.4. Further details of all corporate risks, including those outlined above, can be found in Appendix C of the January 2023 Risk Management report to Cabinet⁵. There is close oversight of the Council's expenditure with monthly financial reports to Cabinet. Any emerging risks arising will continue to be identified and treated as necessary.

10.5. A number of budget proposals identified in December 2022 may require public consultation as they potentially relate to a policy or service change:

- Post 16 transport: remove option to pay a daily fare (currently only available on local buses which charge fares)
- Recycling Centres: Mayton Wood relocation to Norwich North HWRC site
- Streetlighting – further dim all lights with an existing CMS (central management system), which are usually the main road streetlights

10.6. This will be confirmed as implementation plans are developed and, if required, any public consultation will be undertaken prior to the implementation of proposals. In the event that the response to public consultation identifies modifications to proposals, or proposals which are not ultimately deliverable,

⁵ Cabinet 11 January 2023:

<https://norfolkcc.cmis.uk.com/norfolkcc/CalendarofMeetings/tabid/128/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/496/Meeting/1904/Committee/169/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

this will be reported in the usual way as part of financial monitoring during the financial year. Service Departments are expected to manage within their agreed budget envelope for the year and in the first instance would be expected to identify alternative in-year savings to avoid overspending in 2023-24. The level of the additional savings identified as potentially requiring consultation is low (£0.344m in 2023-24), and has also been profiled on the basis of delivering only a part year saving for 2023-24. This is therefore considered to be a low risk to the overall 2023-24 Budget position as it represents 0.6% of the total savings for the year and less than 0.07% of the Net Budget for the year.

10.7. Proposals identified as part of the Strategic Review of the County Council have been identified to contribute to delivering a balanced budget for 2023-24. The anticipated 2023-24 savings are included within Departmental budget plans. Where required, staff consultation in relation to these is due to commence in February and March 2023, with further stages planned for later in the year. As such the detailed plans and associated savings cannot be confirmed until consultation responses have been considered.

10.8. However, Executive Directors have considered in detail the work undertaken as part of the Strategic Review including the proposed new structures and ways of working, and have indicated that they are satisfied with the quantum of saving that has been identified and included in 2023-24 Departmental budgets. Due to the timescales for implementation, some Strategic Review savings will deliver a part-year saving in 2023-24 with full recurrent savings achieved from 2024-25, and where appropriate this is reflected within this Budget planning paper. In the event that the response to staff consultation identifies modifications to proposals, or proposals which are not ultimately deliverable, this will be reported in the usual way as part of financial monitoring during the financial year. Service Departments are expected to manage within their agreed budget envelope for the year and in the first instance would be expected to identify alternative in-year savings to avoid overspending in 2023-24. Ultimately any shortfall in Strategic Review savings that could not be addressed through alternative proposals would need to be met from reserves on a one-off basis in 2023-24. While the level of Strategic Review savings is material to the overall Budget (29% of all savings planned), not all of these will require staff consultation. The proposals are based on sound methodology and detailed work and therefore it is considered unlikely that a significant proportion of the savings in the planned Budget would not be deliverable during the year. Further details about Strategic Review savings are set out in [Appendix 1 in paragraph 4.23](#) and the detailed Service Budgets in [Sections 8 to 12](#).

10.9. High level risks associated with budget proposals are described as part of the report on the Robustness of Estimates. The Robustness of Estimates and the Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves also set out financial risks that have been identified as part of the assessment of the level of reserves and provisions in order to evaluate the minimum level of general balances. In setting the Budget, the Council can accept different levels of risk, for example, minimising risk through investment in services, reducing higher risk savings, or putting in place additional reserves for specific risks. The

robustness of the budget estimates are evaluated, setting out budget assumptions and areas of risk, to enable Members to consider the assumptions and risks that will underpin further decisions for agreeing the budget and level of general balances. The assumptions set out in the Robustness of Estimates report directly impact on the risk assessment of the level of general balances.

- 10.10. Executive Directors have responsibility for managing their budgets within the amounts approved by County Council. Executive Directors will therefore take measures throughout the year to identify, and then reduce or eliminate, potential overspends.

11. Select Committee comments

- 11.1. As in previous years, Select Committees have had two opportunities to consider and provide input to the Council's budget setting. In May 2022, Select Committees discussed the broad strategic approach to budget setting for the services within their remit, and then in November 2022 had an opportunity to comment on the detailed proposals for the 2023-24 Budget being taken forward for public consultation.

- 11.2. Links to the papers and (where available) minutes of Select Committee discussions can be found here:

- 11.3. May 2022:

- [Corporate Select Committee](#)
- [Infrastructure and Development Select Committee](#)
- [People and Communities Select Committee](#)

- 11.4. November 2022:

- [Corporate Select Committee](#)
- [Infrastructure and Development Select Committee](#)
- [People and Communities Select Committee](#)

- 11.5. In their discussions, Select Committees:

- Considered the implications of available Government funding announcements, the funding challenges facing the Council, the associated savings required, and the implications for the level of council tax.
- Discussed the approach to public consultation, particularly in relation to council tax;
- Considered the Government's approach to addressing the issue of Adult Social Care funding, and the implications of delay to Adult Social Care reforms nationally.
- Reviewed the impact of inflation on the Council's Budget.
- Considered the Council's record of delivering savings in the past and the impact of demand-driven statutory services.

- Discussed specific proposals for services within their remit and commented on these, including:
 - The level of reliance on one-off reserves;
 - The impact of increases in demand and savings proposals, and the need for service transformation to deliver efficiencies; and
 - How savings aligned to strategic objectives.

11.6. Full details of Select Committee discussions can be found within the meeting minutes.

12. Recommendations

12.1. Cabinet is recommended:

- 1) To consider the statements regarding the uncertain planning environment, robustness of budget estimates, assumptions and risks relating to the 2023-24 budget, and authorise the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance, to make any changes required to reflect Final Local Government Finance Settlement information (if available), or changes in council tax and business rates forecasts from District Councils, in order to maintain a balanced budget position for presentation to Full Council. In recognition of the budget gap forecast for 2024-25, and to enable a final balanced Budget position to be recommended to County Council, Cabinet is asked to agree the following principles:
 - a) that any additional resources which become available should be used to delay the use of one-off funding from reserves from 2023-24 to 2024-25, or
 - b) that any income shortfall should be addressed from the Corporate Business Risk Reserve (to the extent possible). Where the Corporate Business Risk Reserve is insufficient, to note that the ultimate source of funding to balance the Budget will be the General Fund.
- 2) To review the findings of public consultation as set out in [Section 13 of Appendix 1](#), in full in [Appendix 5](#), and in [Appendix 7](#) in relation to Mobile Libraries, and consider these when recommending the budget changes required to deliver a balanced budget as set out in [Appendix 1](#).
- 3) To consider and comment on the findings of equality impact assessments, as set out in [Appendix 6](#) to this report (also [Appendix 7](#) in relation to Mobile Libraries), and in doing so, note the Council's duty under the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 4) To note that the Council has responded to the consultation undertaken on the Provisional Local Government Settlement for 2023-24 as detailed in [Section 3 of Appendix 1](#).
- 5) To note that the Council will continue to operate a Business Rates Pool for 2023-24 in partnership with Norfolk District Councils on the same terms as the existing 2022-23 Pool and as set out in [Section 6 of Appendix 1](#), and approve the use of 2022-23 Pool funds as set out.
- 6) To agree to recommend to County Council:
 - a) The level of risk and budget assumptions set out in the Robustness of Estimates report ([Appendix 4](#)), which underpin the revenue and capital budget decisions and planning for 2023-27.
 - b) The general principle of seeking to increase general fund balances as part of closing the 2022-23 accounts and that in 2023-24 any further additional resources which become available during the year should be added to the general fund balance wherever possible.
 - c) The findings of public consultation ([Appendix 5](#)), which should be considered when agreeing the 2023-24 Budget ([Appendix 1](#)).
 - d) To note the advice of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services (Section 151 Officer), in [Section 5 of Appendix 1](#), on the financial impact of an increase in council tax and the sustainability of the Council's medium term position.
 - e) That the Council's 2023-24 Budget will include a general council tax increase of 2.99% and a 2.00% increase in the Adult Social Care precept, an overall increase of 4.99% (shown in [Section 5 of Appendix 1](#)), as recommended by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, and resulting in an increased overall County Council Net Revenue Budget of £493.707m for 2023-24, including budget increases of £169.523m and budget decreases of -£139.939m as set out in [Table 15 of Appendix 1](#), and the actions required to deliver the proposed savings, subject to any changes required in line with recommendation 1 above to enable a balanced budget to be proposed. This would result in a budget gap of £45.920m to be addressed for 2024-25, and £124.127m over the life of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
 - f) The budget proposals set out for 2024-25 to 2026-27, including authorising Executive Directors to take the action required to deliver budget savings for 2024-25 to 2026-27 as appropriate.
 - g) With regard to the future years, that further plans, including phase two of the Strategic Review, to meet the remaining budget shortfalls in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 are developed and brought back to Cabinet during 2023-24 in line with the proposed timetable.
 - h) Noting Government's assumptions that local authorities will raise the maximum council tax available to them, and that the final level of council tax for future years is subject to Member decisions annually (informed by any referendum principles defined by the Government), to confirm, or otherwise, the assumptions set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy ([MTFS Table 2 in Appendix 2](#)) that the Council's budget planning for 2024-25 will include for planning purposes:

- i) general council tax increases of 2.99% (1.99% from 2025-26);
- ii) Adult Social Care precept increases of 2.00% (1.00% 2025-26 and 0.00% 2026-27); and
- iii) that if the referendum threshold were increased in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 to above 2.99%, or any further discretion were offered to increase the Adult Social Care precept (or similar), the Section 151 Officer would recommend the Council take full advantage of any flexibility in view of the overall financial position.
- i) That the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services be authorised to transfer from the County Fund to the Salaries and General Accounts all sums necessary in respect of revenue and capital expenditure provided in the 2023-24 Budget, to make payments, to raise and repay loans, and to invest funds.
- j) To agree the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27 as set out in [Appendix 2](#), including the two policy objectives to be achieved:
 - i) Revenue: To identify further funding or savings for 2024-25 to 2026-27 to produce a balanced budget in all years 2023-27 in accordance with the timetable set out in the Revenue Budget report ([Section 4 of Appendix 1](#)).
 - ii) Capital: To continue to provide a framework for identifying and prioritising capital requirements and proposals to ensure that all capital investment is targeted at meeting the Council's priorities.
- k) The [mitigating actions](#) proposed in the equality impact assessments ([Appendix 6](#)).
- l) Note the planned reduction in non-schools earmarked and general reserves of 48.94% over five years, from £182.994m (March 2022) to £93.441m (March 2027) ([Section 6 of Appendix 3](#));
- m) Note the policy on reserves and provisions in [Section 3 of Appendix 3](#);
- n) Agree, based on current planning assumptions and risk forecasts set out in [Section 5 of Appendix 3](#):
 - i) for 2023-24, a minimum level of general balances of £25.340m, and
 - ii) a forecast minimum level for planning purposes of
 - 2024-25, £26.590m;
 - 2025-26, £27.840m; and
 - 2026-27, £29.090m.

as part of the consideration of the budget plans for 2023-27 and supporting these budget recommendations;

- o) Agree the use of non-school Earmarked Reserves, as set out in [Section 6 of Appendix 3](#).

13. Background Papers

13.1. Background papers for this report are listed below:

[Norfolk County Council Revenue and Capital Budget 2022-23 to 2025-26, County Council 21/02/2022, agenda item 5](#)

[Norfolk County Council 2022-23 Budget Book](#)

[Strategic and financial planning 2023-24, Cabinet, 04/04/2022, agenda item 15](#)

[Finance Monitoring 2021-22 Report Outturn, Cabinet, 06/06/2022, agenda item 14](#)

[Strategic and financial planning 2023-24, Cabinet, 04/07/2022, agenda item 17](#)

[Strategic and financial planning 2023-24, Cabinet, 03/10/2022, agenda item 18](#)

[Risk Management, Cabinet, 11/01/2023, agenda item 12](#)

Strategic and Financial Planning 2023-24 reports to November 2022 Select Committees:

- [Corporate Select Committee](#)
- [Infrastructure and Development Select Committee](#)
- [People and Communities Select Committee](#)

Finance Monitoring Report 2022-23 P8, Cabinet, 30/01/2023 (on this agenda)

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: Titus Adam

Tel no.: 01603 222806

Email address: titus.adam@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Revenue Budget for 2023-24 proposed in this report represents the culmination of a process over the course of the current financial year to develop a robust, balanced Budget for consideration by Cabinet and Full Council. This has included detailed work to validate unavoidable cost pressures, model changes in funding, and identify saving options. Budget development has been undertaken, once again, in the context of considerable uncertainty about the wider financial environment for local authorities, a result of both changes in national Government policy and direction, and wider global instability. While the immediate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is now receding in most areas of the budget, the war in Ukraine, the cost of living crisis, wider inflationary pressures and financial and policy uncertainty at the national level have all had implications in terms of additional costs, levels of demand and financial planning.
- 1.2. The level of Settlement funding provided since 2021-22 has begun to reverse the trend of year-on-year cuts to local government funding experienced during the austerity period. The provisional 2023-24 Settlement is one of the most generous for some time, but it comes at a time of immense financial pressure and much of the new funding has specific conditions attached to it. As a result, the improvements in the 2023-24 Settlement are some way short of mitigating the sustained reductions experienced since 2010-11. The need remains for the Council to continue to identify material levels of savings in order to operate within the resources available to it. Cost pressures are still increasing for many of the Council's services, and inflation is a particular challenge within the 2023-24 Budget. The Council needs to not only address the "under provision" for inflation in the 2022-23 Budget resulting from the sudden and unexpected inflationary pressures which emerged after the Budget was agreed in February 2022, but also to deal with the expected persistent higher inflation rates forecast for 2023-24 and beyond. The level of inflationary pressure in the 2023-24 Budget is materially higher than the usual run rate as a result of these adjustments and represents a permanent addition to the Council's underlying cost base.
- 1.3. Dealing with ongoing spending pressures of this scale requires the Council to keep its business and operations under constant review, and to continually seek to deliver value for money services in the most economic, efficient and effective way possible, for the lowest cost. It is for this reason, and in the context of a very significant 2023-24 budget gap, that Cabinet acted promptly to begin the Budget setting process for 2023-24 early in the year, initiating the Strategic Review of the organisation and allocating saving targets to Departments in April 2022. The Strategic Review process, undertaken through the course of 2022-23 financial year, has identified savings which are being incorporated into the 2023-24 Budget as outlined in more detail later in this report. It should be noted that there are likely to be changes to the organisation and senior management

structure as a result of the Strategic Review and these associated savings which may also result in amendments to departmental structures⁶. These structures are not yet finalised and staff consultation linked the Strategic Review is expected to commence between February and March 2023, with further phases later in the year. As a result, these changes are not reflected in the 2023-24 Budget paper, but will be incorporated into the 2023-24 Budget Book to the extent possible once the overall Budgets have been agreed by the County Council. Taken collectively, these initiatives and considerations, alongside the Council's [vision and strategy](#), as set out in *Better Together, for Norfolk*, have been critical to informing the preparation of the Council's 2023-24 Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

- 1.4. Work through the course of 2022-23 has enabled the Council to prepare a robust, balanced Budget for 2023-24 as set out within this report. The proposals for 2023-24 close the very significant budget gap of £59.927m identified in the 2022 Medium Term Financial Strategy, make provision to address the material additional pressures which have arisen since the MTFS was prepared, and support the continued investment in key services. The Budget is based on a 4.99% increase in council tax for Cabinet to consider for recommendation to County Council. This level of increase, within the referendum threshold set by Central Government, will enable a balanced 2023-24 position to be established, and supports a robust position for 2024-25. A 4.99% increase for 2023-24 as well as for 2024-25 planning purposes is therefore the recommendation of the Section 151 Officer.
- 1.5. The latest estimate of the Council's overall budget position for 2023-24 as a result of the matters set out in this report, and other emerging issues, is detailed in the remainder of this paper. In line with the Financial Regulations and associated Budget Protocol, it is possible that the position will need to be updated between Cabinet and the County Council meeting in February to incorporate any final Settlement information and also to reflect any final changes to District Council business rates and council tax forecasts due at the end of January. It is proposed that any adjustments required are handled on the following basis:
 - a) that any additional resources which become available will be used to establish a budget contingency for 2023-24 onwards, or
 - b) that any income shortfall will be addressed from reserves, including the Corporate Business Risk Reserve (to the extent possible).

2. Strategic Context

National context

- 2.1. The context in which the 2023-24 strategic and financial planning is happening has moved on from being dominated just by Covid. Instead, this has been

⁶ Further details can be found in the Recommendations to County Council from the Corporate Select Committee held on 14 November 2022 here: [Norfolk County Council meeting 13 December 2022, Supplementary Agenda](#)

replaced by a fundamental uncertainty around the ongoing war in Ukraine in terms of global energy and food supply as well as current inflationary pressures and the consequent impact on both the cost of services we deliver, and the demand for services as households and communities struggle with the rising cost of living. These inflationary impacts are not only a short-term issue but could very likely result in a permanent uplift in our cost base.

- 2.2. In its November Monetary Policy Report, the Bank of England updated its projections for activity and inflation, and described a challenging outlook for the UK economy, which is expected to be in recession for a prolonged period. The Office for Budget Responsibility's (OBR's) latest economic forecast (November 2022) shows inflation peaking at 11% in this quarter (and that is after allowing for a 2.5% benefit arising from the energy price guarantee) before falling sharply to potentially negative territory and then stabilising at the target rate of 2% by the end of 2027.
- 2.3. Added to this are significant uncertainties around Government policy and the timing of any changes in terms of local government funding reforms, despite the two-year delay in implementing the Social Care reforms discussed elsewhere in these papers. As a consequence, the economic situation remains hugely challenging, with the direct and indirect impacts of all these factors on the County Council, as well as our partners, both unknown and highly volatile at this stage.
- 2.4. It is in these difficult times that the County Council cannot afford any complacency and, working with its partners, will have to ensure it deploys its own limited resources to support the most vulnerable people and communities, while continuing to provide wider public services.

Devolution

- 2.5. On 8 December 2022, Norfolk County Council and Government signed a County Deal for Norfolk. Devolution offers a generational opportunity to unlock significant long-term funding and gain greater freedom to decide how best to meet local needs and create new opportunities for the people who live and work in Norfolk. Some decisions and funding previously controlled in Westminster will now be decided by Norfolk, for Norfolk.
- 2.6. If agreed, a Deal for Norfolk will mean that, from 2024 onwards, we can:
- target funding and resources to Norfolk's own priorities, with a new investment fund of £20m per year for 30 years
 - unlock housing and employment sites with an injection of £12.9m capital funding in this Spending Review period and new powers to drive regeneration, housing and development priorities
 - invest in the skills we know we need, with devolution of the adult education budget and input into the new Local Skills Improvement Plans
 - invest in local transport planning and consolidate transport budgets to direct funding to better meet our local needs and priorities

- strengthen the local business voice to inform local decision making and strategic economic planning through the future integration of New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
- have a council leader who is directly elected by the public, with the first election in May 2024
- raise our influence regionally and nationally, enabling our voice to be better heard by Government to shape future policies and funding decisions for the benefit of our County

2.7. This agreement would be the first step in a process of further devolution and will pave the way for future conversations as part of an ongoing dialogue; with the experience from other devolution areas showing that initial deals can open the door to receiving further powers, funding, and influence.

Council Strategy and Transformation

2.8. The Council Strategy '[Better Together, for Norfolk 2021-2025](#)' is the key high-level document that, alongside the Medium Term Financial Strategy, sets the Council's strategic policy direction.

2.9. The four-year strategy, through five strategic priorities, sets out the Council's vision – to make the most of all that Norfolk has to offer, help improve the quality of life for every community, support businesses to be successful and make sure Norfolk is a place where people want to live, work and visit.

1. **A vibrant clean and sustainable economy** – as well as growing the economy this is also about skills and creating high value jobs; growth and investment; infrastructure and digital connectivity.
2. **Better opportunities for children and young people** – prioritising better opportunities for children and young people, raising educational attainment and creating better employment opportunities.
3. **Healthy, fulfilling and independent lives** – supported by themes of levelling up health; Living Well; and Better Local Services.
4. **Strong, engaged and inclusive communities** – a mix of urban, rural and coastal communities that we can support and empower.
5. **A greener, more resilient future** – recognising our priorities for our physical environment and access to quality spaces and building community resilience.

2.10. Our ongoing service transformation programmes and the Strategic Review of the organisation, which runs alongside those, collectively enable us to improve services and manage demand, making the Council more effective and efficient. In short, our change agenda will help us deliver better outcomes for residents for less money.

- 2.11. Key areas for transformation include service redesign, improving our approach to prevention and early help, driving improvements in customer experience, organisational culture, and use of digital and data. Recognising our commitment to no one left behind, the Council is also going to deliver a refreshed agenda for Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion to enable the Council to become more inclusive, bringing strength through difference.

3. Financial Context

Government funding announcements during 2022

- 3.1. While the Council is now well accustomed to setting its Budget with a degree of uncertainty about Government announcements, the 2023-24 budget-setting process has been undertaken in an almost unprecedented climate of change. This was most clearly demonstrated in uncertainty about Central Government policy and direction following the resignation of Boris Johnson as Prime Minister on 7 July 2022 (ultimately stepping down on 6 September 2022), and between 6 September 2022 and 25 October 2022 when Liz Truss served as Prime Minister. However the appointment of Rishi Sunak as Prime Minister on 25 October 2022 has brought a period of greater stability leading up to the announcement of the Autumn Statement 2022 by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Jeremy Hunt.
- 3.2. Against this backdrop there have been further delays to major reforms of local government finance including the Fair Funding Review, Business Rates Reform, and social care funding reform. While the Government set out plans for social care reform in September 2021 within the [Build Back Better plan for health and social care](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care)⁷, much of this has subsequently been reversed (the Health and Social Care levy planned for April 2023) or delayed (adult social care charging reforms (including the cap on care costs)) and the full implications therefore remain to be fully understood. It has subsequently been confirmed that charging reforms have been delayed until October 2025, while any form of Fair Funding Review is unlikely until the 2025-26 financial year at the earliest.
- 3.3. The Chancellor set out the [Autumn Statement 2022](https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/autumn-statement-2022) on 17 November 2022. Announcements for Local Government were better than had initially been anticipated, with no cuts, additional social care funding, a delay to social care reforms, and increased council tax flexibilities. While the Autumn Statement did not include the significant spending cuts which had originally been anticipated and can therefore be seen as positive in the short to medium term, a key concern remains that these spending reductions are now assumed to be required after the end of the current Spending Review (i.e. from 2025-26 onwards). As such the prospects for the later years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy may be significantly more challenging, with current forecasts suggesting that Departmental Expenditure Limits (DEL) in the next Spending Review period may increase by only 1% in real terms. Key headlines from the Autumn Statement included:

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care>

- No reductions to the overall funding allocations announced in the Spending Review 2021. Local Government Resource DEL to increase by 33% from 2022-23 to 2023-24. (Reflecting both council tax flexibility and social care funding)
- Delay of social care reforms from October 2023 until “at least” October 2025.
- Additional funding for social care – £1bn new social care grant funding (£0.600m via iBCF (improved Better Care Fund) and £0.400m directly), the release of funding previously earmarked to deliver reform, and increase Adult Social Care precept flexibility.
- Council tax referendum limit for upper tier authorities increased to 5% (3% general and 2% Adult Social Care precept).

3.4. Following the Autumn Statement, the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) published the [Local Government finance Policy Statement 2023-24 to 2024-25](#) on 12 December 2022. The Statement set out details of the Government’s intentions for the Local Government finance Settlement for 2023-24 and 2024-25, in recognition of the fact that “*providing councils with greater certainty on key aspects of their funding is incredibly important for their budget setting process and their ability to plan for the future.*” While the Statement provided some useful clarity about the likely content of the provisional Settlement, there was not enough detail to determine specific settlement allocations with confidence. Nonetheless, the headlines from the Policy Statement confirmed the direction of travel previously set out in the Autumn Statement. Key points from the Policy Statement for Norfolk County Council are reflected in the provisional Settlement analysis which follows. In this context it is worth noting that although the Chancellor’s Autumn Statement 2022 confirmed the outcomes of the multi-year Spending Review announced alongside the Autumn Budget 2021⁸ on 27 October 2021, and in spite of ministerial aspirations⁹, and the indications set out in the Policy Statement, there has still been no multi-year Settlement provided for local government.

3.5. The [Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement](#) 2023-24 was published via a [Written Ministerial Statement](#) on 19 December 2022. The Provisional Settlement provided further details about the funding increases announced at the Autumn Statement 2022 and subsequently set out in the DLUHC Policy Statement. This includes a welcome increase in the level of funding for social care. The Government assumes that upper-tier authorities will increase council tax by 5% for 2023-24. If this were the case, the Government expectations are that the County Council’s “Core Spending Power” will rise by 10.5% between 2022-23 and 2023-24. The Council faces significant inflationary and demand pressures, including additional costs from the level of the National Living Wage, which is set by Government. The Provisional Settlement figures remain to be confirmed in the Final Settlement expected in late January or early February 2023. The accompanying [consultation](#) on the provisional Settlement ran for four weeks and closed 16 January 2023. A Council response was submitted,

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/autumn-budget-and-spending-review-2021-documents>

⁹ [Gove confirms multi-year local government settlements | Public Finance](#)

following consideration by the Leader and the Cabinet Member for Finance and covering the following key points:

- Welcoming the Government's move to provide stability, certainty, and additional funding in the 2023-24 Settlement, and the indications set out for 2024-25, while expressing disappointment at the continued delays to key reforms including Fair Funding and the lack of a true multi-year settlement;
- Challenging the approach which has seen some elements of funding receive inflationary increases while others such as Rural Services Delivery Grant have not;
- Highlighting issues of council tax inequality; and
- Raising concerns about the continuing need for a long-term funding solution for Adult Social Care.

Core Spending Power

3.6. The provisional Settlement sets out the following Core Spending Power figures:

Table 1: Provisional Settlement Core Spending Power for Norfolk County Council

	2022-23	2023-24	Change
	£m	£m	£m
Settlement Funding Assessment	195.903	205.875	9.972
Compensation for under-indexing the business rates multiplier	15.844	27.394	11.551
Council Tax Requirement excluding parish precepts (<i>government assumption</i>) ¹⁰	462.203	491.501	29.298
Improved Better Care Fund	39.619	39.619	0.000
New Homes Bonus	1.833	0.628	-1.205
Rural Services Delivery Grant	4.178	4.178	0.000
Social Care Grant	41.495	66.525	25.030
Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care Fund ¹¹	2.821	0.000	-2.821
ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund	0.000	9.785	9.785
ASC Discharge Fund	0.000	5.554	5.554
Services Grant ¹²	10.687	6.022	-4.665
Grants rolled in ¹³	1.402	0.000	-1.402
Core Spending Power	775.984	857.080	81.096
Change %			10.5%

3.7. In overall terms, the Provisional Settlement reflects an increase in Core Spending Power (CSP) for the County Council, as expected following the Autumn Statement and the Policy Statement. The increase in CSP is largely

¹⁰ This figure represents the Government assumption for council tax in the provisional settlement, rather than the County Council's actual proposed budget.

¹¹ Rolled into "ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund"

¹² Reduction includes removal of H&SC Levy funding

¹³ Principally Independent Living Fund rolled into Social Care Grant

being delivered via increased funding for social care and a higher threshold for council tax increases, including the Adult Social Care precept. The % change in CSP excluding council tax assumptions is 6.7%. These CSP increases are accompanied by significant cost pressures including high inflation rates and the increase in the National Living Wage. Commentators have noted that *“in the 2023-24 settlement, those authorities with the highest “needs”, and lowest tax bases, will typically have the highest increases in CSP.”*

3.8. Other elements of the Provisional Settlement announcement include:

- Freezing of the Business Rates Multiplier for 2023-24 at 49.9p. This is to be fully compensated in line with CPI.
- Revenue Support Grant will also increase in line with CPI.
- Services Grant will reduce in 2023-24, reflecting removal of funding for the cancelled increase in National Insurance Contribution / Health and Social Care Levy and provision to increase funding for the Supporting Families programme. Services Grant continues to be distributed via the Settlement Funding Assessment.
- No change to Rural Services Delivery Grant
- New Homes Bonus to continue at a reduced level in 2023-24 (and possibly 2024-25, but this is under review).
- Consolidating Independent Living Fund; Council Tax Discounts – Family Annexe; Local Council Tax Support Administration Subsidy; and Food Safety Enforcement (Natasha’s Law) grants totalling £239 million into the local government finance settlement. All four grants will keep their existing distribution.

Social Care funding

3.9. Additional social care funding was announced at the Autumn Statement 2022 and this has been confirmed in the Provisional Settlement. The table below sets out the amounts that the Council can expect to receive in 2023-24. The announcements at national level include:

- Delaying charging reform: £1.265 billion in 2023-24 and £1.877 billion in 2024-25 will be distributed to local authorities through the Social Care Grant for adult and children’s social care. This is in addition to the existing Social Care Grant. Government is continuing to equalise against the adult social care precept.
- New grant funding: £600 million will be distributed in 2023-24 and £1 billion in 2024-25 through the Better Care Fund to “get people out of hospital on time into care settings, freeing up NHS beds for those who need them.” The funding is split 50:50 between the DLUHC Local Government DEL (departmental expenditure limit) and the Department for Health and Social Care DEL.
- New grant funding: £400 million in 2023-24 and £683 million in 2024-25 will be distributed through a grant ringfenced for adult social care which will also help to support capacity and discharge.
- Funding for adult social care retains £162 million per year of Fair Cost of Care funding and its distribution.

- There will be reporting requirements on the new Adult Social Care Grant and the Better Care Fund regarding performance and use of funding to deliver tangible improvements against the following objectives: discharge delays, social care waiting times, low fee rates and workforce pressures in the adult social care sector.

Table 2: Provisional Settlement allocations of social care funding for Norfolk County Council

	Norfolk County Council	Share of national total
	£m	%
Rollover of Social Care Grant for 2022-23	41.495	1.77%
Independent Living Fund (Rolled in for 2023-24)	1.379	0.86%
Element used to equalise for 2% ASC precept flexibility for 2023-24	3.019	1.89%
Additional funding through existing ASC RNF ¹⁴ for 2023-24	20.632	1.74%
Social Care Grant for 2023-24	66.525	1.73%
ASC Discharge Fund for 2023/24	5.554	1.85%
ASC Market Sustainability & Improvement Fund for 2023/24	9.785	1.74%
Total	81.864	1.74%

3.10. The purpose of the individual grants is as follows:

- **Social Care Grant** is “provided to upper tier authorities for social care expenditure, on both adult and children’s social care.”
- **Discharge Funding grant** is “provided to upper tier authorities to ensure those people who need to draw on social care when they are discharged from hospital can leave as soon as possible. The Discharge Funding must be pooled as part of the Better Care Fund.”
- **Adult Social Care Market Sustainability and Improvement Funding Grant** is “provided to upper tier authorities to enable tangible improvements to be made to adult social care.”

3.11. The Written Statement notes that Government has “*listened to councils’ concerns about implementing adult social care charging reform in light of [inflationary and demand] pressures. That is why Government has made the difficult decision to delay these reforms, and to prioritise core pressures rather than risk destabilising the market. The funding intended for implementation will be retained in local authority budgets.*”

Remaining uncertainties

¹⁴ Relative Needs Formula

- 3.12. The Provisional Settlement announcement has confirmed a number of key elements of funding for the 2023-24 Budget, however there remain several areas of uncertainty and it is likely that further details will emerge over time and as the Budget is finalised. In particular, the Provisional Settlement does not include details of the allocations of Public Health grant for 2023-24. In 2022-23 Public Health grant was worth £42.261m for Norfolk.
- 3.13. The Government expects the Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging (pEPR) scheme to provide additional income from 2024-25. This Extended Packaging reform is to be phased in over a period of time. Nationally the expected amounts total £1.2bn in 2024-25 rising to £1.7bn. It represents genuine new income as the policy is for the producer to pay, however Government has indicated that it intends to review overall funding in light of additional income. The implications of this for the Council's 2024-25 Budget are unknown at this stage.
- 3.14. Government has "*noted*" the significant increase in some local authority reserves and is encouraging local authorities to consider how they can use reserves to maintain services in response to immediate inflationary pressures. This must be balanced with the need to maintain appropriate levels of reserves to support financial sustainability and future investment.

Summary

- 3.15. In overall terms, the 2023-24 Provisional Settlement has provided additional funding for the County Council to meet budget pressures. New pressures since the 2022-23 MTFS was agreed are anticipated to be broadly met by this additional funding. However, significant cost pressures have emerged across a number of service areas, and pressures overall are extremely high this year (driven by a combination of factors including the pay award, National Living Wage and cost of care market pressures, wider inflation rates, energy costs, and demand).
- 3.16. The outlook for future years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) remains extremely challenging as additional funding has largely been front loaded in 2023-24 and (to some extent) 2024-25, with very limited increases available for 2025-26 onwards. The Provisional Settlement for 2023-24 is essentially a one-year announcement and as such there is limited certainty for planning for 2024-25 onwards. As a result of this, and the overall pressures in 2023-24, there is anticipated to be very little flexibility in the MTFS as a whole.
- 3.17. The detail of the Provisional Settlement announcements have been analysed and incorporated in Budget planning for January Cabinet. District forecasts for council tax and business rates remain to be confirmed (due 31 January 2023) although latest estimates have been incorporated in planning. There remains potential for some change between the Provisional and Final Settlement (although material changes are unlikely).

4. Proposed Revenue Budget 2023-24

4.1. Budget planning for 2023-24 was undertaken in line with the following overarching timetable. Cabinet's proposed recommendations to Council and the draft timetable below for 2024-25 outline the approach to developing plans to meet the remaining budget shortfalls in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27.

Table 3 Budget planning timetable 2023-24 and proposed 2024-25

Activity / Milestone	Timeframe
Cabinet review of the financial planning position for 2023-27 – including formal allocation of targets	4 April 2022
Scrutiny Committee	20 April 2022
Select Committee input to development of 2023-24 Budget – strategy	w/c 23 May 2022
Review of budget pressures and development of budget strategy and detailed savings proposals 2023-27 incorporating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Challenge 1 (May) Budget Challenge 2 (July) Budget Challenge 3 (September) Budget Challenge 4 (December) 	April to December 2022
Cabinet agree strategic budget approach and any initial proposals for summer consultation	4 July 2022
Scrutiny Committee	20 July 2022
Summer consultation activity	22 July to 21 September 2022
Cabinet approve final proposals for public consultation	3 October 2022
Scrutiny Committee	19 October 2022
Public consultation on 2023-24 Budget proposals, council tax and adult social care precept	21 October to 16 December 2022
Select Committee input to development of 2023-24 Budget – comments on specific proposals	w/c 14 November 2022
<i>Government Autumn Statement</i>	<i>17 November 2022</i>
<i>Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement announced including provisional council tax and precept arrangements (outcomes of Fair Funding Review?)</i>	<i>19 December 2022</i>
Cabinet considers outcomes of service and financial planning, EQIA and consultation feedback and agrees revenue budget and capital programme recommendations to County Council	30 January 2023
Confirmation of District Council tax base and Business Rate forecasts	31 January 2023
<i>Final Local Government Finance Settlement</i>	<i>TBC January / February 2023</i>
Scrutiny Committee 2023-24 Budget scrutiny	15 February 2023

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

County Council agrees Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-24 to 2026-27, revenue budget, capital programme and level of council tax for 2023-24	21 February 2023
2024-25 Proposed	Time frame
Cabinet review of the financial planning position for 2024-28 – including formal allocation of targets	May / June 2023
Scrutiny Committee	May / June 2023
Select Committee input to development of 2024-25 Budget – strategy	TBC
Review of budget pressures and development of budget strategy and detailed savings proposals 2024-28 incorporating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Challenge 1 (early June) – context / strategy / approach / outline proposals Budget Challenge 2 (early September) – detail and final proposals 	April to December 2023
Cabinet approve final proposals for public consultation	TBC October 2023
Scrutiny Committee	TBC October 2023
Public consultation on 2024-25 Budget proposals, council tax and adult social care precept	Late October to mid December 2023
Select Committee input to development of 2024-25 Budget – comments on specific proposals	TBC November 2023
<i>Government Autumn Budget</i>	<i>TBC October / November 2023</i>
<i>Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement announced including provisional council tax and precept arrangements</i>	<i>TBC December 2023</i>
Cabinet considers outcomes of service and financial planning, EQIA and consultation feedback and agrees revenue budget and capital programme recommendations to County Council	TBC January 2024
Confirmation of District Council tax base and Business Rate forecasts	31 January 2024
<i>Final Local Government Finance Settlement</i>	<i>TBC January / February 2024</i>
Scrutiny Committee 2024-25 Budget scrutiny	TBC February 2024
County Council agrees Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024-25 to 2027-28, revenue budget, capital programme and level of council tax for 2024-25	TBC February 2024

**Assumed Government activity and timescales*

4.2. On 21 February 2022, the County Council approved the current year's (2022-23) Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to 2025-26. Based on information available at that time, and including £45.793m of planned savings, the MTFS set out a budget gap of £96.676m over the period, with a gap of £59.927m to be addressed in 2023-24. This was based on an assumption that the funding allocations set out in the 2022-23 final Local Government Finance Settlement would be broadly "rolled over" for 2023-24 and beyond. The 2022-23 MTFS provided the starting point for the Council's 2023-24 Budget planning activity. Full details of cost pressures assumed in the

council's MTFS are set out in the [Budget Book 2022-26](#) and were summarised in the [Strategic and Financial Planning](#) report to Cabinet in April 2022.

- 4.3. The [April 2022 Cabinet](#) meeting considered the approach to Budget setting for 2023-24. At that time, Cabinet agreed the addition of a further financial year (for 2026-27) to the planning period. The inclusion of a further year in MTFS planning based on the same broad assumptions added £19.137m to the forecast gap, bringing it to £115.814m for the MTFS period. The forecast budget gap for 2023-24 remained £59.927m. Taking into account this £60m forecast gap for the year, Cabinet agreed to seek to find an initial £15m of proposals for July Cabinet in order to provide a robust foundation for Budget-setting. Cabinet also agreed the overall allocation of saving targets to departments, being the new savings which needed to be found in addition to those currently planned for in the 2022-23 MTFS position and set out in the Council's 2022-23 Budget Book. These decisions represented the starting point to inform wider budget setting work across the organisation.
- 4.4. In developing the 2023-24 Budget, Cabinet next considered the MTFS position in [July 2022](#), at which point it considered and agreed "Phase 1" budget proposals totalling £13.007m for 2023-24 against the target of £15.000m. Cabinet agreed to undertake public consultation over the summer in order to support in shaping the specific saving proposal to review Norfolk's Mobile Library Service, which would have service delivery implications. This consultation was completed and the outcomes are reflected within the recommendations set out in this Budget. Further specific details relating to Mobile Library saving proposals are detailed in [Appendix 7](#). Cabinet also agreed that public consultation in relation to all other proposals would be undertaken later in the year, alongside the consultation on any additional savings proposals brought forward for consideration by Cabinet in October 2022. Full details of all saving proposals in the 2023-24 Budget are set out later in this report.
- 4.5. In [October 2022](#), Cabinet then received a further update on the progress towards identifying proposals to address the remaining 2023-24 target and the proposed approaches to tackling the remaining MTFS gap. At that point, further work was required to identify additional proposals that would support the development of a balanced Budget for 2023-24. Cabinet considered the 2023-24 Budget proposals prior to public consultation being undertaken, and agreed the proposed approach to public consultation on, and equality impact assessments of, the 2023-24 Budget. The report also provided an update on the emerging service and other budget pressures along with key areas of risk and uncertainty.
- 4.6. The latest information about the Council's 2022-23 financial position is set out in the Financial Monitoring report elsewhere on the agenda (Period 8 as reported at January 2023). The Council's overarching budget planning for 2023-24 is based on the assumption that a balanced 2022-23 outturn position is delivered (i.e. that in aggregate savings are achieved as planned and there are no overall overspends). Where possible, ongoing pressures and non-delivery of savings identified within the forecast 2022-23 position have been

provided for as detailed later in this paper. In particular the Children's Services overspend in 2022-23 has been considered as part of the 2023-24 budget process with pressures provided in the proposed Budget alongside the mitigating actions in place as set out elsewhere in this report and in financial monitoring.

- 4.7. As set out in Section 3 above, collectively the Spending Review 2021, Autumn Budget 2022 and DLUHC Policy Statement have provided indications of the medium term financial envelope within which local authorities will operate, but the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2023-24 itself only set out funding allocations for one year. The failure to publish full medium term funding forecasts is disappointing and impacts on the Council's ability to plan over the longer term. The further significant delay to long awaited funding reforms, alongside the absence of any detail at this stage about the likely terms of reference for this funding review only serves to add further uncertainty to the Council's planning and associated forecasts.
- 4.8. Announcements in the Provisional Settlement were broadly in line with overall planning assumptions, or have been accompanied with associated spending pressures, such as the National Living Wage. As a result the provisional Settlement enables the Council to prepare a balanced 2023-24 Budget but is not sufficient to deliver a balanced position over the life of the MTFS. The Council therefore continues to expect to need to draw on its earmarked reserves over the period covered by the MTFS. This includes a significant draw on one-off resources in 2023-24, continuing the trend of the current year 2022-23. This is not however a sustainable position in the longer term. Some contributions into reserves will be made, but this mainly reflects the timing of spend funded from specific grants. Current planning does not include any draw on the Council's general balances, which are planned to be maintained at the minimum level of at least 5% of the net revenue budget. The use of reserves is also in part a reflection of the various severe cost pressures and challenges in achieving planned savings, which the Council faces across almost all service areas. It is important to recognise that as a result, the Council is not in a position to be able to remove or reverse any of the saving proposals agreed as part of the 2022-23 budget, including those savings which are due for implementation during 2023-24, beyond those set out later in this report.
- 4.9. The Revenue Budget proposals set out in this document form a suite of proposals which will enable the County Council to set a balanced Budget for 2023-24. As such, **recommendations to add growth items, amend or remove proposed savings, or otherwise change the budget proposals, will require Cabinet (or ultimately, County Council) to identify offsetting saving proposals or equivalent reductions in planned expenditure.**
- 4.10. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is required to comment on the robustness of budget proposals, and the estimates upon which the budget is based, as part of the annual budget-setting process. This assessment is set out in the [Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-24](#) (Appendix 4)). The budget position and associated assumptions are kept under continuous review. The latest financial planning position and details of

all Service Department savings proposals are therefore set out for Cabinet to consider in this report prior to budget-setting by County Council in February 2023.

- 4.11. **Subject to decisions about the level of council tax increase for 2023-24, the overall net budget proposed for 2023-24 is £493.707m (based on an increase of 4.99%).** The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement for 2023-24 was published 19 December 2022 but remains to be confirmed in January 2023 and therefore amendments may be required to reflect any changes. At this stage, no material adjustments in the Final Settlement are anticipated.
- 4.12. Table 4 below summarises the overall proposed final budget for 2023-24, including the cash limited budgets by service. Details of the proposed changes for each service are shown in Sections 8 to 12. The structure of the budget is based on the current Service Departments within the organisational framework¹⁵. Following the departure of the Director of Governance in January 2023, the services which previously formed the Governance Department (Nplaw and Governance) have been incorporated within Strategy and Transformation.
- 4.13. The net budget reflects the council tax requirement only, that is, the amount to be funded by council taxpayers. All income from the Business Rates Retention Scheme is accounted for as council income. The net budget also includes current information received from the District Councils on their respective council tax base, Collection Funds and expected Business Rates.
- 4.14. At the time of preparing this report in early January 2023, estimates of business rates collection, and the impact of Districts' council tax decisions are not fully known and therefore may change prior to reporting to County Council. In addition, the Local Government Finance Settlement is also not finalised and so the proposed 2023-24 Budget may need to be altered to reflect any changes to government funding amounts for 2023-24 following the final Settlement publication, expected to be announced at the end of January or early February 2023. Likewise, final changes to the District Councils' collection funds and the final Business Rates position will not be confirmed until the end of January and may alter the proposed 2023-24 Budget.
- 4.15. In relation to council tax, if the County Council agrees to increase council tax by 4.99% overall (2.99% in relation to general council tax and 2.00% for the Adult Social Care precept), this would generate £23.356m additional funding in 2023-24. Further details about council tax are included within Section 5 of this report.
- 4.16. Service and budget planning for 2023-24 has been based on a number of assumptions about changes in core government funding, which remain to be

¹⁵ As highlighted previously, there may be further changes to the organisational structure as a result of the Strategic Review and the departure of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services in April 2023. As the detailed implications remain to be confirmed, these are not incorporated in this report but will be reflected as far as possible in the 2023-24 Budget Book.

confirmed. The details of all such assumptions and the remaining key risks are set out later in this section of the report. The policy and position of the Council's reserves and balances is set out in [Appendix 3](#) and recommends a minimum level of general balances, reflecting budget risks and uncertainty around future government funding.

- 4.17. **Cabinet is asked to recommend to County Council the 2023-24 Budget proposals, subject to any changes they may have.** The proposed overall budget is shown in the table below and detailed in the remainder of this report.

Table 4: Net Revenue Budget

Service Department	2022-23 Base Budget	Budget increases - cost pressures	Budget decreases - savings	2023-24 Recommended Budget before funding and cost neutral changes	Net funding changes	Net cost neutral changes	2023-24 Recommended Net Budget
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Adult Social Services	263.184	50.176	-28.040	285.321	-36.170	0.330	249.481
Children's Services	189.065	55.187	-12.517	231.735	0.000	0.858	232.593
Community and Environmental Services	166.162	19.823	-10.254	175.731	0.024	1.354	177.109
Strategy and Transformation	10.720	3.752	-2.042	12.429	0.000	0.331	12.761
Finance and Commercial Services	33.424	3.297	-1.200	35.520	0.000	0.273	35.793
Finance General	-198.432	16.603	-5.650	-187.480	-23.404	-3.146	-214.029
Total	464.123	148.838	-59.704	553.257	-59.550	0.000	493.707

Note: Tables throughout the budget reports are rounded to the nearest £0.001m and therefore may not sum exactly.

- 4.18. The change in the Adult Social Services Net Budget 2022-23 to 2023-24 reflects significant growth pressures of £50.176m (including inflation and market pressures), offset by savings of -£28.040m resulting in a net increase of £22.136m in the Department's budget before funding and cost neutral changes. Within the 2023-24 Budget it is proposed that additional social care grant funding be recognised in full within the Adult Social Services base budget.

4.19. Any new budget pressures, changes to planned savings, or removal of proposals will require alternative savings to be identified by the relevant Service Department in order to maintain a balanced budget position.

4.20. Note:

- Budget increases of £148.838m include £41.528m inflationary pressures, £31.069m legislative pressures, £20.495m of demand and demographic pressures and £55.746m of pressures arising from policy decisions. See detailed Service Budgets in Sections 8 to 12 for further details.
- Details of £59.704m total savings are also shown within the relevant Service Department in Sections 8 to 12. Within the total budget savings, £24.173m (40%) relate broadly to transformation of services or service delivery in 2023-24. £17.052m relate to one-off savings in 2023-24, which will result in a pressure in subsequent years¹⁶. These are detailed in Table 6 below. The budget also includes one-off use of reserves (included in Table 6) and detailed in the Reserves and Balances report ([Appendix 3](#)).
- The net funding increase of £59.550m includes £75.665m funding increases and £16.115m funding decreases as shown in Table 5.
- Further details of the £4.570m of cost neutral changes are provided in the detailed Service Budgets in Sections 8 to 12.
- The change in the net revenue budget between 2022-23 and 2023-24 is £29.584m. The breakdown of this is set out in Table 7 below.

¹⁶ Note the transformation savings include some one-off items and vice versa

Table 5: Breakdown of net funding changes

	2023-24
	£m
<i>Funding increases</i>	
Government Funding changes: Social Care Funding (£25.030m Social Care Grant, £9.785m "ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund")	-34.815
CPI increase in Business Rates budget	-16.355
One-off application of Business Rates Risk reserve to support 2023-24 revenue budget	-7.752
2023-24 Services Grant	-6.022
Government Funding changes: ASC Discharge Fund	-5.554
Change in Revenue Support Grant	-4.170
Rebase Business Rates budget	-0.996
Total funding increases	-75.665
<i>Funding decreases</i>	
Removal of 2022-23 "Services Grant" one-off (share of £1.5bn pa SR21 announcement)	10.687
Removal of 2022-23 Social Care Reform grant	2.821
Adults grant assumption decreases (2023-24 Independent Living Fund rolled in to Social Care Grant)	1.379
New Homes Bonus Grant	1.205
Food Safety Enforcement grant rolled into main settlement 2023-24	0.024
Total funding decreases	16.115
Net funding changes	-59.550

Table 6: One-off savings and use of reserves

		2022-23
Ref	Saving	£m
S2324ASS041	One-off usage of ASC Reserves	-3.000
S2324ASS045	One-off usage of ASC Reserves: Additional one-off usage of ASC Reserves (reprioritisation).	-2.000
S2324ASS052	Additional capitalisation to release further one-off reserves	-4.000
S2324CS024	Contract efficiencies: Efficiency savings through reducing management roles and one-off inflationary savings.	-0.100
S2324CS033	One-off funding of transformation spend from capital receipts	-2.500
S2324CES123	One-off usage of CES Reserves	-1.000
S2324CES129	One-off saving from Trading Standards staffing budget	-0.042
S2324CES130	Armed forces covenant - reduce funding contribution for one year	-0.010
S2324CES133	Vehicle replacement fund	-0.300
S2324CES136	Fire and Rescue Service efficiencies	-0.050
S2324CES146	Application of Business Rates Pool funds to support Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF) expenditure	-2.000
S2324CES147	One-off application of CES reserves to support core budget	-1.000
S2324S&T008	One-off usage of S&T Reserves	-0.050
S2324FG016	One-off application of Finance General reserves to support core budget	-1.000
	Total savings	-17.052
	One-off application of Business Rates Risk reserve to support 2023-24 revenue budget	-7.752

4.21. Note:

- These figures exclude funding increases (base adjustments), such as from the improved Better Care Fund and social care funding, and cost neutral changes. A summary is provided within Table 15 and details provided within Table 26 to Table 31.
- The Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) includes the one-off use of resources such as the use of Public Health Reserves to deliver public health outcomes and which will result in future budget pressures. The implications of one-off funding are discussed in further detail throughout these reports and particularly within the MTFS ([Appendix 2](#)).

Table 7: Change in Net Revenue Budget 2022-23 to 2023-24

	£m
Budgeted council tax 2022-23	464.123
<i>Increase due to:</i>	
Tax base change (increase 3,876 Band D equivalent)	5.880
General council tax increase (2.99%)	14.024
Adult Social Care precept (2.00%)	9.331
Forecast increase in Collection Fund ¹⁷	0.348
Budgeted council tax 2023-24	493.707

Revisions to saving proposals

4.22. The table below sets out a summary of the savings proposals for 2023-24 to 2026-27. After adjustment for changes to saving proposals brought forward from the 2022-23 Budget, the Council has identified a net £50.545m of new savings proposals in this budget round to help enable the Council to set a balanced budget for 2023-24. Since reporting proposed savings for public consultation to Cabinet in October 2022, a number of additional proposals have been identified, and some savings, including plans brought forward from previous years, have been removed, or the saving value has been reassessed. Further details of all the savings within 2023-24 planning can be found in the detailed Service Budgets in Sections 8 to 12. In particular, the following changes have been made to the proposals considered by Cabinet in October and included in public consultation:

Savings removed from 2023-24 planning

- Children's Services: Review of budget assumptions: Review of mainstream Post 16 transport policy and subsidies. -£0.100m
- Children's Services: Review of all Children's Services grants: Review to determine grants which can be ceased or reduced -£0.140m
- Children's Services: Withdrawing from Professional Development Centre (PDC) building -£1.250m. *Note – withdrawal from site and disposal approval process to be progressed, but this delivers a capital receipt which is not a direct revenue saving.*
- Community and Environmental Services: Recycling Centres: Wednesday closures -£0.200m

¹⁷ The Collection Fund position in 2021-22 reflected a material movement from a surplus position in the 2020-21 Budget to a deficit position for 2021-22, due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on council tax collections in 2020-21. Government subsequently made provision to mandate that any deficit arising in 2020-21 must be phased over a three year period. The movement forecast for 2023-24 reflects a continuation of the improved Collection Fund position from 2022-23, and includes the final year of this deficit phasing from 2020-21. All Norfolk districts apart from King's Lynn and West Norfolk are forecasting a surplus position on the Collection Fund as set out in Table 22 of this report.

Savings amended in 2023-24 planning

- Community and Environmental Services: Strategic salt storage facility at Ketteringham Depot -£0.045m *Delivery of saving deferred to 2026-27*
- Community and Environmental Services: Review of budget assumptions: Removal of growth and cost pressures previously assumed in the Community and Environmental Services budget which are no longer expected to be required. -£1.211m *Saving reduced by £0.011m*
- Community and Environmental Services: Review of Norfolk's Mobile Library Service -£0.200m *The total saving value to be achieved and the overall approach to delivery of the proposal have been significantly revised following public consultation.¹⁸ Saving reduced by £0.093m See [Appendix 7](#) for full details of the revised proposal.*

Table 8: Summary of recurring net new budget savings by Department

	2023-24 Saving £m	2024-25 Saving £m	2025-26 Saving £m	2026-27 Saving £m	Total Saving £m
Adult Social Services	-23.865	8.400	-2.500	-2.000	-19.965
Children's Services	-7.617	2.588	0.050	0.000	-4.979
Community and Environmental Services	-10.018	2.819	0.570	-0.045	-6.674
Strategy and Transformation	-2.244	0.050	1.571	0.000	-0.624
Finance and Commercial Services / Finance General	-6.800	0.540	-0.360	-0.240	-6.860
Grand Total	-50.545	14.397	-0.669	-2.285	-39.102

Strategic Review

4.23. To support the Council in meeting the financial challenges of the next few years, the Strategic Review was commissioned (Cabinet, 4 April 2022,¹⁹) to identify opportunities to redesign how we are organised to support and deliver the services that residents of Norfolk rely upon in the most efficient and effective ways. This Strategic Review has considered all parts of the organisation but the focus to date has been on ensuring our enabling functions and management structures are fit for the future, limiting disruption to frontline services that are directly supporting our residents and communities.

4.24. The Strategic Review has identified significant opportunities to deliver savings from these changes to our organisation design and ways of working, the first tranche of which have been included in these budget proposals. They represent a whole Council response to delivering on our Strategic Plan, recognising the challenging financial context. Where we are implementing new models for our enabling and support services, some of which will require staff consultation given the extent of changes proposed, these are expected to

¹⁸ The proposal to undertake a review of Norfolk's Mobile Library Service was subject to a consultation in Summer 2022: <https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/mobilelibraries/>, it did not therefore form part of the budget consultation in October 2022.

¹⁹ Agenda Item 12: [Document.ashx \(cmis.uk.com\)](#)

provide non-financial benefits as well. The financial savings identified as part of the Strategic Review respond to one or more of the following drivers:

- Remove areas of duplication or clarify accountabilities and ways of working, in particular for how our 'enabling' services work with departments delivering to residents and communities;
- Refocus and consolidate capability within our enabling services and improve the ability to direct the right resources to agreed priorities and collaborate to support departments or major projects;
- Apply consistent organisational design principles, including in the number of management levels and spans of control for managers across our organisation, to improve clarity of accountability, line management and operational decision making;
- Reduce operating costs by safely removing roles in areas where work can be redistributed, stopped or redesigned to be undertaken with less capacity.

4.25. A total of £17m has been identified with changes and resulting savings across all departments, that deliver against the agreed priorities and scope of the Strategic Review. Due to the complexity and importance of the task, and the need to design and implement these changes while ensuring stability and sustaining improvement achieved in our safety-critical services, changes will be brought forward in phases in 2023-24, with full-year effects realised in 2024-25. Further plans are already being drawn up to build on the foundations that are being put in place over the next few months as a result of the Strategic Review. Additional benefits to ways of working and resulting financial savings are anticipated to be identified for 2024-25 and 2025-26 as the next phases of the Strategic Review. There will be broadening and deepening of proposals being brought forwards for 2023-24, and also new proposals that continue to strengthen the Council's resilience and deliver efficient and effective services and outcomes. It is considered that it would be realistic for phase two of the Strategic Review to target to make a material contribution of c.£10m towards reducing the forecast 2024-25 gap.

4.26. As the changes are embedded, they will provide the platform for a more joined-up approach across the Council to wider changes and opportunities in the local system, in particular our participation in the Integrated Care System with health partners and the implementation of the recently agreed County Deal.

4.27. The proposed 2023-24 Budget includes the savings set out by Department in the following table and linked to the Strategic Review. Further details of all individual savings within the 2023-24 Budget are provided in the detailed Service Budgets in Sections 8 to 1212.

Table 9: Summary of proposed Strategic Review savings by Department

	2023-24 Saving £m
Adult Social Services	-4.800
Children's Services	-5.418
Community and Environmental Services	-2.557
Strategy and Transformation	-2.268
Finance and Commercial Services / Finance General	-2.020
Grand Total	-17.063

4.28. As in previous years, budget planning across the Council has also included work to review in detail the deliverability of planned savings and to understand service pressures. Following this activity, the 2023-24 Budget sees further investment in essential services through both the removal of previously planned savings and recognition of budget overspend pressures. The changes to previously agreed savings proposed in this report contribute to ensuring that the 2023-24 Budget will be both robust and deliverable. The net saving position above reflects the removal or delay of £3.040m of saving proposals brought forward from previous budget rounds.

4.29. Details of the key elements of the Council's proposed revenue budget are set out here.

Income

4.30. The Council has four main funding streams:

- Business Rates Retention Scheme (including Revenue Support Grant)
- Council Tax
- Specific Grants
- Fees and Charges

4.31. The main issues in relation to each of these are as follows:

1. Business Rates Retention Scheme

The provisional Local Government Funding Settlement in December 2022 set out details of the Council's Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) allocations for 2023-24, which include the authority's Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and business rates baseline funding level.

The business rates baseline within SFA is normally uprated annually in line with CPI (previously RPI up to 2017-18). For 2023-24, the Government has announced that the Business Rate multiplier will again be frozen. The real terms increase which would normally be expected will instead be provided via a Section 31 grant. Until recently, in order to ensure that local government spending was within the national departmental expenditure limits, after taking into account the business rates baseline funding, RSG

has been used as a balancing figure and subsequently was reducing year on year in line with the Government's deficit reduction plan. Planned reductions in RSG have given rise to a "negative RSG adjustment" for some local authorities since 2019-20 (Norfolk was not affected), which the Government has decided to continue to eliminate. RSG is being uplifted in line with CPI for 2023-24.

The tables below show the breakdown of the 2023-24 Settlement Funding Assessment compared to the 2022-23 allocations, and the component elements. In overall terms, the provisional Settlement shows an increase of £9.945m or 5.08% to core government funding compared to the 2022-23 actual amounts, although this does not reflect the Section 31 grant. It should be noted these figures remain subject to confirmation in the final Settlement in January 2023.

Table 10: Provisional Settlement Funding Assessment changes

	2022-23 Actual	2023-24 Provisional	% Change (2022-23 actual to 2023-24 provisional)
	£m	£m	%
Upper-tier funding within Baseline Funding Level	147.134	152.640	3.74%
Fire and Rescue within Baseline Funding Level	7.884	8.179	3.74%
Total Baseline Funding Level	155.019	160.820	3.74%
Upper-tier funding within RSG	36.628	40.343	10.14%
Fire and Rescue within RSG	4.232	4.661	10.14%
Total Revenue Support Grant	40.860	45.004	10.14%
Total Settlement Funding Assessment	195.879	205.824²⁰	5.08%

²⁰ RSG figures stated in Table 10 exclude the grants rolled in at the Provisional Settlement and therefore do not equal to the total RSG and SFA figures shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Breakdown of Provisional Settlement Funding Assessment

	2022-23 Actual	2023-24 Provisional	Change (2022-23 actual to 2023-24 provisional)
	£m	£m	£m
Settlement Funding Assessment	195.903	205.875	9.972
<i>Notional breakdown:</i>			
Revenue Support Grant	40.885	45.055	4.170
Business Rates Baseline	155.019	160.820	5.801
<i>Via: Top-up</i>	<i>127.897</i>	<i>132.936</i>	<i>5.039</i>
<i>Retained Rates</i>	<i>27.122</i>	<i>27.884</i>	<i>0.762</i>

2. Council Tax

The level of council tax remains a matter for local councils and the four options open to the Council are to:

- Decrease council tax;
- Freeze council tax;
- Increase council tax below the council tax referenda limits; or
- Increase council tax above the council tax referenda limits and undertake a council tax referendum within Norfolk.

These budget papers have been prepared on the basis of a recommended 2.99% increase in general (basic) council tax and a 2.00% increase in the Adult Social Care precept. This **4.99%** increase is within the referendum threshold, generates £23.356m of additional income and results in total council tax of £493.707m for the year.

The Council has previously opted to raise council tax including the adult social care precept as shown below:

Table 12: Previous council tax increases

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
General increase	1.99%	1.80%	2.99%	2.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%
ASC precept increase	2.00%	3.00%	3.00%	0.00% ²¹	2.00%	2.00% ²²	1.00% ²³
Total increase	3.99%	4.80%	5.99%	2.99%	3.99%	3.99%	2.99%

The Government's assumptions within the Settlement about local authorities' abilities to raise council tax continue to mean that any decision to raise council tax by less than the Government's inflation assumptions,

²¹ No increase available as maximum 8% taken in period 2016-17 to 2018-19.

²² Maximum 3% available, 1% deferred to 2022-23.

²³ 1% deferred from 2021-22. Additional 1% not taken 2022-23.

result in underfunding of the Council compared to Government's expectations as expressed within the "core spending power" position.

3. Other Income

A table on total Government grant funding is shown below, with further details provided in the Medium Term Financial Strategy ([Appendix 2](#)).

Table 13: List of key grants and funding

	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	Budget	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Un-ring-fenced					
Business Rates	168.196	185.547	185.547	185.547	185.547
Revenue Support Grant	40.885	45.055	45.055	45.055	45.055
Rural Services Delivery Grant	4.178	4.178	4.178	4.178	4.178
Social Care Grant	41.495	66.525	66.525	66.525	66.525
Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care Fund	2.821	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund	0.000	9.785	9.785	9.785	9.785
ASC Discharge Fund	0.000	5.554	20.919	20.919	20.919
Services Grant	10.687	6.022	0.000	0.000	0.000
New Homes Bonus	1.833	0.628	0.000	0.000	0.000
School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant	0.296	0.296	0.296	0.296	0.296
Fire Pension Grant	1.629	1.629	1.629	1.629	1.629
Fire Revenue	1.184	1.184	1.184	1.184	1.184
Inshore Fisheries	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152	0.152
Local reform and community voices	0.581	0.581	0.581	0.581	0.581
Social Care in Prisons	0.345	0.345	0.345	0.345	0.345
War Pensions Scheme Disregard	0.248	0.248	0.248	0.248	0.248
Extended rights to free travel (Local Services Support Grant)	1.387	1.387	1.387	1.387	1.387
PFI Revenue Grant (streetlights and schools)	7.905	7.905	7.905	7.905	7.905
Independent Living Fund Grant	1.379	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Improved Better Care Fund	39.617	39.617	39.617	39.617	39.617
Ring-fenced					
Public Health	42.261	43.318	43.318	43.318	43.318
Dedicated Schools Grant	729.191	787.655	787.655	787.655	787.655
Pupil Premium Grant	36.332	36.332	36.332	36.332	36.332
Locally collected tax (forecasts)					
Council tax (assuming increase 4.99% 2023-24 & 2024-25, 2.99% 2025-26, 1.99% 2026-27)	464.123	493.707	521.121	542.070	558.386

Shaded items remain to be confirmed

4. Fees and Charges

- 4.32. Fees and charges are an important source of income, and the Council charges for some discretionary services. Inflationary increases to fees and charges have been included within the budget where appropriate.

Expenditure – underlying trends

- 4.33. The aim of the budget planning process is to prepare a robust budget that supports the Council's priority areas, protects and develops services, but is affordable within the available levels of funding. The major cost drivers affecting Norfolk County Council that have been incorporated into the 2023-24 budget plans are:

1. Price inflation

A significant proportion of the Council's services continues to be delivered externally to the County Council – through partners, private sector contracts, and via the council's own companies (including Norse). This means that contractual arrangements are a key driver of the Council's cost pressures, and many contracts are linked to CPI, RPI or other indices. A significant proportion of the Council's spend is via third party contracts and the effective management of these contracts to ensure both value for money and proper standards of service, is critical. While difficult to identify separately, inflationary price rises are being driven by a range of factors including the war in Ukraine and its associated impact on energy and fuel costs, the wider "cost of living crisis", the legacy of the Covid-19 pandemic and wider changes in the economy.

2. Demographics

Demand for services continues to rise, both through the age profile of the county, wider population changes and through changes to need, such as increasing complexity partially as a result of medical advancements and economic changes. Preventative strategies are in place and, wherever possible, continue to be developed, but these alone will not be sufficient to stem the growth in levels of demand. Budget savings designed to reduce the impact of growth are shown separately. In children's social care, the national picture, driven in part by the pandemic, continues to show a significant rise in demand both in terms of numbers and complexity of need, and thus cost. There is uncertainty about the impacts of reforms to Adult Social Care arrangements which could also give rise to a significant increase in demand by self-funders for the Council to arrange care services. Prior to the Autumn Statement announcement delaying charging reforms until October 2025, Government had indicated that these Fair Cost of Care reforms would be implemented in stages from October 2023 to April 2025.

3. Pay award and the National Living Wage

The annual pay award and National Living Wage increases for both the Council's directly employed staff and contracted services are an important cost driver. At the time of preparing the 2023-24 Budget, the 2022-23 pay

award has been confirmed as a £1,925 flat rate uplift for all employees. This equates to approximately a 5.5% increase across the Council's full staffing structure. No announcements about negotiations for 2023-24 pay awards have been made, although there is likely to be continued significant upward pressure on pay given wider inflation rates and the wider economic situation. The Budget makes provision to fully fund the 2022-23 pay award on an ongoing basis and further makes provision for a pay award of up to 5% for all staff in 2023-24. The pay award remains subject to confirmation at this point, but collectively these pay adjustments (compared to assumptions brought forward from 2022-23) total £14.887m in the 2023-24 Budget, materially higher than the trend rate in recent years.

4. Ongoing costs of COVID-19 pandemic

Beyond the more generalised impact of COVID-19 on wider costs, which is now effectively built into the Council's baseline budget, additional specific costs have been experienced across a range of Council services. Some of these costs, for example outbreak management activities, were met via specific Government funding in 2022-23. In December 2022, Government confirmed that any remaining COVID Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) can be carried over "*into the 2023-24 financial year for purposes of COVID control and COVID recovery, including mitigating the impact of COVID on health and health inequalities in your populations.*" However, in a number of other areas, such as social care, exceptional and other costs of responding to the COVID-19 pandemic (whether short or long term) will continue to need to be met within existing Council budgets.

5. Increased costs of borrowing

Increased costs are anticipated from 2023-24 in line with borrowing forecast to be undertaken in 2022-23 and 2023-24, with an element of contingency for possible interest rate growth and any additional borrowing for cash flow or capital purposes. The Council continues to seek to minimise borrowing costs, including by assessing alternative sources of borrowing, and accessing lower rates for infrastructure investment where possible.

- 4.34. The Capital Programme will be funded from external capital grants, prudential borrowing, revenue budgets and/or reserves. The majority of schemes have historically been funded from capital grants received from central government departments. The largest capital grants are from the Department for Transport and the Department for Education, and this is reflected in the balance of the programme. Capital receipts can only be used to fund capital expenditure (which in turn reduces the future revenue impact of borrowing), to repay debt, or (as a result of additional flexibilities from the 2015 Spending Review) to support the revenue costs of transformation projects as set out in the Capital Programme report elsewhere on the agenda. Government has confirmed the extension of the capital receipts flexibility for a further three years from 2022-23 (until 2024-25)²⁴. Proposed changes to the capital framework for local government²⁵ may have an impact on the Council's

²⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/final-guidance-on-flexible-use-of-capital-receipts>

²⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-capital-framework-minimum-revenue-provision/consultation-on-changes-to-the-capital-framework-minimum-revenue-provision>

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

planning assumptions in relation to Minimum Revenue Provision. However, Government has confirmed that *“any regulation changes will not be implemented on a mandatory basis earlier than April 2024”* and this is reflected in 2023-24 planning.

- 4.35. Subject to the timing of borrowing and the application of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy, the future annual revenue cost of prudential borrowing can be significant (as much as 9% of the amount borrowed based on a typical asset life). The amount and timing of these costs is reflected in the revenue budgets where appropriate and in particular assumes additional borrowing for future years. Separate reports to Cabinet, elsewhere on this agenda, set out the detail of the Treasury Management Strategy and the Capital Strategy including the 2023-27+ programme and funding plans.
- 4.36. Financial planning assumptions for future years take account of the latest monitoring position for 2022-23, as reported to Cabinet elsewhere on this agenda. Further details of the financial planning context are set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27.
- 4.37. The Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-27 ([Appendix 4](#)) sets out the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' (Section 151 Officer) view on the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the calculation of the precept and therefore in agreeing the County Council's budget. The factors and budget assumptions used in developing the 2023-27 budget estimates are set out as part of that judgement. The level of reserves has been analysed in terms of risk and is reported to Cabinet as part of these budget papers. The recommended level of general balances is £25.340m for 2023-24. Provision has been made within the 2023-24 position to increase the General Fund to contribute to maintaining a target balance of at least 5% of the net revenue budget in future years. There may also be some opportunity to increase general reserves as part of the closure of 2022-23 accounts. The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022-26 assumes that general balances will remain at or above the recommended level.

Expenditure and savings – proposals

- 4.38. Table 26 to Table 31 set out in detail the proposed cash limited budget for all Service Departments for 2023-24, and the medium term financial plans for 2024-25 to 2026-27. These are based on the identified pressures and proposed budget savings shown in the table below. Cost neutral adjustments are also reflected within the Service Department budgets.
- 4.39. As previously set out, significant uncertainty remains around the following areas:
- District council tax and business rate forecasts are not finalised, these remain subject to change until final forecasts are received at the end of January.

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

- The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement was published on 19 December 2022, but the final settlement is not expected to be confirmed until the end of January / early February 2023.

4.40. Any changes arising following Cabinet recommendations, or as a result of these uncertainties, will be reported to Full Council for decisions as appropriate and in line with the Budget Protocol.

4.41. The table below provides a summary of the changes in budget planning from the February 2022 MTFS to the current position across the four years of the 2023-27 MTFS.

Table 14: Budget planning position 2023-24 to 2026-27 – changes from the 2022-23 MTFS position

	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
<u>Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022-26</u>					
<u>Cost pressures and funding decreases</u>					
Economic and inflationary pressures	22.119	23.016	23.016	0.000	68.151
Legislative requirements	16.225	6.760	-0.200	0.000	22.785
Demand and demographic pressures	21.270	17.050	11.650	0.000	49.970
NCC policy decisions	36.234	2.821	-1.732	0.000	37.323
Funding decreases	1.833	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.833
Total cost pressures and funding decreases	97.682	49.647	32.734	0.000	180.062
<u>Council tax</u>					
Collection Fund	-0.080	2.000	0.000	0.000	1.920
Council tax increase %	-13.958	-14.519	-15.103	0.000	-43.580
Tax base increase	-4.622	-4.808	-5.001	0.000	-14.431
Total change in council tax income	-18.660	-17.327	-20.104	0.000	-56.091
<u>Savings and funding increases</u>					
Adult Social Services	-4.175	-5.700	0.000	0.000	-9.875
Children's Services	-4.900	-2.500	0.000	0.000	-7.400
Community and Environmental Services	-0.236	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.236
Strategy and Transformation	0.102	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.102
Governance	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.100
Finance and Commercial Services	-0.300	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.300
Finance General	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.250
Sub-total savings	-9.159	-8.200	0.000	0.000	-17.359
Funding increases	-9.936	0.000	0.000	0.000	-9.936
Total savings and funding increases	-19.095	-8.200	0.000	0.000	-27.295
Original gap at MTFS 2022-23 to 2025-26 (Surplus)/Deficit	59.927	24.120	12.630	0.000	96.677

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
<u>Extend MTFS assumptions for 2026-27</u>					
Economic and inflationary pressures	0.000	0.000	0.000	23.670	23.670
Legislative requirements	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Demand and demographic pressures	0.000	0.000	0.000	11.000	11.000
NCC policy decisions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.124	0.124
Council tax increase %	0.000	0.000	0.000	-10.456	-10.456
Tax base increase	0.000	0.000	0.000	-5.202	-5.202
MTFS Gap 2023-24 to 2026-27 (Surplus)/Deficit [Reported to April 2022 Cabinet]	59.927	24.120	12.630	19.137	115.814
<u>New pressures and changes to MTFS assumptions for 2023-27</u>					
Economic and inflationary pressures					
Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-2.790	0.000	0.000	0.000	-2.790
Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	15.605	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.605
Central provision for pay award 2022-23 allocated to services (originally assumed 3%)	-7.484	0.000	0.000	0.000	-7.484
Basic inflation - Pay (2023-24 additional c2% central contingency, 1% 2024-25)	6.766	3.319	0.000	0.000	10.515
Remove 2022-23 inflation contingency not required	-0.296	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.296
Non-pay inflation update	7.431	-1.899	-1.313	-1.442	2.777
Insurance premium uplift pressures anticipated c15% (10% provided)	0.176	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.176
Legislative requirements					
Increase in the local levy to the Regional Flood and Coastal Committees of up to 3.00% (Cabinet 03/10/2022)	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.028
Additional costs of External Audit following PSAA re-procurement exercise 2022	0.188	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.188
Market pressures including National Living Wage and cost of care	9.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.250
ASC Discharge Fund pooled within iBCF - cost pressures	5.554	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.554
Children's Services additional inflationary pressures including impact of National Living Wage	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.000
Remove pressures linked to Social Care reform - cost of care due to implementation delay	-7.626	0.000	0.000	0.000	-7.626
Increase in Apprenticeship levy to reflect historic pay awards and actual costs	0.450	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.450
Demand and demographic pressures					
Coroners - increased pathologist fees	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.100
Loss of income due to lower demand for chargeable services post-COVID (Children's traded services)	0.150	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.150

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
Reduction in Waste pressure - demand and demographic (tonnage)	-1.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	-1.100
Reprofile Future maintenance costs of Great Yarmouth 3rd river crossing	-0.100	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
Great Yarmouth 3rd river crossing - future electricity costs for bridge operation	0.175	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.175
Provision for future Service Pressures	0.000	25.000	25.500	26.010	76.510
NCC policy decisions					
Adult Social Care one-off funding for inspection and assurance preparation activities	2.000	-2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Children's Services recurrent pressures arising from 2022-23 service levels (2022-23 overspend)	20.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	20.000
DSG/HNB recovery plan "Safety Valve" - Norfolk County Council contribution	5.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.500
ICT support to enable WFH equipment provision	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.031
Green energy tariff via ESPO	0.161	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.161
Delivery of Environmental policy 2024-25	0.000	0.150	0.000	0.000	0.150
Implementation of council tax maximisation activities with partners	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.250
Minimum Revenue Provision	-10.555	-0.503	1.720	1.954	-7.385
Interest payable from Repton	-0.900	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.900
One-off interest payable / receivable Treasury Management adjustment	-2.200	2.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
County Deal - implementation costs including consultation	0.250	-0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
Growth and Development - Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF) expenditure (one-off)	2.000	-2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Growth and Development - Local Transport Plan	0.000	0.300	0.000	0.000	0.300
Growth and Development - Transport for Norwich	0.000	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.200
Fire Service - Lease cars pressure - cost increases including EV provision, and increased fleet requirement	0.430	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.430
Fire Service - Norse contractual pressures for fleet services	0.266	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.266
Fire Service - Resource pressure to support NFRS improvement "People" activity following HMI inspection report	0.155	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.155
Coroners resource / capacity increase to address volumes of work	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.200
Provision to increase General Fund level to maintain at target 5% net Budget	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.250
8% Market Supplement for Nplaw Grades I to N until 31 October 2023	0.142	-0.142	0.000	0.000	0.000
Transformation service - growth pressure following Strategic Review (funded by capital receipt flexibility)	1.531	0.000	-1.531	0.000	0.000
Funding decreases					
Reverse assumptions for Social Care Reform grant	10.447	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.447
Reverse NCC assumptions for transitional arrangements in 2023-24 Fair Funding Review	12.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	12.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
Adults grant assumption decreases (2023-24 Independent Living Fund rolled in to Social Care Grant)	1.379	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.379
Food Safety Enforcement grant rolled into main settlement 2023-24	0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.024
Funding increases					
One-off application of Business Rates Risk reserve to support 2023-24 revenue budget	-7.752	7.752	0.000	0.000	0.000
2023-24 Services Grant	-6.022	0.000	0.000	0.000	-6.022
Government Funding changes: Social Care Funding (£25.030m Social Care Grant, £9.785m "ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund")	-34.815	-15.364	0.000	0.000	-50.179
Change in Revenue Support Grant	-4.170	0.000	0.000	0.000	-4.170
CPI increase in Business Rates budget	-16.355	0.000	0.000	0.000	-16.355
New Homes Bonus Grant	-0.628	0.628	0.000	0.000	0.000
Government Funding changes: ASC Discharge Fund	-5.554	0.000	0.000	0.000	-5.554
<u>Changes to savings proposals brought forward</u>					
Reversal / delay of savings brought forward - ASS027 Extra care housing, and ASS008 Supported Housing	1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.500
Reversal / delay of savings brought forward - CES capitalisation ArcGIS	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.100
Rephasing of Museums savings brought forward	0.435	-0.435	0.000	0.000	0.000
Reversal of HR savings linked to software and system savings	0.099	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.099
Rephasing of savings brought forward - FCS	0.700	-0.180	-0.180	0.000	0.340
Reversal of previous savings no longer deliverable: CHL003 Young Parent & Baby Semi-Independent Accommodation, CHL001: Specialist social care housing support, reduced family court costs and reducing LAC numbers, Smarter working: mobile phone reduction through introduction of text service from personal phones	1.241	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.241
Reprofiling of planned Children's Services savings to reflect early delivery	-1.100	1.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
<u>New savings proposals developed for 2023-24 budget setting</u>					
Adult Social Services	-25.365	8.400	-2.500	-2.000	-21.465
Children's Services	-7.758	1.488	0.050	0.000	-6.220
Community and Environmental Services	-10.553	3.254	0.570	-0.045	-6.774
Strategy and Transformation	-2.268	0.050	1.571	0.000	-0.647
Governance	-0.075	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.075
Finance and Commercial Services	-1.600	-0.230	-0.180	0.000	-2.010
Finance General	-5.900	0.950	0.000	0.000	-4.950

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
<u>Changes in council tax assumptions</u>					
Collection Fund	-0.268	0.268	0.000	0.000	0.000
Council tax increase %	-9.398	-10.249	-0.635	-0.439	-20.720
Tax base increase	-1.258	-0.107	-0.210	-0.219	-1.794
Gap for 2023-24 to 2026-27 MTFS	0.000	45.920	35.491	42.716	124.127

4.42. Reflecting these proposed adjustments, the resulting budgets for the period of the MTFS are shown below.

Table 15: Summary Net Budget Changes 2023-24

	Adult Social Services	Children's Services	Community and Environmental Services	Strategy and Transformation	Finance and Commercial Services	Finance General	Norfolk County Council
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Base Budget 2022-23	263.184	189.065	166.162	10.720	33.424	-198.432	464.123
Growth							
Economic and inflationary	12.944	11.997	12.268	1.343	3.157	-0.181	41.528
Legislative requirements	21.532	7.000	-0.190	0.000	0.000	2.727	31.069
Demand and demographic	6.700	11.650	1.965	0.180	0.000	0.000	20.495
Policy decisions	9.000	24.540	5.780	2.228	0.140	14.057	55.746
Funding reductions	4.199	0.000	0.024	0.000	0.000	11.892	16.115
Cost neutral increases	0.580	1.266	1.504	0.356	0.813	0.050	4.570
Total budget increase	54.956	56.453	21.351	4.108	4.110	28.545	169.523
Reductions							
Total savings	-28.040	-12.517	-10.254	-2.042	-1.200	-5.650	-59.704
Funding increases	-40.369	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-35.296	-75.665
Cost neutral decreases	-0.250	-0.409	-0.151	-0.025	-0.540	-3.196	-4.570
Total budget decrease	-68.659	-12.926	-10.405	-2.067	-1.740	-44.142	-139.939
Base Budget 2023-24	249.481	232.593	177.109	12.761	35.793	-214.029	493.707

Funded by: Council tax		-491.439
Collection Fund surplus		-2.268
		-493.707
2023-24 Budget Gap		0.000

Table 16: Summary Net Budget Changes 2024-25

	Adult Social Services	Children's Services	Community and Environmental Services	Strategy and Transformation	Finance and Commercial Services	Finance General	Norfolk County Council
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Base Budget 2023-24	249.481	232.593	177.109	12.761	35.793	-214.029	493.707
Growth							
Economic and inflationary	8.960	5.772	4.361	0.496	1.078	3.768	24.436
Legislative requirements	7.010	0.000	-0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	6.760
Demand and demographic	5.500	9.500	2.150	0.000	0.000	25.000	42.150
Policy decisions	-2.000	-0.540	-1.350	-0.281	0.000	4.947	0.776
Funding reductions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.628	0.628
Cost neutral increases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total budget increase	19.471	14.732	4.911	0.215	1.078	34.344	74.750
Reductions							
Total savings	2.700	0.088	2.819	0.050	-0.410	0.950	6.197
Funding increases	-15.364	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.752	-7.612
Cost neutral decreases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total budget decrease	-12.664	0.088	2.819	0.050	-0.410	8.702	-1.415
Base Budget 2024-25	256.287	247.412	184.839	13.025	36.461	-170.984	567.041

Funded by: Council tax		-521.121
Collection Fund surplus		0.000
		-521.121
2023-24 Budget Gap		0.000
2024-25 Budget Gap		45.920

Table 17: Summary Net Budget Changes 2025-26

	Adult Social Services	Children's Services	Community and Environmental Services	Strategy and Transformation	Finance and Commercial Services	Finance General	Norfolk County Council
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Base Budget 2024-25	256.287	247.412	184.839	13.025	36.461	-170.984	567.041
Growth							
Economic and inflationary	9.068	6.041	4.516	0.514	1.102	0.461	21.702
Legislative requirements	0.000	0.000	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.200
Demand and demographic	6.100	3.500	2.050	0.000	0.000	25.500	37.150
Policy decisions	0.000	-0.100	0.250	-1.413	0.000	-0.280	-1.543
Funding reductions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Cost neutral increases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total budget increase	15.168	9.441	6.616	-0.899	1.102	25.681	57.109
Reductions							
Total savings	-2.500	0.050	0.570	1.571	-0.360	0.000	-0.669
Funding increases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Cost neutral decreases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total budget decrease	-2.500	0.050	0.570	1.571	-0.360	0.000	-0.669
Base Budget 2025-26	268.955	256.903	192.026	13.697	37.203	-145.303	623.481

Funded by: Council tax		-542.070
Collection Fund surplus		0.000
		-542.070
2023-24 Budget Gap		0.000
2024-25 Budget Gap		45.920
2025-26 Budget Gap		35.491

Table 18: Summary Net Budget Changes 2026-27

	Adult Social Services	Children's Services	Community and Environmental Services	Strategy and Transformation	Finance and Commercial Services	Finance General	Norfolk County Council
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Base Budget 2025-26	268.955	256.903	192.026	13.697	37.203	-145.303	623.481
Growth							
Economic and inflationary	9.271	6.193	4.630	0.533	1.128	0.474	22.229
Legislative requirements	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Demand and demographic	6.000	3.000	2.000	0.000	0.000	26.010	37.010
Policy decisions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.124	0.000	1.954	2.078
Funding reductions	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Cost neutral increases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total budget increase	15.271	9.193	6.630	0.657	1.128	28.437	61.317
Reductions							
Total savings	-2.000	0.000	-0.045	0.000	-0.240	0.000	-2.285
Funding increases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Cost neutral decreases	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total budget decrease	-2.000	0.000	-0.045	0.000	-0.240	0.000	-2.285
Base Budget 2026-27	282.226	266.097	198.610	14.354	38.091	-116.866	682.513

Funded by: Council tax		-558.386
Collection Fund surplus		0.000
		-558.386
2023-24 Budget Gap		0.000
2024-25 Budget Gap		45.920
2025-26 Budget Gap		35.491
2026-27 Budget Gap		42.716

- 4.43. In setting the annual budget, Section 25 of the Local Government Finance Act 2003 requires the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services (Section 151 Officer, S151) to report to members on the robustness of budget estimates and the adequacy of proposed financial reserves. This informs the development of a robust and deliverable budget for 2023-24. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' judgement on the robustness of the 2023-24 Budget is set out in [Appendix 4](#), and will be substantially based upon the following considerations:

Changes in budget planning

- Significant service pressures, totalling over £132m, which have been identified for 2023-24 and been incorporated into the Budget in February after being reviewed and validated.
- Net new saving proposals totalling £50.545m (after changes to savings brought forward from the 2022-23 Budget)
- Review and validation of the deliverability of previously planned saving programmes has been undertaken so that changes can be reflected in final budget setting for 2023-24. Any saving proposals which are now judged to be at risk of either non-delivery or delay have been removed or delayed as appropriate from 2023-24 and future years.
- The level of reliance on capital receipts and one-off measures including the use of reserves across the life of the MTFS has been considered. This is judged to be appropriate for 2023-24 but it is recognised that reserves do not represent a sustainable long term funding source. Options to reduce the reliance on such measures will be required in future and are reflected in the budget gaps for future years of the MTFS.
- Budget planning reflects final changes to inflation forecasts for 2023-24, however it should be noted that inflation figures are estimates only for future years and these will continue to change.

Assumptions and Risks

- The Budget assumes that, except where they have been specifically amended, all the savings proposed and included from the 2022-23 planning round can be successfully achieved.
- The latest information about the 2022-23 budget monitoring position is set out in the Financial Monitoring report elsewhere on the agenda. A number of the issues identified in the 2022-23 position are provided for in the pressures included in the 2023-24 Budget, however, save where they have been specifically mitigated within the budget process, the underlying assumption for budget setting is that the 2022-23 Budget is delivered (i.e. that all savings are achieved as planned and there are no significant unfunded overspends). This effectively assumes that any "unmitigated" non delivery of savings from 2022-23 can be made up during 2023-24.
- The Chancellor's Autumn Statement 2022 announcements, as confirmed in the provisional Settlement, are expected to provide additional resources in 2023-24 beyond the level assumed in the February 2022 MTFS. These represent both funding for core services and specific funding for social care. Further details are

provided in Section 3 of this report. The additional funding will enable a number of the pressures identified in the Budget process to be mitigated to ensure a robust position can be established for 2023-24. Assumptions have also been made that elements of funding will continue in 2024-25 and beyond, but the Settlement and Policy Statement do not provide detailed figures. The short-term nature of the Settlement announcement (for 2023-24 only, in spite of a multi-year Spending Review provided in 2021) means that risks remain around the levels of funding in future years and therefore a material impact and potential cliff-edge may emerge in 2024-25 or subsequent years, particularly if social care reforms are now implemented in October 2025 as planned. It is likely that Government would put in place transitional arrangements to “smooth” some of the impact of any future burdens or funding changes but details of any proposed approach remain to be announced by Government. Whatever the case, significant additional funding will be required to enable social care reforms to be implemented effectively. Finally, the trajectory for local authority funding implied by both the Spending Review 2021, Autumn Statement 2022, and Provisional Settlement is for only very limited increases in core ongoing funding in 2025-26 and beyond. Government continues to make assumptions about council tax increases which effectively increase the burden of funding services for Norfolk taxpayers. As set out elsewhere in these papers, details of the final Local Government Finance Settlement for 2023-24 remain to be confirmed, although significant changes are considered unlikely.

- Council tax increases are recommended as set out elsewhere in these papers. The assumed council tax increases are subject to Full Council’s decisions on the levels of council tax, which will be made before the start of each financial year. In future years there will be an opportunity to consider the required level of council tax and Adult Social Care precept in light of any future Government funding and reform announcements relating to initiatives such as a Fair Funding Review, Business Rates Reform, Social Care Reform and the next Comprehensive Spending Review (for 2025-26). However, having regard to Government assumptions about council tax increases, the impact these have on Core Spending Power, and Government expectations about council tax addressing inflationary pressures, it remains the view of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services that the pressures within the current budget planning position are such that the Council will have very limited opportunity to vary these assumptions. **Therefore, in the event that the Government offered the discretion for larger increases in council tax, or further increases in the Adult Social Care precept, this would be the recommendation of the Section 151 Officer in order to ensure that the Council’s financial position remains robust and sustainable.**
- In addition to an annual increase in the level of council tax, the **budget assumes annual tax base increases of 1.27% in 2023-24 and 1.00% for 2024-25 and subsequent years.** If these do not occur, the budget gap would be increased, but equally, additional growth would reduce the gap. This position reflects the broad Norfolk trends experienced in recent years (with the exception of the impact of COVID-19 in 2021-22) in relation to the overall tax base level. It should be noted that council tax forecasts from District Councils for tax base and

collection fund have not yet been finalised and updated information will be provided at the end of January 2023.

- The 2023-24 Budget provides for the following in relation to pay awards:
 - fully funding the impact of the 2022-23 pay award agreed during the year;
 - a pay award of 3% for 2023-24 within departmental budgets
 - an additional pay contingency provision of 2%, providing in total for a pay award of circa 5% in respect of 2023-24. This is in line with inflation forecasts and slightly lower than the actual pay award agreed for 2022-23.
 - At the time of preparing this report, national negotiation about the pay award for the 2023-24 financial year has not commenced and therefore the final pay settlement is not known. In broad terms, every 1% pay increase represents an additional £3.1m pressure to the Council.
- Pay inflation from 2024-25 onwards are assumed and included in budget planning at 4% in 2024-25 and 3% per year thereafter, broadly reflecting national pressures and expected increases to the level of the minimum wage / national living wage, however increases may also have further implications for some of the lower points on the Council's current salary scales, which may increase the pressures, and this will need to be refined as pay negotiations progress.
- The assumed use of one-off funding including reserves within savings proposals. Significantly the 2023-24 Budget assumes that £19.802m can be deployed from reserves in year, including as part of saving proposals and to meet identified 493.707. **The use of one-off resources contributes materially to the scale of the budget gap to be addressed in 2024-25.**
- **Government announced new 2023-24 Social Care funding in the provisional Settlement 2023-24. This includes the re-purposing of funding originally provided to support the implementation of social care reforms.** The level of future funding for social care remains unclear and it is a key concern whether this will be sufficient to meet costs associated with market pressures and fee uplifts. The specific requirements also now attached to this funding and the associated pressures including the level of the National Living Wage are significant. In relation to future years it is unclear what additional resources will be provided to meet the cost pressures associated with planned reforms to Adult Social Care deferred until October 2025, whether these will be sufficient, and how they will be funded at national level.
- The additional Social Care funding in 2023-24 is provided for the purposes described in further detail in paragraph 3.10. Within the 2023-24 Budget it is proposed that these grants be recognised in full within the Adult Social Services base budget. The result of this treatment is that there is a reduction in the department's Net Budget for 2023-24. This reflects a shift, driven by Government funding policy decisions, towards Adult Social Care being increasingly supported via specific funding (social care grants and the Adult Social Care precept) rather than via general council tax. In spite of the Net Budget reduction, the Adult Social Service department's gross budget and spending power for next year will increase, reflecting the significant growth

pressures provided for in the 2023-24 Budget, which have been supported by these new grant funds and the increase in the ASC Precept.

- Transformational change and growth pressures forecast in Children's Services relating to vulnerable children and families, and home to school transport, can be delivered within the funding allocated.
- The High Needs Block overspend and brought forward DSG deficit position can continue be treated in line with the accounting treatment set out by Government (as discussed in more detail below).
- Norfolk is currently carrying an outstanding Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) deficit from previous financial years, with a forecast £71.6m cumulative deficit forecast for the end of 2022-23. On the basis of the accounting treatment introduced in 2020 by the Government²⁶:
 - the DSG is a ring-fenced specific grant separate from the general funding of Local Authorities (LAs);
 - any deficit an authority may have on its DSG account is expected to be carried forward and is not required to be covered by the authority's general reserves;
 - the deficit should be repaid through future years' DSG income.

Norfolk has worked intensively during Summer 2022 with the DfE and their appointed financial and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Advisors as part of the Safety Valve programme, the DfE mechanism to work with local authorities who have the highest levels of High Needs Block (DSG) pressure/overspend, to develop a DSG Management plan and to negotiate potential DfE investment. The core aim for DfE and NCC alike is to achieve an in-year balanced budget to enable the cumulative deficit to be addressed. Through these discussions with the DfE, a plan has been prepared to bring the in-year deficit into surplus and to reduce the cumulative deficit over 6 years. Norfolk's plan is 'Local 1st Inclusion' and is the next stage of our SEND improvement journey, covering the period 2023-29; it marks the end of the first phase of our improvement planning, our SEND and AP transformation programme. In addition to revenue elements the DfE are also considering capital bids from NCC for two more special schools alongside the Council's ongoing £120m capital investment.

Local 1st Inclusion will continue the expansion of specialist provision, to reduce our reliance on high cost, lower quality independent sector provision; our state-funded special schools offer an excellent and high-quality education for children and young people with higher needs SEND and we're investing in more state specialist provision for those children and young people with higher needs. But additionally, we will have a renewed focus on mainstream inclusion and a reduction in the reliance on Education Health and Care Plans.

The programme aims to create a sustainable and effective system which supports children and young people with SEND to flourish in their education, through:

²⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dedicated-schools-grant-dsg-2019-to-2020/dedicated-schools-grant-conditions-of-grant-2019-to-2020#accounting>

- Creating a system of improved support for children and young people's education by increasing support and funding for mainstream schools/school leaders
- Ensuring fewer children need Education, Health and Care Plans by improving support within the mainstream system
- Meeting demand earlier to prevent needs escalating by creating more support to mainstream schools and, through them, families
- Improving the confidence of parents and carers in local support and provision in mainstream education
- Strengthening/expanding state-funded specialist education capacity and reducing reliance on costly independent specialist education provision

Local 1st Inclusion is all about improving outcomes for children and young people with SEND, ensuring wherever possible and appropriate they can attend school close to their home/in their community with the support they need to make progress in their learning alongside other children of the same age.

- There are financial risks linked to the Council's ambitious net zero carbon emissions target which is set out within the Environment Policy adopted by the County Council in 2019-20. This aims to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. The Budget provides for cost pressures and capital schemes intended to support the achievement of 2030 carbon neutrality linked to the Environmental Policy, however further financial pressures may emerge linked to other carbon reduction initiatives. Further details about the Council's financial assumptions linked to carbon reduction are set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- It is assumed pressures forecast within waste budgets can be accommodated within the funding allocations for 2023-24. There is an ongoing risk in relation to pressures within the County Council's budget for waste services which primarily relates to changes in the overall volumes of waste and recycling collected by all councils in Norfolk. Key factors that influence these volumes include the status of the general economy, consumer confidence, changes in national waste policy and the effect of weather patterns on the amount of garden waste that is generated. The two years 2020-21 and 2021-22 saw a combined 8.8% surge in residual waste volumes of around 18,000 tonnes, which was driven by the effects of Covid-19 on consumer behaviours and an increase in work from home practices. The existing data for 2022-23 shows that although residual waste levels have reduced sharply they have not returned to levels seen before Covid-19, even when an allowance is made for an increase in household numbers. The current tonnage projection for residual waste in 2022-23 is for around 210,000 tonnes in total, when street sweepings are excluded, which compares to levels before Covid-19 of around 200,000 tonnes. Service data for 2022-23 also show the impact of a long dry summer on reducing the amount of garden waste collected by councils in Norfolk by around 10,000 tonnes, thereby reducing the total subsidy payment that the County Council makes to the District, City and Borough Councils to support the costs of the recycling they collect. During 2023-24 the current levels of waste and recycling are expected to be sustained with an allowance given for an increase in household numbers and the effects of indexation on costs, and with the levels of garden waste collected by all councils in Norfolk increasing to levels seen in previous years before the reduction in 2022-23. However, there remains a risk that any policy

changes introduced during the year by either the Government, or by the Environment Agency as regulator, could lead to an increase in service volumes and or costs. In the longer term the effects of changes to national policy are expected to reduce residual waste volumes, for example if District, City and Brough Councils are required to collect food waste or a national deposit return scheme is introduced. Policy changes are also expected to increase costs through changes in requirements for how some materials are dealt with and through the introduction of emissions related levies for waste treatment. And the introduction of a national producer responsibility scheme for packaging is expected to lead to changes in how some of the costs of the County Council's waste services are funded, with the expectation that producers will be obliged to pay those that deal with their packaging in waste and recycling.

- Winter Hardship Funds were provided to upper tier local authorities to support families and adults struggling financially as a result of the covid pandemic. This was bolstered in October 2021 with a new Household Support Fund, alongside other funding in place to help vulnerable households and individuals. Government has since extended this funding, most recently until 31 March 2023²⁷ "to support those most in need to help with global inflationary challenges and the significantly rising cost of living." This has represented welcome funding to date but there remains a risk that need will continue for an extended or ongoing period and that local authorities will be expected to meet this demand without further additional resources. However the written statement accompanying the Provisional Settlement also sets out that Government has provided "*£100 million of additional funding for local authorities to support the most vulnerable households in England. This funding will allow councils to deliver additional support to the 3.8 million households already receiving council tax support, whilst also providing councils with the resources and flexibility to determine the local approaches to support other vulnerable households in their area.*"
- On 17 November 2022, the Government announced²⁸ National Living Wage increases which will come into effect from April 2023. These reflect a significant 9.7% increase from £9.50 to £10.42 for workers aged over 23. This is an even greater increase than the 6.6% provided for 2022-23 and represents a sustained level of material increase in the National Living Wage (NLW) which is becoming increasingly challenging. Although the NLW can be accommodated in the Council's own pay scales, it will be difficult in the medium term if this level of increase is sustained. It also has significant implications for some third party providers, particularly in respect of Adult Social Care, but also increasingly for Children's Services, both in terms of the direct financial cost and also on wider recruitment and retention. The impacts for Adults are discussed in further detail in the Fee Levels for Adult Social Care Providers 2023-24 report to Cabinet elsewhere on this agenda. The Council's proposed fee uplift is set at a level intended to enable providers to offer pay at National Living Wage rates but this represents a major financial pressure for the Council – in broad terms, every penny increase in the National Living Wage rate represents a pressure of approximately £0.270m for Adult Social Care. In summary, increases to meet

²⁷ [Household Support Fund \(1 October 2022 to 31 March 2023\): final guidance for county councils and unitary authorities in England - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/minimum-wage-rates-for-2023)

²⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/minimum-wage-rates-for-2023>

the National Living Wage pay rates have been provided for within 2023-24 budget plans, but future increases will continue to put significant pressure on the medium term position.

4.44. The S151 Officer has considered the **adequacy of the overall general fund balance**, as well as the need for providing a general contingency amount within the revenue budget. This assessment is informed by the increasing level of the Council's net budget, uncertainty about business rates income, Government funding, the impact and economic uncertainty linked to the war in Ukraine, the cost of living crisis, the legacy of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the Council's overall value for money position. In broad terms, the general fund balance provides for around 19 days of the Council's net budget activity. While recognising the changing picture, and increasing levels of risk, the proposed revenue budget for 2023-24 is based on increasing general balances to £25.340m. This position acknowledges the significant pressures within the revenue budget and also takes into account the fact that specific earmarked reserves have been established which will help to address pressures and risks in 2023-24. Having regard to the reserves and balances risk assessment, the S151 Officer further continues to recommend a principle of seeking to increase general fund balances and that any additional resources which become available during 2023-24 from (but not limited to) the following sources, should be added to the general fund balance wherever possible:

- in year revenue underspends as reported through the monthly revenue monitor to Cabinet or at year end;
- one off revenue funds which become available such as one-off unbudgeted income;
- any other resources which become available on an unforeseen or unbudgeted basis.

4.45. Taking these issues into account, it is the recommendation of the Section 151 Officer that early planning is undertaken in respect of 2024-25 and the scope to address pressures within the constraints of the overall budget should be reviewed in the round during 2023-24. This should be informed by any local government funding announcements during 2023-24. It may be that further specific details of the longer term funding allocations for the Council are not known until late in 2023-24. **In this context it will be essential that the Council is able to produce a realistic plan for reducing the budget requirement in future years through the early identification of saving proposals for 2024-25, or the mitigation of currently identified pressures,** and that all proposals are considered in the context of the significant budget gap identified for that year. The proposed timetable for 2024-25 Budget setting in Table 3 reflects these considerations.

5. Council tax

5.1. The level of council tax and Adult Social Care (ASC) precept is set annually by Members in the context of thresholds determined by Government. Legislation requires that any council tax increase in excess of a limit / threshold determined by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and approved by the House of Commons, must be decided by local voters, who,

through a local referendum, will be able to approve or veto the proposed increase. In 2023-24, the threshold for upper tier authorities with responsibility for social care has been provisionally announced as 5%. For Norfolk County Council in 2022-23 this equates to 3% for general council tax and 2% for the Adult Social Care precept. Government has also indicated its intention to set a threshold of 5% (3% general and 2% ASC precept) for 2024-25. The threshold for the year is normally finalised annually alongside the Final Local Government Finance Settlement. There is currently no option for any “unused” element of increase to be carried forward to future years, i.e. if not taken in the relevant year, that discretion will be lost.

- 5.2. The MTFS approved by Members in February 2022 assumed a 1.99% increase in council tax for 2023-24 and subsequent years, plus a 1.00% increase in the Adult Social Care precept for 2023-24 to 2025-26. In October 2022, Cabinet agreed to undertake consultation on a proposed increase in council tax of 2.99% (in line with the February MTFS), and two further options including 4.1% and 10.1%²⁹. **Having reviewed the latest financial position and the underlying Budget proposals for 2023-24, the Section 151 Officer recommends that Members adopt the maximum council tax increase available within the referendum threshold, an overall increase of 4.99% for 2023-24.** The table below sets out the additional income available from an increase of 4.99%.

Table 19: Forecast additional income from 4.99% council tax increase 2023-24


	2023-24 £m
General council tax	14.024
Adult Social Care precept	9.331
Total	23.356

- 5.3. The increase in council tax contributes to closing the 2023-24 budget gap and mitigating the gap in future years. **An overall council tax increase of 4.99% supports a substantially more robust Budget for 2023-24 and in particular helps to enable a sustainable position over the Medium Term Financial Strategy period.** A further 4.99% increase for 2024-25 is recommended for planning purposes, taking into account the referendum threshold anticipated to be set by Government, Government expectations about council tax exemplified within Core Spending Power, and the robustness of the Council’s wider financial position in the context of the forecast 2024-25 gap.
- 5.4. The referendum threshold of 5% (including the Adult Social Care precept) is intended by Government to allow local authorities to raise additional resources to meet increased costs within social care and also across wider services. The chart below illustrates how historic and planned council tax increases compare with the level it would have been if CPI increases had been applied since 2010-11. With significant CPI increases now forecast for both 2022-23 and 2023-

²⁹ 4.1% reflects average increase of recent years. Increase of 10.1% informed by inflation rates as of September 2022.


24³⁰, the forecast actual level of council tax is slightly below the theoretical CPI level. This is reflective of the Government's policy of encouraging councils to limit council tax increases in the period to 2015-16, prior to the more recent policy of assuming that local authorities will raise the maximum council tax available. Comparison of changes in the County Council's band D council tax indicates that most upper tier shire counties have made similar decisions in recent years in relation to the level of council tax increase to apply.

Chart 1: Actual council tax levels compared to theoretical CPI increases



³⁰ 9% 2022-23 per [ONS](#) and 5.5% 2023-24 per [OBR EFO November 2022 \(Table A.3\)](#)
C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

Chart 2: Norfolk County Council council tax increases compared to average for shire counties




5.5. The Government will examine council tax increases and budget increases when final decisions have been made throughout the country. County Councils are required by regulations to declare their level of council tax precept by the end of February.

5.6. The council is required to state its council tax / precept as an amount for an average Band D property, together with information on the other valuation bands i.e. Bands A to H. Band D properties had a value in April 1991 of over £68,000 and up to £88,000.

5.7. To calculate the level of the County Council's council tax / precept, District Councils supply information on the number of properties in each of their areas. This information also includes estimated losses in council tax / precept collection and any deficits or surpluses on District Council collection funds. Current forecasts suggest that between 2016-17 and 2023-24, Norfolk will have experienced average growth in the tax base of 1.51% per year. However, the level of growth forecast for 2023-24 is slightly lower than this, at 1.27%. The chart below shows the tax base for each district since 2018-19.

Chart 3 Norfolk Band D equivalent tax base 2018-19 to 2023-24 (forecast)



5.8. As set out in Table 12, the Council has utilised the flexibility provided by Government in 2016-17 for authorities with Adult Social Care responsibilities to increase their council tax by 8% more than the core referendum principle over the period 2016-17 to 2019-20, on the basis that the additional precept raised is allocated to Adult Social Care. The Government then offered a further flexibility to increase the Adult Social Care precept by 2% in 2020-21, which the Council also opted to raise. In respect of 2021-22, the Government confirmed the option to raise the Adult Social Care precept by up to 3%, but with the possibility for some or all of this increase to be deferred (to 2022-23). The Council subsequently agreed that the Adult Social Care precept should be increased by 2% in 2021-22 with a further 1% increase deferred to 2022-23. This decision was taken in recognition of the cumulative impact of council tax increases. For 2022-23 Government has confirmed an ASC precept of 1% plus any deferred element from 2021-22. In February 2022, Council agreed an increase for 2022-23 of 2.99%, foregoing 1% of the Adult Social Care precept available. This report recommends that Cabinet propose to Council an increase in council tax for 2023-24, of 4.99%. This reflects the views of the Section 151 officer that:

- a robust budget can be proposed for 2023-24 based on a 4.99% increase (including the 2.00% Adult Social Care precept increase available), which will support a more sustainable medium term position;
- it remains critical to secure available increases in council tax and the Adult Social Care precept within the base budget to provide additional resources to meet pressures across the organisation. Doing so will enable demographic and other pressures within the Adult Social Care budget and elsewhere across the Council, to be met in 2023-24 and beyond;
- the Government continues with its general assumption that councils will increase council tax at the referendum limit, make use of the flexibility to raise a social care precept where available, and will benefit from ongoing levels of council tax base growth. Failure to raise council tax in line with the Government's assumptions would lead to the Council experiencing a different change in spending power than the Government forecasts. In

addition, a decision not to maximise locally available resources makes the Council's position more difficult when calling for additional funding from Government.

- in "[Build Back Better: Our Plan for Health and Social Care](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care#our-plan-for-adult-social-care-in-England)"³¹, the Government has clearly set out its expectation that *"demographic and unit cost pressures will be met through Council Tax, social care precept, and long-term efficiencies."* The nature and level of pressures within the system, and the achievability of further long term efficiencies in the context of more than ten years of budget savings, mean that meeting this expectation will be extremely challenging (and not achievable in the medium term) if the Council fails to raise the maximum available local resources.
- the pressures within the current budget planning position are such that, unless mitigated by additional savings or government funding, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services considers that the Council will have very limited opportunity to vary these assumptions, and in the event that the Government offered the discretion for larger increases in council tax, or further increases in the Adult Social Care precept, this would be the recommendation of the Section 151 Officer in order to ensure that the Council's financial position remains robust and sustainable. This judgement reflects:
 - the levels of emerging service pressures balanced against saving proposals identified;
 - consideration of the robustness of the Council's overall 2023-24 budget;
 - the risks for the longer term financial position, and in particular the need to ensure that a resilient budget can be set in future years,
 - reliance on one-off measures to support the 2023-24 Budget which will need to be addressed in 2024-25.
 - the considerable remaining uncertainty around risks, funding and cost pressures in 2024-25 and beyond.

5.9. The precise final level of any change in council tax will be confirmed in February 2023 and is subject to Member decision making annually.

5.10. Under the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the Section 151 Officer is required to provide confirmation to Government that the adult social care precept is used to fund Adult Social Care. This must be done within seven days of the Council setting its budget and council tax for 2023-24.

5.11. Details of the findings of public consultation on the level of council tax are set out in [Appendix 5](#) to inform decisions about budget recommendations to County Council.

³¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care#our-plan-for-adult-social-care-in-England>

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

Implications of council tax proposals

- 5.12. The table below sets out the current proposals within the MTFS and reflected within this report.

Table 20: Proposed Council Tax assumptions in MTFS

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
General council tax	2.99%	2.99%	1.99%	1.99%
Adult Social Care precept	2.00%	2.00%	1.00%	0.00%
Total increase	4.99%	4.99%	2.99%	1.99%

- 5.13. Taking into account the findings of consultation set out elsewhere in this report, **Cabinet is asked to consider and confirm, or otherwise, the assumption that the Council's 2023-24 budget will include a 2.99% increase in general (basic) council tax and a 2.00% increase in the Adult Social Care precept (a total increase of 4.99%)** as recommended by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services (Section 151 Officer).
- 5.14. This will need to be considered at the County Council meeting on 21 February 2023.
- 5.15. For planning purposes, for 2024-25 the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) assumes an increase of general council tax of 2.99%, and 2.00% in the Adult Social Care precept, reflecting the threshold indicated in the DLUHC Policy Statement³². For 2025-26, the MTFS assumes increases overall increases of 2.99%, reflecting the thresholds implied at the Spending Review 2021, and for 2026-27 onwards. 1.99%. If the referendum threshold were increased in 2024-25 and subsequent years to above 3%, or any further discretion were offered to increase the Adult Social Care precept (or similar), then it is likely that the Section 151 Officer would recommend the Council take advantage of this flexibility in view of the overall financial position.
- 5.16. The calculation of total payments of £493.707m due to be collected from District Councils in 2023-24 based on a council tax increase of 4.99% as set out, together with the instalment dates and the council tax level for each valuation band A to H is set out below.
- 5.17. The Council is also required to authorise the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services to transfer from the County Fund to the Salaries and General Accounts, all sums necessary in respect of revenue and capital expenditure provided in the 2023-24 budget in order that he can make payments, raise and repay loans, and invest funds.

Council tax precept 2023-24

³² "For 2024-25, the core council tax referendum principles will continue the same as 2023-24. We can confirm that the referendum limit for increases to council tax will remain at 3% per year. In addition, local authorities with social care responsibilities will be able to increase the adult social care precept by up to 2% per year." <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-government-finance-policy-statement-2023-24-to-2024-25/local-government-finance-policy-statement-2023-24-to-2024-25>

5.18. The number of properties, in each council tax band and in each district is converted into 'Band D' equivalent properties to provide the council tax base. The number of properties in each district is shown below.

5.19. The council tax base is then multiplied by the 'Band D' amount to calculate the council tax income (the precept). The precept generated in each district is shown below.

Table 21: Council tax precept 2023-24

2022-23 £m		2023-4 £m
462.203	Precept Charge on District Councils	491.439
	<u>Plus:</u>	
1.920	Estimated Surplus / (Deficit) on District Council Collection Funds etc.	2.268
464.123	Total payments due from District Councils (2023-24 Council Tax Requirement)	493.707
£1,516.95	Council Tax for an average Band "D" Property in 2023-24	£1,592.64
£1,179.85	Council Tax for an average Band "B" Property in 2023-24	£1,238.72

Table 22: Total payments to be collected from District Councils in 2023-24

District Council	Tax Base	Collection Fund Surplus / (Deficit)	Precept	Total Payments Due
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
		£	£	£
Breckland	45,925.50	£1,010,072	£73,142,788	£74,152,860
Broadland	48,127.00	£290,248	£76,648,985	£76,939,233
Great Yarmouth	29,851.00	£265,746	£47,541,897	£47,807,642
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	52,984.40	-£84,480	£84,385,075	£84,300,595
North Norfolk	41,085.85	£72,648	£65,434,968	£65,507,616
Norwich	38,260.00	£153,616	£60,934,406	£61,088,022
South Norfolk	52,335.00	£560,247	£83,350,814	£83,911,062
Total	308,568.75	£2,268,097	£491,438,934	£493,707,031

Council tax collection

5.20. The precept (column (c) above) for 2023-24 will be collected in 12 instalments from the District Council Collection Funds, as follows:

Table 23: 2023-24 precept instalments

Payment	Date	%
1	28 April 2023	8
2	19 May 2023	9
3	19 June 2023	9
4	19 July 2023	9
5	21 August 2023	9
6	19 September 2023	9
7	19 October 2023	9
8	20 November 2023	9
9	19 December 2023	9
10	19 January 2024	9
11	19 February 2024	3
12	19 March 2024	8
		100%

5.21. Where a surplus on collection of 2022-23 council tax (column (b) above) has been estimated, the District Council concerned will pay to the County Council its proportion of the sum by ten equal instalments, as an addition to the May 2023 to February 2024 precept payments.

5.22. Where a deficit on collection of 2022-23 council tax (column (b) above) has been estimated, the District Council concerned will receive from the County Council its proportion of the sum by ten equal instalments, as a reduction to the May 2023 to February 2024 precept payments.

2023-24 council tax bands

5.23. In accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, the County Council amount of the council tax for each valuation band be as follows:

Table 24: Norfolk County Council 2023-24 council tax bands

Band	£
A	1,061.76
B	1,238.72
C	1,415.68
D	1,592.64
E	1,946.56
F	2,300.48
G	2,654.40
H	3,185.28

6. Business rate pool 2023-24

- 6.1. Between 2013-14 and 2020-21 Norfolk County Council participated in a Business Rate Pool (Pilot in 2019-20) with other Norfolk Local Authorities. Taking into account the level of risk attached to pooling in 2021-22 as a result of the significant impact of COVID-19 on business rates, Norfolk Leaders agreed to withdraw from pooling in 2021-22.
- 6.2. The opportunity for pooling was reviewed for 2022-23 and full details were presented to Cabinet in November 2021 in the report [*Business Rates Pool – Annual Report 2020-21 and Pooling Decision 2022-23*](#)³³. At that point, Cabinet endorsed the proposed application and governance arrangements for a 2022-23 Norfolk Business Rates Pool, which is in place for the current financial year. In the 2023-24 Budget, £0.600m of 2022-23 Pool funds are being used to support the underlying revenue Budget position within Community and Environmental Services, and £2.000m is being applied to establish a one-off fund which will be created for investing in the economy (including the Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF)). This fund is intended to generate a “pipeline” of proposals that could ultimately be funded through the County Deal, if approved.
- 6.3. In August 2022, Government invited local authorities to consider their intentions for pooling in 2023-24. Following discussions, all pool members indicated that they wished to continue pooling in 2023-24 on the same basis as in 2022-23 and this was confirmed to Government. Accordingly, as part of the provisional Settlement announced 19 December 2022, Government has confirmed its intention to designate Norfolk County Council and all Norfolk Districts as a Pool on the terms requested. Any prospective member of the Pool had until 16 January 2023 to indicate to Government that they wished to withdraw. No prospective member of the Pool has done so, and it is therefore anticipated that Government will confirm the Norfolk Pool for 2023-24 at the Final Settlement announcement. The 2023-24 Pool is expected (based on current forecasts) to deliver additional one-off revenue Budget resources to Norfolk County Council of approximately £3m. These resources are available for use, at the Council’s discretion, from 2024-25 and the MTFS currently makes no

³³ Business Rates Pool – Annual Report 2020-21 and Pooling Decision 2022-23, Cabinet, 08/11/2021, agenda item 15

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

assumptions about how they will be used beyond the £0.600m supporting the revenue position.

- 6.4. Cabinet is asked to note the expected establishment of the 2023-24 Pool, and the resources which are forecast to be available to the Council in future budget years.

7. Service strategy and new saving proposals for 2023-24

- 7.1. Total saving proposals for inclusion in this year's Budget total £56.461m, of which £59.704m relate to 2023-24 as shown in the table below.

Table 25: Summary of total MTFs savings proposals for 2023-24 to 2026-27

	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
Adult Social Services	-28.040	2.700	-2.500	-2.000	-29.840
Children's Services	-12.517	0.088	0.050	0.000	-12.379
Community and Environmental Services	-10.254	2.819	0.570	-0.045	-6.910
Strategy and Transformation	-2.042	0.050	1.571	0.000	-0.422
Finance and Commercial Services	-1.200	-0.410	-0.360	-0.240	-2.210
Finance General	-5.650	0.950	0.000	0.000	-4.700
Total savings target	-59.704	6.197	-0.669	-2.285	-56.461

- 7.2. The following sections of the Budget report set out details of the financial and savings strategy for each Department, along with details of the new savings proposals for 2023-24. Where required (and subject to the caveat set out below and in paragraph 10.5 onwards of the [Risk Implications/Assessment](#) section of the covering report), these have been subject to consultation and further validation work to ensure that they are robust and deliverable prior to being included in the Budget presented to Cabinet for recommendation to Full Council for consideration in February 2023. No final decisions on the implementation of savings will be made until February 2023 when the County Council considers the Cabinet's proposed Budget for 2023-24, including the findings of public consultation and equality impact assessments.

- 7.3. The savings target to be found for the 2023-24 Budget was materially higher than it has been in previous years and after significant budget reductions over recent years the identification of savings has inevitably been challenging. When proposals were reported to Cabinet prior to public consultation, there remained a gap to be closed against the required target. As part of the 2023-24 Budget setting process, the County Council therefore undertook further rounds of savings development up to December 2023 to identify additional savings to support the 2023-24 Budget. This process has successfully resulted in further savings being identified, which have been included within the budget proposals set out in this report. In addition, as set out elsewhere in this report, savings

linked to the Strategic Review have been added to the 2023-24 Budget. In overall terms, £22.750m of additional new 2023-24 savings (offset by £1.746m of changes to proposals) have been incorporated into the Budget since October.


- 7.4. If, following agreement of the 2023-24 Budget it subsequently becomes apparent (once the Council starts to implement the proposals) that any Budget proposals impact on the delivery of services, then the Council would carry out detailed consultation on those during 2023-24 prior to the proposals being implemented. Equality impact assessments would also be undertaken as required. If necessary, this process will enable Cabinet to make a decision on whether or not to implement proposals, taking into account the findings of consultation and EQIA. In the event that any savings cannot be delivered in the year, or shortfall on savings delivery were to arise due to the timing of implementation, it is proposed that these would be mitigated to the extent possible via service Business Risk Reserves in the first instance. Further specific considerations in respect of 2023-24 additional savings are set out in paragraph 10.5 onwards of the Risk Implications/Assessment section of the covering report.
- 7.5. Details of Service Budgets and savings currently included within them are set out in Sections 8 to 12.

8. 2023-24 Budget proposals - Adult Social Services

Service Strategy and context

Local Context

8.1. The Better Together, for Norfolk Council strategy creates 5 clear priorities. The Adult Social Care strategy underpinning the departments delivery of these priorities is called Promoting Independence: Living Well and Changing Lives. For Norfolk, our vision for Adult Social Care is to “support people to be independent, resilient and well”.



8.2. Promoting Independence: Living Well and Changing Lives represents the second phase of our strategy and has 8 core ambitions:

- **Prevention and early help** – a clear strategy, targeted interventions and a re-purposed ‘front door’ which put people and their family carers at the heart.
- **Integrated Health and Social Care Offer** – integrated health and social care offer in each locality to help people retain independence
- **Living Well social work** – being led by people who direct their own choices, addressing holding lists, reviews and practice quality
- **A stable, modern care market** where 85% of providers are good or outstanding
- A step change in **housing choices** for older people and disabled people and through our building programme
- **Transformation of the Norse Care estate** to match market needs and ensure it remains a leader in the sector
- Driving the **‘Eight technologies that will change the face of health and social care’**
- **Workforce Development** – Developing skills and capacity in social care and the care market

8.3. Each of these ambitions is crucial in delivering Adult Social Care not just in a sustainable way, or a way that offers value for money, but one that is progressive and puts prevention at the heart of the offer.

8.4. As we came out of the pandemic, we developed a 3 pronged approach to driving the department forward. This focused on:

8.4.1. Transformation of Adult Social Care

- Our new Connecting Communities programme
- Short term offer, in particular driving home first principles to support people home from hospital
- Commissioning the Care Market (market shaping and accommodation development)

8.4.2. The national reform of Adult Social Care

- Delivering the Government's "Putting People at the Heart of Care" white paper
- Delivering the Integration white paper

8.4.3. The recovery of Adult Social Care

- Clearing the backlogs of care that have built during the pandemic
- Recruitment and Retention of our Social Care workforce
- The wellbeing of our staff
- Stabilising the external care market
- Decreasing our interim care lists

8.5. As we move into 2023-24, it will be the right time to launch our third phase of the Promoting Independence Strategy.

Service financial strategy and savings proposals 2023-24

Financial Strategy

8.6. The Adult Social Care financial strategy is firmly intertwined with both the service's vision "to support people to be independent, resilient and well", as well as the department's Promoting Independence strategy.

8.7. We know our Promoting Independence approach has helped, and will continue to help, the service to deliver the significant financial savings needed to continue to meet the increasing demands for social care across Norfolk. Our financial strategy therefore remains fairly consistent as we move from 2022-23 to 2023-24. Within the overall strategy, our specific financial strategy for achieving savings and financial sustainability is focussed on:

- **Investing in early intervention and targeted prevention:** Using specific services and being responsive and proactive in order to prevent need or prevent the escalation of need to keep people independent for longer.
- **Focusing and building upon people's strengths:** Investing in excellent social work and therapy which focuses on people's strengths and helps people regain and retain independence, and reduces, prevents and delays the need for formal social care.
- **Provide services that focus on the future potential of the person:** Commissioning services which enable and re-able people so they achieve and maintain as much independence as they can and reducing the amount of formal social care they need.
- **Driving housing solutions:** Stimulating a market to provide alternative choices to permanent residential and nursing care; including focusing on wider housing options alongside care, for older and younger adults.
- **A prosperous care economy:** Leading and developing the care market for social care so that it can offer people choice from a collective of good quality providers, within an efficient, stable and sustainable care economy, whose ambitions aligns with those of Promoting Independence.
- **A healthy Integrated Care System:** Working with health partners in a refreshed Integrated Health and Care system, that seeks to reduce system demand, whilst also focusing on improving long term health and care outcomes for the people of Norfolk. This includes both the alignment to localised Primary Care but also an efficient and sustainable system of supporting people upon leaving hospital and into the community.
- **Digital by default:** Seeking innovation and creating a culture that strives to embrace the efficiencies afforded by technology, when suitable, without losing the focus on the customer.
- **Maximising value for money:** Continuing to get the basics right by using our resources to their full extent, questioning and challenging ourselves in areas of improvement, reducing inefficiencies and strengthening the contract management of our commissioned contracts to ensure we both get, and utilise, what we are paying for.

8.8. What we continue to evolve and strengthen is the focus on specific areas of change required to deliver the themes of our Financial Strategy. Whilst Promoting Independence gave us the broad approach, centring on demand management, our continued development has allowed us to begin to focus on specifics.

8.9. Our 2023-27 budget cycle includes some very specific areas of focus that we believe will deliver financial benefits in a supported way. In particular:

8.9.1. We will drive forward self-directed support, ensuring those who draw on social care have choice and flexibility in the way their needs are met. We believe this level of control often creates ownership of cost and the innovative ways care can be delivered create cost efficiency.

8.9.2. We will review those people who require two carers to provide the care in their homes. We will work with those people and their care providers to see if alternative approaches, such as the provision of enabling equipment, can be utilised to reduce the demand on physical staff time.

8.9.3. We will transform the service supporting people with a physical disability. In doing so, under the strategic review, we will create a standalone service to recognise the focus and specific service offer that will enable us to appropriately meet the needs of this group of people. Alongside this we will continue our transformation of the support to people with Learning Disabilities.

8.9.4. We will focus on prevention in some specific areas that appear to drive the need for Social Care. These include but not limited to recovering from or ideally preventing falls, self-neglect and hoarding, and the support required overnight within your own home.

8.9.5. We will continue our building programme to develop alternative and enabling accommodation for both younger adults with disabilities and our older adults.

8.10. During 2022-23 we were very excited to launch our Connecting Communities programme. This programme underpins a substantial proportion of our financial benefits and will deliver over £18m of recurrent savings when it is wholly delivered. 2023-24 will be a really important year for the roll-out and implementation of this programme.



8.11. This programme is being delivered in partnership and has begun to deliver major change in our service offer. This work will deliver within four main workstreams:

8.11.1. Workstream 1 - Initial Engagement

We want to improve the ways people can contact us. Redesigning how initial access is structured within communities, shaped by a clear understanding of the unique value-add of the Front Door and the structural challenges currently faced by SCCE, our Adult Social Services front door.

Bringing together the best insight from our data and our people to really understand our communities and the best services for them. This will help us focus our efforts on the right services which will best support our residents, helping them both now and much further into the future and empowering them to live well for longer.

8.11.2. Workstream 2 - Short Term Services

Our ambition is to always be able to offer the service that would be right for the service user and not let constraints stop us from providing the best support to maximise any of our community's longer-term independence.

We wish to consolidate and streamline how our services are accessed and delivered throughout all localities. Very specifically, we recognise the importance of, and impact of, our reablement services on reducing and delaying long term needs. We will transform this service to ensure we generate efficient capacity and enhance the effectiveness of its outputs and outcomes.

8.11.3. Workstream 3 – Environment for Social Care

We want to ensure that adults in Norfolk get appropriate support to lead an actively independent and connected life in their community, in the best setting for them. We want to empowering practitioners to deliver evidence-based social work and social care interventions supported by clear processes and agile leadership.

Creating effective, two-way links between the community and social workers, and making use of the latest technology to be evidence based in our decision making to achieve the best outcomes for the people of Norfolk, now and in the future.

8.11.4. Workstream 4 – Proactive Interventions

The newest but perhaps most progressive of our workstreams is underpinned by a digital analytics platform. The future of health and care services is one that is resident-centred and preventative and makes most use of advanced digital technology such as being able to extract meaningful data from case notes and use risk classification and segmentation to identify levels of need so we can proactively support. Some of initial work to test how we can proactively use this rich intelligence will be a falls pilot.

8.12. Finally, alongside both our targeted areas of support and the major transformation described above, is a simple but continued focus on value for

money and accountability. We recognise that getting the basics right is important and vital to managing the Adult Social Care budget. Whilst it is one of the largest budgets the Council has, it is very much spent on thousands of individual services and by hundreds of individual practitioners who support those people who draw upon these services. It continues to be critical that we utilise our systems, such as My Oracle and Liquid Logic, to employ controls and create accountability in our spending decisions.

Key issues and risks

- 8.13. Whilst considered a robust budget, the Adult Social Care service does have some underlying risks and issues that need to be considered within the context of the budget. The following are not considered to be an exhaustive list of these risks.

Recovery implications

- 8.14. The Adult Social Care department has made some positive impacts on its recovery from the pandemic. However, it is still managing significant backlogs in key areas of its service typified by holding lists, interim care lists and overdue reviews.
- 8.15. As a result of these backlogs, we continue to manage the demands and risks associated with both new demand for support and the existing demand within these backlogs. Whilst the risk to individuals is thoroughly managed, it does put excess strain on our staff. These backlogs are replicated nationally, and our position represents a similar situation that a number of Councils face. In managing this on an extended, ongoing basis, it will likely undermine the capacity and impact our wider transformation seeks to achieve.

Market Stability

- 8.16. Each year the Council spends over £330m in buying thousands of care packages from our local care market. Section 5 of the Care Act (2014): "Promoting diversity and quality in provision of service" outlines a Local Authorities duties in regards to local care markets. In particular, "*A local authority must promote the efficient and effective operation of a market in services for meeting care and support needs with a view to ensuring that any person in its area wishing to access services in the market*". In achieving this a Local Authority must effectively shape local care markets and commission care that:
- Focuses on outcomes and wellbeing
 - Promotes a quality services
 - Is sustainable and offers value for money services
 - Offers choice through a wider array of diverse providers
 - Has been co-produced with the people who wish to access these services

- 8.17. Whilst many who operate within these markets are independent businesses, it is therefore vital that we shape these markets so they are sustainable and prosperous. There is no Social Care without these services. The ASC Fee uplift paper also on this agenda describes a market picture of relatively poor quality (as assessed by the Care Quality Commission and compared to other Local Authority regions) and a level of increasing instability. Whilst our MTFS provides for a significant investment in these markets for 23/24, there is a risk that it is not sufficient to enable providers to either attract high quality labour in sufficient quantities or provide sufficient returns to incentivise businesses to stay or enter the market.

Hospital Discharge

- 8.18. As part of the Health and Care response to the pandemic, hospital discharge, and in particular discharge to assess, has become a central feature of the national recruitment to ensure acute capacity is sufficient to manage both those requiring emergency care but also those awaiting delayed elective procedures.
- 8.19. Each Integrated Care System (ICS) will face its own unique challenges, but many experience pressures in acute hospitals, whose demands often exceed the level of available beds. Much work is undertaken within the Norfolk and Waveney ICS to ensure those who no longer meet the “criteria to reside” are supported to be discharged from our three acute hospitals.
- 8.20. For our ICS, it is vital that those who require social care upon hospital discharge have access to it. This approach is underpinned by our home first principle. Equally, it is vital for those being supported to be discharged that they have access to the right health and care services in the community to enable them to stand the best chance of recovery. One risk many ICS will face is to support the discharge from acute hospitals in such a way that ongoing demand for health and care services is not created.

Workforce


- 8.21. Workforce shortages in the delivery of care are now becoming more widely understood nationally. The ability to deliver Adult Social Care will be contingent on solving these shortages and is in part a large part of the risk referred to under market stability. The lesser talked about risk is the emerging shortage of qualified social care practitioner (qualified Social Workers).
- 8.22. In Norfolk we have seen both high levels of vacancies related to Social Workers and indeed a high level of turnover. Whilst we are doing a lot of work to both attract workers to Norfolk, retain our existing staff and “grow our own” new practitioners, it is still a very challenging staff position.
- 8.23. Simply put, without sufficient high quality, experienced, professionally qualified staff, our MTFS will not work over the longer term.

Demand

8.24. Each year the MTFs includes funding towards an underlying growth in our demand, either characterised by increased volume or an increasing complexity of the support required.

8.25. It is widely recognised, and indicated by both the following [Norfolk Insight](#) graphics and [Institute of Public Care](#) population projections, that the demography of Norfolk represents a higher proportion of Adults over the age of 65 than both the East of England and National averages.

Population estimates by age, 2021 and 2043



Population aged 65 and over, projected to 2024

Population aged 65 and over, projected to 2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Norfolk: People aged 65-69	56,300	56,600	57,400	58,300	59,500
Norfolk: People aged 70-74	62,000	61,800	58,100	56,300	55,700
Norfolk: People aged 75-79	44,600	47,300	52,600	55,100	55,900
Norfolk: People aged 80-84	31,700	31,700	32,300	33,500	35,400
Norfolk: People aged 85-89	19,800	20,200	20,700	21,400	21,900
Norfolk: People aged 90 and over	11,700	11,900	12,200	12,300	12,500
Norfolk: Total population 65 and over	226,100	229,500	233,300	236,900	240,900

www.poppi.org.uk version 14.0 (Institute of Public Care)

8.26. At the same time, we know that improvements in our Health and Care services means that people are now more likely to live longer with the most complex of disabilities. This is of course a most welcome improvement but does mean that the underlying demand for our services continues to grow year on year. Equally, the social care support people with the most complex needs require continues to rise with underlying complexity of care increasing year on year.

8.27. There is a risk that the impact of the pandemic will have created latent demand that will materialise over the life of the MTFS and render the funding insufficient to meeting this need.

Reform and Assurance

8.28. Whilst much of the national reform of Adult Social Care has been delayed until “at least October 2025” there are some aspects have not been. In particular, the new CQC led assurance regime is due to start in 2023-24 and will likely provide independent assessment of the quality of Local Authority run Adult Social Care services. With such levels of backlogs, and our known quality issues within our care market, there will be a significant requirement for the service department to focus on and invest in its wider performance to ensure we are in the best possible place for when this new regime begins.

8.29. Whilst key elements of the reform were delayed, they were delayed in order for Local Authorities to be ready to deliver them. Government’s delay recognised the challenges in delivering this ambitious agenda in the original timescales. This therefore means that we need to continue to plan to deliver the original scope of change within the slightly longer period of time.

Adult Social Services proposed budget 2023-24

8.30. Within the 2023-24 Budget it is proposed that additional social care grant funding be recognised in full within the Adult Social Services base budget. The result of this is a reduction in the department’s Net Budget for 2023-24, reflecting a shift, driven by Government funding policy decisions, towards Adult Social Care being increasingly supported via specific funding rather than general council tax. In spite of the Net Budget reduction, the Adult Social Service Department’s 2022-23 Gross Budget of £495m (and therefore spending power) will increase for 2023-24 by an estimated £20-25m to approximately £515-520m (subject to final budget reconciliations following Cabinet and Full Council), reflecting the significant growth pressures provided for in the 2023-24 Budget.

Table 26: Detailed budget change forecast Adult Social Services 2023-27

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	OPENING BUDGET	263.184	249.481	256.287	268.955

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	ADDITIONAL COSTS				
	Economic / Inflationary				
	Basic Inflation - Pay (3% 22-23 onwards)	2.108	2.204	2.237	2.304
	Basic Inflation - Prices	7.108	6.756	6.831	6.967
G2324ASS001	Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	4.372	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324ASS002	Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-0.643	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Legislative Requirements				
G2223ASS008	Pay and Price Market Pressures	6.728	7.010	0.000	0.000
G2223ASS006	New Social Care reform pressures funding - cost of care	7.626	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2223ASS006	Remove pressures linked to Social Care reform - cost of care due to implementation delay	-7.626	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324ASS005	ASC Discharge Fund pooled within iBCF - cost pressures	5.554	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324ASS004	Market pressures including National Living Wage and cost of care	9.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Demand / Demographic				
G2223ASS008	Demographic growth	6.100	6.100	6.100	6.000
G2324ASS003	Leap year pressure in Adult Social Care	0.600	-0.600	0.000	0.000
	NCC Policy				
G2223ASS003	Emerging cost pressures for social care demography and market pressures in 2023-24	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324ASS007	Adult Social Care one-off funding for inspection and assurance preparation activities	2.000	-2.000	0.000	0.000
		50.176	19.471	15.168	15.271
	SAVINGS				
ASS015	Revising the short term out of hospital offer - We want to review what our offer is – as part of a health and social care intermediate care offer. This will allow us to focus more resources on home first services, including greater therapy input, and moving away from a reliance on short-term beds.	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
ASS027	Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving ASC044: Extra care housing programme - delivering savings by building 2,800 units of extra care housing for older adults.	-0.175	-1.100	0.000	0.000
ASS028	Delivering a saving through an accelerated Supported Housing Programme. Providing 183 units of supported housing for younger adults over a three year period, which is expected to increase independence and help in fewer people needing to be supported early in residential care.	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
ASS030	Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving ASC018: Working with our partners to reshape our approach to supporting people on their initial contact with Adult Social Care (the "Front Door"). We will review our process and how we support people early on in the social care pathway and help their care needs before they escalate.	-4.500	-4.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
ASS031	Improving market utilisation and delivering efficiencies. Strengthening our contract and performance management by getting better value for money in services we purchase by targeting the funding we have available to us.	-1.500	-0.500	0.000	0.000
ASS032	Learning Disabilities transformation. Continued implementation of Norfolk's Learning Disability strategy. This sees the continued development of more choices and alternatives to residential care and access to community based activities.	-1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
ASS034	Expansion of Self Directed Support. Delivering a saving by utilising more Direct Payments rather than commissioned services, particularly when Direct Payments offer individuals more choice and are cost effective.	-0.100	-0.100	0.000	0.000
ASS035	Use of ASC reserves. One-off release of reserves to offset budget pressures.	3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
ASS038	Double up care reviews. Using therapists to lead reviews on care packages requiring two carers to attend, in order to consider alternatives to having two carers on site.	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
ASS039	A strategic refocus of NCC's investment in Intermediate Care Services	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS040	Connecting Communities: Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving ASC018 and 2223ASS030	-2.360	-0.600	-2.500	-2.000
S2324ASS044	Double up care reviews. Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving 2223ASS038	-0.600	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS043	Expansion of Self Directed Support. Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving 2223ASS034	-0.300	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS041	One-off usage of ASC Reserves	-3.000	3.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS045	One-off usage of ASC Reserves: Additional one-off usage of ASC Reserves (reprioritisation).	-2.000	2.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS046 [SR]	Reduction in staff travel costs: Post pandemic, staff travel has not returned to the level seen in previous years. This proposal reflects the changing pattern of spend.	-0.300	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS047	Review of budget assumptions: Removal of cost pressures previously assumed in the Adult Social Care budget which are no longer expected to be required.	-2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS048	Review of budget assumptions: Reprioritised Better Care Fund (BCF) and Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) investment.	-1.855	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS049	Review of service levels and demand post pandemic: Targeted interventions relating to the Adult and Older Care Budgets – getting it right first time.	-3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS042	Working with partners to fully recover the costs of integrated services	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS051	Review of budget assumptions: Utilising alternative funding sources to maintain housing related ASC Prevention Services	-1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
S2324ASS050 [SR]	Transformation of Physical Disabilities Services: Delivering improved choice and independent outcomes for people with a Physical Disability.	-1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS052	Additional capitalisation to release further one-off reserves	-4.000	4.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS053	MH Transformation	-0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324ASS054 [SR]	Strategic Review – Opportunity A and B	-3.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		-28.040	2.700	-2.500	-2.000
	BASE ADJUSTMENTS				
B2223ASS001	New Social Care Reform grant	-7.626	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2324ASS001	Reverse assumptions for Social Care Reform grant	10.447	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2324ASS002	Government Funding changes: ASC Discharge Fund	-5.554	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2324ASS003	Government Funding changes: Social Care Funding (£25.030m Social Care Grant, £9.785m "ASC Market Sustainability and Improvement Fund")	-34.815	-15.364	0.000	0.000
B2324ASS004	Adults grant assumption decreases (2023-24 Independent Living Fund rolled in to Social Care Grant)	1.379	0.000	0.000	0.000
		-36.170	-15.364	0.000	0.000
	COST NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS				
C2324ASS001	Depreciation transfer	0.579	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/ASS - PH 22/23 agreed new cross cutting transfers	-0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324ASS002	REFCUS	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
		0.330	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NET BUDGET	249.481	256.287	268.955	282.226

9. 2023-24 Budget proposals – Children’s Services

National Context

9.1. Children’s Services nationally continue to operate in a challenging context; high levels of need across numerous areas of service continues to be experienced and, in particular, in relation to children with special educational needs and children at risk of harm. The service also continues to respond to newer issues within society, and the range of responsibilities for the department continues to widen to tackle issues such child sexual and criminal exploitation and the threat of radicalisation.

9.2. The cost-of-living crisis is an additional factor that has emerged in recent months both directly in relation to financial pressures increasing the challenges facing families who may already be struggling, and indirectly. It is currently unclear what impact this may have upon demand for services, as well as the impact upon our own workforce and that of the wider system.

9.3. The Association of Directors of Children’s Services (ADCS) have recently published a thematic report on children’s mental health³⁴. This report resonates with the situation currently seen in Norfolk, in particular:

- Proportion of assessments where mental health is a factor is increasing across early help and social care
- Emotional disorders, particularly anxiety, depression and eating disorders are also rising, as is self-harm, suicide and suicidal ideation.
- The wider challenging economic climate and cost of living crisis increases pressure on struggling families and can test emotional resilience; such circumstances are a contributory factor to the emotional wellbeing of children and their families
- The resources available to meet the current level of demand is not readily available and/or accessible, resulting in waiting lists.
- Results in bespoke packages of care being purchased that include therapeutic work for children that cannot access CAMHS support
- There has been a reduction in the provision of Tier 4 beds commissioned by NHS England while at the same time demand for such placements has increased. This lack of provision directly impacts authorities as responsibility often falls to children’s social care to accommodate the child to ensure the safety and welfare of themselves and of others.
- Waiting lists for interventions are too long and delays can affect other areas of a child’s life, such as negatively impacting upon their education and attendance at school.
- This can result in increased and/or escalating needs for children whilst waiting, which respondents felt was unnecessary, or a child being refused a service as they do not meet the clinical criteria with no alternative offer

³⁴ [ADCS Safeguarding Pressures Phase 8 Special Thematic Report on Mental Health](#)

- Unmet emotional wellbeing and poor mental health needs have a knock-on effect to any other work taking place with professionals to meet other needs a child may have
- More children attending acute emergency settings in crisis, resulting in the child receiving more intrusive crisis care
- Where children do not have their emotional wellbeing and mental health needs met in a timely and effective way, this can often result in costly local authority involvement as families reach crisis point and look to safeguarding services to keep themselves and their children safe
- Family breakdown as parents are unable to cope, resulting in some instances with the child coming into the care of the local authority
- Children's unaddressed poor emotional wellbeing and mental ill-health will, without adequate support, continue into adulthood and ultimately affect life chances

9.4. The Eastern Region of Association of Directors of Children's Services have produced a report on Placement Sufficiency for Young People in Care focusing on the impact of the 2021 Placement Regulations on Placement Costs and Outcomes for children and young people. This identifies that the current situation in respect of both placement costs and availability is unsustainable and calls on the Government to act immediately to mitigate the impact of the regulation change, assess the unfunded financial burden of the regulations and pause the implementation of future changes planned until future financial burdens have been fully assessed. The combination of barriers to new entrants to the market and further restrictions on placement availability caused by the regulation changes has resulted in dramatic cost increases seen across the region, illustrated by the table below:

Placement Type	Average weekly unit cost		% Increase
	2020/21	2021/22	
New registered residential placements made in period	£5,292	£5,828	10%
Cost for all registered residential placements in place	£3,854	£4,604	19%
New unregulated/unregistered placements for under 16s made in period	£2,287	£7,131	312%
New Semi-Independent Placements for 16- and 17-year-olds	£1,238	£1,566	26%

9.5. During 2022, the Government published the long awaited National Social Care Review³⁵ and the SEND & AP Green Paper 'SEND review: right support, right place, right time'³⁶. The Government's implementation plans of both of these reviews are awaited.

³⁵ <https://childrensocialcare.independent-review.uk/final-report/>

³⁶ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1063620/SEND_review_right_support_right_place_right_time_accessible.pdf

Local Context

9.6. Children's Services vision and strategy is crucial to delivering the right outcomes for children, whilst also ensuring that provision is preventative, sustainable, and offers value for money.

9.7. Following a full Ofsted inspection, inspectors have praised Children's Services at NCC, judging the authority as "good" and highlight "exemplary" and "exceptional" areas of practice. This recognises "significant improvements" in the services for children and their families, investment in services, "compassionate, warm and committed workers and carers", and "a stable and determined children's senior leadership team, endorsed by councillors, has been innovative, establishing a shared practice culture and new ways of working which have transformed services".

9.8. The inspection outcome and report narrative from the inspectors demonstrates the embedding of Vital Signs for Children (driving the way we work with children and families – our practice principles) and our Flourish framework for outcomes for children and young people.





9.9. The overall number of children in care and having placements has broadly stabilised, which is a better position than in many local authority areas, but the cost is increasing substantially. This is primarily due to the cohort with the very highest and most complex needs continuing to grow as a proportion of all children looked after; particularly as we have been successful with interventions and new models of working to keep children out of care when appropriate to do so.

9.10. In particular, New Roads is proving very successful in keeping children out of care. Without such transformative interventions, the level of pressure would be significantly higher with prices potentially further inflated due to market forces. However, the cost avoidance and reduction being achieved is counteracted by the volume and complexity of need along with market forces, which is proving to be significantly higher than modelled within the 2022-23 budget, particularly in relation to the number of external residential placements for children and an increase in the unit cost of such placements as well as the packages of support we are creating for children and young people with very challenging needs.

9.11. The proportion of children in foster care is lower than anticipated through our transformation programme due to lower numbers of placements being available, reflecting national shortages of foster carers. Consequentially, the proportion of children in external residential care, driven by sufficiency challenges elsewhere in the care market as well as complexity of need, is higher (39% more residential placements in 2022-23 than budgeted). Additionally, the cost of placements are, on average, significantly exceeding 2022-23 budgeted values; again, a trend seen nationally. This pressures is despite the considerable evidenced impact of New Roads showing a very significant diversion from care for many adolescents who may otherwise have

needed to be accommodated in additional residential placements far exceeding current forecasts.

- 9.12. Alongside transformation of children's social care, Norfolk County Council has also undertaken the first phase of our Special Educational Needs and Alternative Provision transformation, particularly through the significant capital investment programme in additional special schools and specialist resource based provision within mainstream primary and secondary schools. Having completed the first phase of our improvement planning, The Council is now launching Local 1st Inclusion as the next stage covering the period 2023-29.

Service Financial Strategy

- 9.13. This evidence shows that Children's Services core strategy and transformation approach is working, and our transformation programme evidences delivery of significant financial savings and avoidance of further financial pressures through keeping families together and reducing numbers in care since we started our transformation programme. Alongside the significant financial benefits, the recent inspection by Ofsted has confirmed that the programme and service have also delivered improved outcomes for children and families.

- 9.14. Given the success of the programme to date, our transformative approach to services remains core to our strategic financial approach. Existing schemes continue to be embedded and deliver benefits, whilst new schemes continue to be delivered within the five key themes around which our transformation strategy has been built:

- Inclusion;
- Prevention and Early Intervention;
- Quality of Practice;
- Edge of Care and Alternatives to Care; and
- Re-shaping the care and specialist support market.




Our five strategic themes



Inclusion

- Supporting more children to stay in mainstream education.
- Investing in specialist resource bases.
- Reducing school exclusions.

Prevention and early help

- Creation of the children's advice and duty service to ensure children getting the right support as quickly as possible.
- Developing a new early prevention model, so that families get help earlier.

Effective practice model

- Creation of a new social work model – with a team around practitioners, so that they can spend more time with families.
- New case discussion meetings, deploying resources earlier rather than at the point of crisis.
- Specialist professionals, such as substance misuse workers and domestic abuse specialists to support social work teams.

Edge of care and alternatives to care

- New therapeutic service for families with children at the edge of care (SIB).
- Turnaround short breaks alternatives to care provision.
- A focus on family finding and building support networks from extended families.
- New Roads – specialist hubs, wrapping support around our most vulnerable children and young people.

Managing the care market and creating capacity

- £120m investment in special educational needs, including at least three new special schools.
- £5m investment in semi-independent provision.
- Family Values – using behavioural science to redesign our approach to recruiting foster carers, alongside a new enhanced fostering model.
- Valuing Care Model – robust needs analysis and outcome based commissioning of placements.
- Dedicated team for our unaccompanied asylum-seeking children.

9.15. Overall, the key financial drivers expected for social care are consistent with recent financial years. The legacy of the pandemic is expected to continue to have a substantial impact; one area causing significant pressure is the court system and the significant delays that continue to be seen. Such delays result in significant additional costs to NCC (for example, lengthier placements preadoption, additional preparation for court when cases are delayed or postponed, etc.) as well as affecting the outcomes for children. Additionally, the pandemic knock-on economic impact continues to drive demand for services as well as the impact upon staffing availability of both NCC staff and those of commissioned services or partner organisations, such as health services.

9.16. The key financial drivers previously identified by the service have not eased and, in many cases, have continued to increase, with many elements being unpredictable in nature:

- lack of supply of placements is significantly impacting our ability to purchase the right placements at the right cost.
- An unhelpfully rigid approach from the regulator (Ofsted) - challenging care settings in a way which makes them unwilling to work with young people with complex needs or drives a demand for very large packages of additional support.

- the continued worsening of emotional wellbeing and mental health amongst children, young people and parents,
- A significant rise in 'extra familial harm', including county lines and exploitation of young people.
- An underlying trend of increasing special educational needs and disabilities, including some children with complex disabilities surviving into later childhood as a result of medical advances.
- An additional strain on families as a result of the pandemic and hidden harm with families locked down together.
- The demand-led aspects of placement and transport provision for children with special needs.
- The shortage in housing available for post-18-year-olds.
- Ongoing shortages of staff in key professional specialisms.

9.17. We know that the legacy of the pandemic has continued to have a significant impact on children and families, as well as our services and those of partners. A range of impacts on demand have been identified, including hidden need, trauma, and economic factors. Sadly, nationally, we have seen examples of the harm which occurred behind closed doors coming to light with several tragic cases across the Country, and overall increases in need in many areas of the children's system. Norfolk saw a persistent increase in demand for Family Support resulting from the impact of the pandemic, which placed those teams under significant pressure. We have seen a stabilisation in the number of children looked after following previous years of reduction since the start of our transformation programme; this is counter to the picture seen by many authorities nationally due to increased demand being countered by the impact of our transformation programme. The situation remains highly uncertain and, whilst attempts have been made to financially plan for these circumstances, the situation is fluid and is likely to continue to be so into 2023-24.

9.18. The key themes of our transformative agenda remain unchanged as they continue to be pertinent to addressing the considerable, ongoing challenges and uncertainties that face children's services and the wider associated system throughout the country. The service will continue to drive this work forward, working alongside the increased strategic partnership working of recent years that has generated and driven system change in Norfolk that, as the County Council alone, could not be delivered. The ongoing challenges and uncertainties are driving significant financial pressures across many authorities due to increasing costs of placements and the changing type and, in some cases, increasing complexity of need as societal changes result in increased and more varied extra familial harm.

9.19. Our transformation programme has an ongoing programme of work alongside activity to identify further new initiatives that could deliver substantial transformation. The services' core financial strategy for achieving savings is on an invest to save basis that aligns with this strategic approach, enabling the service to respond to the changing needs within communities and the current and future financial challenges by developing innovative new approaches, in particular:

- Prevention, early intervention and effective social care – investing in an enhanced operating model which supports families to stay together and ensures fewer children need to come into care;
- Alternatives to care – investing in a range of new services which offer alternatives to care using enhanced therapeutic and care alternatives, combined with a focus on support networks from extended families keeping families safely together where possible and averting family crises; and
- Transforming the care market and creating the capacity that we need – creating and commissioning new care models for children in care – achieving better outcomes and lower costs.

9.20. In recent years, the service has been supported to invest in staffing to enable transformation of services. The people who deliver our services to children and families are the most important asset that the service has, whether these be directly employed staff or indirectly employed through partners and commissioned providers. Having the right people in the right roles delivers the outcomes needed for Norfolk's children whilst also delivery good value for money. That said, where appropriate, technology and automation continue to be exploited to deliver committed efficiency.

9.21. However, the financial pressures projected in 2022-23 are anticipated to continue into 2023-24, with financial provision included within the identified budget pressures for the ongoing impact of the 2022-23 overspend. These forecast pressures are driven by the key financial drivers detailed earlier and would be significantly greater without the ongoing programme of transformation. To meet these pressures, Children's Services, along with the Council as a whole, has committed to identifying additional efficiencies.

Specific Funding

9.22. Supporting Families funding – the Government announced the continuation of this funding after the 2022-23 budget was set with expected income of £2.6m for Norfolk. The funding is made up of various elements including a payment by results amount that is driven by the number of families supported in the programme. Delivery of these results is through social care staff embedded in the social care operating model as part of their core offer. Funding is expected to continue in 2023-24, though specific details of Norfolk's allocation have not yet been provided, leaving a risk that actual funding received is insufficient to meet existing commitments.

9.23. It had previously been announced that the Adoption Support Fund (ASF) would end at the end of 2020-21, and the risk of the loss of funding had been raised in previous reports. To date the funding has continued with amended terms and, currently, the DfE have approved the ASF in its current form until end March 2025. Given the direction indicated within the National Social Care Review and the focus on supporting families, we expect that ASF will be approved in the future when next up for review prior to March 2025

- 9.24. Late on in the 2022-23 budget planning process, the DfE made a decision to cease the School Improvement Monitoring and Brokering Grant, with removal of 50% of the grant in 2022-23 and complete cessation from 2023-24. The DfE expect that all council school improvement activity, including core improvement activities and non-statutory services, would be funded via de-delegation from the Schools Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant, provided on a traded basis or through local authority council tax funds. Norfolk's Schools Forum have not agreed to de-delegation of funds for services and that maintained schools requiring or wanting support should buy-in on a traded basis.

Saving proposals 2023-24

- 9.25. A significant proportion of Children's Services saving proposals for 2023-24 are extensions of our existing programme of work, complementing, and in addition to, the savings already within the 2022-25 MTFS. The proposals comprise of individual but related projects that, together, will continue to deliver significant transformation needed to provide financial sustainability as well as to deliver financial savings:

Prevention, early intervention and effective social care:

- Investing in an enhanced operating model which supports families to stay together and ensures fewer children need to come into care.
- To date, this investment has enabled an increase in permanent social care staff and, thus, a reduction in the usage of agency staff, alongside the introduction of functions such as Support for Success teams to ensure sufficient capacity to work with newly accommodated children and young people can return home or have placements stabilised. The ongoing anticipated financial benefit has been reflected in the MTFS for future years.
- For 2023-24, budget reflects the redesign of support for children with disabilities to deliver more effective care and support and helping more families to stay together through reducing escalation of need and families reaching crisis point, which is expected to avoid children coming into care and costly placements and support.

Alternatives to care:

- Investing in a range of new services which offer alternatives to care using enhanced therapeutic and care alternatives, combined with a focus on support networks from extended families keeping families safely together where possible and averting family crises.
- Through the transformation programme to date, the Council has already invested in Stronger Families (social impact bond), which has delivered significant financial benefits, and New Roads, whose financial benefits to date have significantly exceeded projections, which has been recognised in for 2023-24.

Transforming the care market and creating the capacity that we need:

- Creating and commissioning new care models for children in care – achieving better outcomes and lower costs. We are continuing the

transformation of the care market to keep children and young people who require placements close to home and based in Norfolk wherever possible and appropriate to do so.

- Through the transformation programme to date, the Council has made capital and revenue investment in a range new provision, including the semi-independent accommodation and solo / dual placements, with financial benefits already delivered and embedded within the department's budget.
- In conjunction with health partners, development will continue in 2023-24 of edge of mental health in-patient provision to support, in a therapeutic way, young people to step down from, or avoid, hospital stays and / or expensive, external placements / support, which leads to better outcomes for young people whilst also providing cost savings.

Inclusion:

- The Council has significantly invested capital monies in the development of additional places in existing special schools, new special schools that are being built, and expanding specialist resource base provision throughout the County. This provision will enable more children and young people with Special Educational Needs to access appropriate provision closer to home and in the state sector, which will significantly reduce the pressures on the Dedicated Schools Grant forecast if we 'do nothing'. Additionally, investment in the support in mainstream schools is intended to reduce the escalation of needs enabling more children and young people to remain in the mainstream sector where it is appropriate for them to do so.
- Linked to this investment we are, and will continue, to deliver savings in relation to the home to school transport costs associated with long journeys for children with Special Educational Needs and Alternative Provision requirements.
- For 2023-24, we are proposing extending the existing additional home to school transport savings through expansion of savings already in the MTFS and, in particular, will be delivered through promoting a wider range of opportunities for home to school travel, focus on tightening controls and ensuring good financial grip.

9.26. In addition to the core financial strategy, we continue to have a significant focus on efficiency, modernisation, and funding sources, and our budget proposals look to capture these opportunities, including:

- **Strategic review of internal post 16 teams:** To ensure integrated delivery of these functions across council and wider system;
- **Review of service levels and demand post-pandemic:** An amalgamation of not restarting activities where there is no longer demand nor economic viability, along with withdrawing from the professional development centre building following review of usage;
- **Alternative NPLaw arrangements:** A combination of ensuring the right level of external legal expertise is utilised alongside an invest-to-save

model through the appointment of Legal Officers embedded into the High Needs SEND function in relation to SEND tribunals. By increasing number of individuals within NPLaw able to undertake court advocacy, there will be a reduction of reliance on barristers for shorter hearings and therefore a saving achieved;

- **Post 16 transport: remove option to pay a daily fare (currently only available on local buses which charge fares):** it is proposed that the option to pay for post 16 transport via a daily fare on local buses will be removed meaning that all post 16 students will have the same options for payment regardless of provider;
- **Contract efficiencies;**
- **Capitalisation and use of capital receipts to fund transformation;**
- **Review of grant funding budget assumptions:** As a result of ongoing successful outcomes, the Council is receiving maximum performance by results income. This is expected to continue during 2023-24 offsetting the need for NCC funding for Family Support teams.

9.27. As we work through the budget setting process, the department continues to focus upon potential transformation within our overall strategy, as described above, that could maximise outcomes for children and young people, whilst mitigating the challenges resulting from the pandemic and also delivering financial benefits to alleviate the pressures facing the County Council.

Key Issues and Risks

9.28. Whilst we are seeing some medium-term financial impacts of the pandemic and the budget looks to mitigate these where possible, it remains unclear precisely what the longer-term financial impacts will be of the COVID-19 pandemic. What is clear is that some very significant financial risks associated with the pandemic continue to exist in terms of the long-term design of some services, in relation to joint working, public expectations, levels of demand, and the underlying cost base.

9.29. The level of pressures included in the Children's Services budget for future years attempts to reflect the high-level expectations regarding the medium-to-longer-term demand. However, the last 2 years has shown that it is difficult to predict these with certainty and, therefore, risks within Children's Services remain that include the potential for additional cost pressures linked to surges in demand, particularly in relation to looked after children. In addition, there is a risk that the wider operating environment has shifted, which may put pressure on assumptions about trading with schools.

9.30. Some specific risks that should be noted are:

- **Pandemic economic and societal impact leading changes in market forces**

Increasing cost pressures have been seen throughout the external markets that Children's Services deals within including transport providers and social care placement provision. Some providers have contracted, such as reduced numbers of taxi drivers, or exited the market, such as coach company closures, during the pandemic for various economic and societal reasons, such as seeking more secure income streams, or a different lifestyle being sought. These impacts have resulted in demand exceeding supply, leading to unexpected cost increases, and there is a risk that such patterns continue or other, unexpected, trends emerge in the medium-to-longer-term;

- **Exacerbation of demand pressures due to pandemic legacy and cost of living crisis leading to additional cost pressures**

Demand, as a legacy of the pandemic, could continue to increase in volume and / or complexity. Demand may emerge over time both directly into Children's Services (as evident in demand for Family Support services), as well as through schools or within early years provision (such as reduced speech and language skills). Combined with cost of living pressures being experienced by families, additional children and families may require our services due to a combination of increased strains on families and the medium-term impact of a reduction in the availability of universal support networks as a result of the pandemic. Such demand could lead to increasing requirement for staffing resource on a medium-to-longer-term basis and / or additional placement and support costs, to ensure that the right outcomes for children and families are achieved;

- **Economic and societal impact of the legacy of the pandemic and the cost of living crisis leading to staffing instability**

The pandemic has resulted in many individuals reflecting upon their lives and considering changing roles or careers who previously had not been anticipating this, whilst others may have put on hold such plans. There have always been challenges filling some roles and, in some cases, these challenges have been exacerbated post pandemic, e.g. the national shortage of foster carers. Additionally, public sector pay increases are, on average, below those in the private sector and individuals may choose that they need to make alternative role or career choices to ensure that they can meet their own financial needs, particularly for lower graded roles;

- **Provider market instability leading to key provider failure**

The economic conditions of the pandemic have left many businesses with financial pressures, despite ongoing contracts and access, where applicable, to government support. Whilst Children's services will always bear the risk of the failure of a significant provider, this risk has increased in the current climate. The implications could be increased, unforeseen costs and / or diversion of key resources to ensure continuity of provision. Additionally, the inflation pressures currently being seen are having a significant impact upon key providers, particularly in relation to staffing costs as well as energy and transport, which may result in providers being unable to fulfil contracted provision or choosing to hand back contracts that are no longer financially viable for them;

- **Impact of current economic and societal conditions on the VCSE sector**

A significant portion of Children's Services commissioned provision is through the VCSE sector, with the sector also providing a significant proportion of universal services. Many VCSE organisations, whose financial positions may well have been fragile prior to the pandemic, have been negatively affected by their reduced ability to fundraise as a result of the pandemic combined with increased demand for services. Additionally, they are facing the same inflationary cost pressures as seen by the County Council and key providers. Financial failure of these organisations could lead to increased costs to Children's Services either through additional funding required to maintain provision or through having to fund alternatives;

- **Demand for, and cost of, SEND home to school transport**

Increases in demand for SEND home to school transport provision has mirrored increasing demand for special school and specialist resource base provision. The increase in demand has been exacerbated by price pressures from providers both due to the cost of fuel, vehicles and their ability to recruit and retain staff. Additional resources are allocated in this budget to reflect this situation, but there remains a risk that demand will exceed the financial resources available;

- **Legacy of the pandemic leading to excessive strain on families caring for a child with significant additional needs and / or disabilities**

The majority of families found the pandemic caused strain upon their relationships and ability to cope with the stresses of life, and families who are caring for a child with significant additional needs and / or disabilities were likely to have seen this effect magnified given the reduced services available to support them with their caring roles, such as short-breaks provision, periods of reduced schooling, and friends and family networks of support. Many families had the resilience to cope during the pandemic, but the medium-to-longer-term impact brings increased risk of family break-down and, subsequently, increased demand for services;

- **National Living Wage and impact upon workforce pay rates.**

When the National Minimum Wage, and subsequently National Living Wage (NLW), were introduced there remained a differential to lower graded roles within children's social care sector and education. As the NLW has increased, the pay and terms and conditions for these roles is no longer as attractive and key services and providers are experiencing challenges in recruiting and retaining staff to some roles. There is a risk that any differential is completely eroded, resulting in key roles remaining unfilled as the workforce makes alternative choices to meet their financial needs;

- **Unfunded new burdens from Government in response to the National Social Care Review and the SEND review: right support, right place, right time**

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

The Government's response to both of these reviews has been delayed from the end of 2022 and is currently awaited and, if implemented in full, the recommendations would potentially bring significant additional burdens to local authorities. Previous reviews in both of these policy areas have resulted in legislative change that has then not been fully funded, leading to the significant risk that any changes as a result of these review implementations may not be fully funded.

Children's Services proposed budget 2023-24

Table 27: Detailed budget change forecast Children's Services 2023-27

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	OPENING BUDGET	189.065	232.593	247.412	256.903
	ADDITIONAL COSTS				
	Economic / Inflationary				
	Basic Inflation - Pay (3% 22-23 onwards)	3.322	3.094	3.169	3.264
	Basic Inflation - Prices	4.289	2.678	2.872	2.929
G2324CS001	Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	5.377	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CS002	Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-0.991	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Legislative Requirements				
G2324CS008	Children's Services additional inflationary pressures including impact of National Living Wage	7.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Demand / Demographic				
G2324CS005	Social care: demographic and demand growth	4.000	3.000	3.000	3.000
G2223CS010	Social care: additional growth due to medium term impact COVID-19	4.000	4.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CS006	Home to School Transport: demographic growth	3.500	2.500	0.500	0.000
G2324CS009	Loss of income due to lower demand for chargeable services post-COVID (Children's traded services)	0.150	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NCC Policy				
G2324CS007	Recruitment and retention investment offset by Agency reduction	-0.610	-0.540	-0.100	0.000
G2122CS006	New operating model investment	-0.350	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CS010	Children's Services recurrent pressures arising from 2022-23 service levels (2022-23 overspend)	20.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CS011	DSG/HNB recovery plan "Safety Valve" - Norfolk County Council contribution	5.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
		55.187	14.732	9.441	9.193
	SAVINGS				
CHS002	Expansion of 2019-20 CHS002: Alternatives to care (No Wrong Door) - Investing in a range of new services which offer alternatives to care using enhanced therapeutic and care alternatives, combined with a focus on support networks from	-6.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	extended families keeping families safely together where possible and averting family crises.				
CHS001 (Extend)	Extending our existing savings programme to deliver additional benefits. Proposal is to expand our 2019-20 saving CHS001: Prevention, early intervention and effective social care – Investing in an enhanced operating model which supports families to stay together and ensures fewer children need to come into care.	0.000	-0.900	0.000	0.000
CHS002 (Extend)	Extending our existing savings programme to deliver additional benefits. Proposal is to expand our 2019-20 saving CHS002: Alternatives to care – Investing in a range of new services which offer alternatives to care using enhanced therapeutic interventions, combined with a focus on support networks from extended families keeping families safely together where possible and averting family crises.	0.000	-0.250	0.000	0.000
CHS003 (Extend)	Extending our existing savings programme to deliver additional benefits. Proposal is to expand our 2019-20 saving CHS003: Transforming the care market and creating the capacity that we need – Creating and commissioning new care models for children in care – achieving better outcomes and lower costs.	0.000	-0.250	0.000	0.000
S2324CS023 [SR]	Changes in ways of working post pandemic: Reduction in the Early Years Training Budget as a result of the move towards a digital training offer	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS020	Expansion of CHS002: Alternatives to care (New Roads)	-1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS019	Expansion of CHS007: Inclusion (Home to School Transport). Extension of existing activity focussed on providing education more locally, supporting inclusion, supporting independent travel where that is right for the child, and commissioning transport most efficiently.	-0.935	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS025 [SR]	Review of budget assumptions: Additional Supporting Families base funding offsetting the need for NCC funding for Family Support teams.	-0.476	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS026 [SR]	Review of budget assumptions: Additional Supporting Families income due to ongoing successful outcomes resulting in maximum performance by results income.	-0.235	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS028 [SR]	Review of legal costs: Ensuring the right level of external legal expertise is utilised	-0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS029	Review of service levels and demand post pandemic: Right sizing of the Early Years Sustainability Fund to reflect the level of demand seen in recent years	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS031	Withdrawing from the PDC Building: Revenue implications	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS030 [SR]	Revision to NPLaw Model: Alternative arrangement expected to deliver savings for Children's Services	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS024 [SR]	Contract efficiencies: Efficiency savings through reducing management roles and one-off inflationary savings.	-0.156	0.050	0.050	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
S2324CS022 [SR]	Review of service levels and demand post pandemic: Not restarting activities where there is no longer demand nor economic viability.	-0.016	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS033 [SR]	One-off funding of transformation spend from capital receipts	-2.500	2.500	0.000	0.000
S2324CS034 [SR]	Additional capitalisation of Senior Leaders in relation to asset development	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS035	Post 16 transport: remove option to pay a daily fare (currently only available on local buses which charge fares)	-0.055	-0.045	0.000	0.000
S2324CS036	Strategic review of internal post 16 teams to ensure integrated delivery of these functions across council and wider system	-0.150	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CS037 [SR]	Strategic Review – Opportunity A and B	-1.485	-1.017	0.000	0.000
Various CHL003 / CHL001	Reversal of previous savings no longer deliverable: CHL003 Young Parent & Baby Semi-Independent Accommodation, CHL001: Specialist social care housing support, reduced family court costs and reducing LAC numbers, Smarter working: mobile phone reduction through introduction of text service from personal phones	1.241	0.000	0.000	0.000
		-12.517	0.088	0.050	0.000
	BASE ADJUSTMENTS				
		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	COST NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS				
C2324CS001	Depreciation transfer	1.264	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CS002	Debt management transfer	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CS003	CES/CS - Repeat Removals Prevention	-0.080	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2223CS002	FG to CS Extended Rights to Free Travel grant	-0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/CS - PH 22/23 agreed new cross cutting transfers	-0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CS/FCS - Semi Independent Accommodation	-0.029	0.000	0.000	0.000
		0.858	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NET BUDGET	232.593	247.412	256.903	266.097

10. 2023-24 Budget proposals – Community and Environmental Services

Financial Strategy

- 10.1. Community and Environmental Services (CES) has responsibility for the delivery of a wide range of services; there is no hierarchy as each area has a vital role to play in achieving better outcomes for Norfolk and we have a key role to play in supporting the delivery of the Better Together, for Norfolk strategy.
- 10.2. Our services are delivered across the county in the heart of local communities. The common factor is that CES services impact on residents, visitors and businesses in Norfolk every day. They are also crucial to successful economic growth.
- 10.3. We play a key role in keeping Norfolk communities safe, healthy and independent; including responding to emergencies, developing skills, tackling social isolation and providing the advice and support people need to stay safe and healthy. There is also a focus on Norfolk as a place, including looking after our unique heritage and environment as well as ensuring that key community infrastructure is in place.
- 10.4. We are investing in some key service areas to ensure critical activities to support local communities and businesses can continue to be delivered and developed further:
- Supporting economic recovery and growth, including development of a County Deal and the Norfolk Investment Framework to focus future growth and development.
 - Supporting community resilience and development of social infrastructure, including through the Social Infrastructure Fund and delivery of projects and interventions with a range of partners.
 - Providing the community infrastructure individuals and businesses in Norfolk need to thrive, including investments in transport, community facilities and skills development.
 - Work to reduce our impact on the environment and deliver the action plan supporting the Council's Environmental Policy, including developing transport infrastructure that supports green ways to travel and enjoy Norfolk.
 - Investing in services to help keep Norfolk Communities safe and healthy.
 - Working with partners and stakeholders to further develop the visitor economy.
- 10.5. A key part of our strategy for some time has been to reduce our reliance on revenue funding whilst continuing to make significant investment in key improvements and activities for Norfolk. We have achieved this through successfully securing funding from alternative sources, including grants,

competitively bidding for funding and generating income, for example the £49.6m of funding securing during 2022 to deliver our bus service improvement plan. Less than half of the workforce in CES is revenue funded.

Savings proposals 2023-24

10.6. The service continues to first look for opportunities to deliver budget savings, to minimise the impact on vital front-line services which local communities, businesses and visitors rely on. The range of services and outcomes means that a single approach would not be beneficial. Instead, CES is focussing on service redesign across the following broad approaches:

- A focus on Core service provision – Protecting, developing and enhancing the core services at the heart of local communities, including those supporting the work to keep people safe and healthy and to support economic activity.
- Working both internally and with key partners and stakeholders to collectively maximise alternative funding sources, including opportunities to generate income, to deliver shared outcomes for Norfolk without a continued reliance on NCC revenue contributions.
- Smarter Working – Efficiency and cost reduction – this includes putting new ways of working in place for our directly employed workforce, as well as working with our contractors to enable efficiencies from our commissioned services.
- Through the work as part of the Strategic Review, making sure that we organise our resources in the most effective and efficient way, including removing duplication.
- Recognising the importance of community infrastructure and continuing to invest in new and enhanced facilities, for example investment in more modern libraries and recycling centres. To ensure that communities can continue to access infrastructure in their local areas, the approach aims to change and flex access arrangements to better meet wider demand and to make best use of the new modern new facilities we are investing in.

Community and Environmental Services proposed budget 2023-24

Table 28: Detailed budget change forecast Community and Environmental Services 2023-27

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	OPENING BUDGET	166.162	177.109	184.839	192.026
	ADDITIONAL COSTS				
	Economic / Inflationary				
	Basic Inflation - Pay (3% 22-23 onwards)	3.145	2.396	2.468	2.537
	Basic Inflation - Prices	6.587	1.966	2.048	2.092
G2324CES001	Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	3.234	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
G2324CES002	Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-0.699	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Legislative Requirements				
G2122CES002	Trading Standards - additional trading standards requirements following Brexit	-0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2223CES005	Fire Pension pressures	-0.100	-0.250	0.000	0.000
G2324CES003	Fire Service - Ill health payment to Home Office fire pension account	0.000	0.000	-0.200	0.000
	Demand / Demographic				
G2324CES004	Waste pressure - demand and demographic (tonnage)	0.600	2.000	2.000	2.000
G2324CES005	Future maintenance costs of other new infrastructure assets	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.000
G2223CES036	Future maintenance costs of Great Yarmouth 3rd river crossing	1.140	0.100	0.000	0.000
G2324CES006	Great Yarmouth 3rd river crossing - future electricity costs for bridge operation	0.175	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NCC Policy				
G2223CES035	Emerging cost pressures across all services in 2023-24 ³⁷	3.000	0.150	0.000	0.000
G2223CES025	Growth and Development - One-off funding for local implementation plans arising from the Local Transport Plan adopted by Full Council 29 November 2021	-0.215	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CES010	Growth and Development - Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF) expenditure (one-off)	2.000	-2.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CES011	Growth and Development - Local Transport Plan	0.000	0.300	0.000	0.000
G2324CES012	Growth and Development - Transport for Norwich	0.000	0.200	0.000	0.000
G2223CES037	Loss of income from removal of overdue library charges for children and young people [Cabinet 08/03/2021]	0.044	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2223CES009	Other pressure on CES income budgets including other library fine income due to changes in policy	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2223CES040	Upfront investment for project / scheme development	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.000
G2324CES007	Fire Service - Lease cars pressure - cost increases including EV provision, and increased fleet requirement	0.430	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CES008	Fire Service - Norse contractual pressures for fleet services	0.266	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324CES009	Fire Service - Resource pressure to support NFRS improvement "People" activity following HMI inspection report	0.155	0.000	0.000	0.000
		19.823	4.911	6.616	6.630

³⁷ This growth has been allocated in the 2023-24 Budget as follows: Pressures linked to retender of P&R contracts £0.600m, Highways exceptional materials cost pressures £0.300m, Highways exceptional energy cost pressures (street lighting) £0.950m, Delivery of the Council's Environment Policy £0.150m (plus £0.150m 2024-25), Culture and heritage - statutory duties in relation to resilience of structures (environment / planning related) £0.250m, Community information and learning income budget pressures £0.050m, release of pressure to contribute to saving S2324CES125 £0.700m.

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	SAVINGS				
CMM043	Income generation – Norfolk Museums Service	0.000	-0.400	0.000	0.000
CES001	Additional efficiencies in staffing and operations to progress the Adult Learning service towards its goal of being cost neutral.	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES017	Reviewing the operation of Museum catering facilities to make them more commercial.	0.000	-0.035	0.000	0.000
CES051	Buying rather than leasing fire service vehicles. This would bring savings while keeping the same number of vehicles on the road.	-0.111	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES052	Charge for some of the expert planning advice and services we provide. This proposal requires that some of the costs for environment planning advice and information be transferred from the County Council revenue budget to a charge to the planning system. Enacting this change will require engagement with Tier 2 Local Authorities for those planning functions they cover.	-0.075	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES060	Fixed Penalty Notices. Income from fines if utilities and other companies do not comply with the roadwork permits they have been issued.	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES061	Fines for overrunning roadworks. Income from fines if utilities and other companies do not comply with the roadwork permits they have been issued. Section 74 of the New Roads and Street Works Act (NRSWA) allows highway authorities to charge undertakers if street works are unreasonably prolonged i.e. take longer than previously agreed.	0.350	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES094	Bring forward the reversal of Brexit pressures	0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES097	Remove CES ICT reserve	0.085	0.000	0.000	0.000
CES099	Tarmac - increased 2021 contract saving over and above £250,000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES122	Budget reduction: Reduction of Arts Projects Grants and reduction in the Strategic Fund	-0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES105	Business Rates Pool - forecast income over £2m	-0.600	0.000	0.600	0.000
S2324CES121 [SR]	Business Support review (CES)	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES109 [SR]	Civil Parking Enforcement - future back office efficiencies	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES113	Closed landfill: capitalise borehole installations	-0.030	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES108	Flood Prevention Funding – capitalise relevant activity previously funded from revenue budgets	-0.120	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES117	Norfolk Record Office - reduction in opening hours and income generation	-0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES123	One-off usage of CES Reserves	-1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES112	Recycling Centres: contract efficiencies	-0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
S2324CES119	Recycling Centres: harmonise summer opening hours at recycling centres	-0.070	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES118	Reduce funding to the Norfolk Windmills trust	-0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES107	Reducing weedkilling on highway network to a single treatment	-0.130	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES106	Review charges for events on the Highway	-0.075	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES125	Review of budget assumptions: Removal of growth and cost pressures previously assumed in the Community and Environmental Services budget which are no longer expected to be required.	-1.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES116	Review of Norfolk's Mobile Library Service	-0.107	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES114	Roll out of on street parking charges	-0.200	-0.800	0.000	0.000
S2324CES110	Strategic salt storage facility at Ketteringham Depot	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.045
S2324CES111	Waste reduction initiatives: reduced funding	-0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES115	Winter Maintenance - operational delivery efficiencies	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES126	Review of fees and charges: Review of fees and charges across Highways and Waste budgets to ensure charging is at the right level and introduce new charges in line with other local authorities where appropriate.	-0.290	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES127	Review of Highways and Waste budgets: Reviewing service levels, budget requirements and demand, contract efficiencies, capitalisation and deletion of vacant posts.	-0.207	0.010	0.000	0.000
S2324CES124 [SR]	Restructure of the Museums Service	-0.157	-0.094	-0.030	0.000
S2324CES128 [SR]	Capitalisation in EDI service	-0.058	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES129 [SR]	One-off saving from Trading Standards staffing budget	-0.042	0.042	0.000	0.000
S2324CES130	Armed forces covenant - reduce funding contribution for one year	-0.010	0.010	0.000	0.000
S2324CES131	Remove L&D budget	-0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES133	Vehicle replacement fund	-0.300	0.300	0.000	0.000
S2324CES135	Joined-up approach to Prevention and Protection / Trading Standards activities	0.000	-0.050	0.000	0.000
S2324CES136	Fire and Rescue Service efficiencies	-0.050	0.050	0.000	0.000
S2324CES137	Norfolk Record Office efficiencies	-0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES139	Changes to the process for determining planning decisions where the County Council is the applicant	-0.025	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES140	Residual waste: waste growth review – additional saving over and above BC2 proposal	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES141	Recycling Centres: Mayton Wood relocation to Norwich North RC site	-0.030	-0.040	0.000	0.000
S2324CES142	Increase Recycling Centre charges	-0.025	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES143	External funding contribution	-0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
S2324CES144	Streetlighting - further dim all lights with an existing CMS (central management system) which are usually the main road streetlights - lights would come on @ 75%, dim to 50% from 8pm	-0.100	-0.074	0.000	0.000
S2324CES145 [SR]	Strategic Review – Opportunity A and B	-2.100	-0.100	0.000	0.000
S2324CES146	Application of Business Rates Pool funds to support Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF) expenditure	-2.000	2.000	0.000	0.000
S2324CES147	One-off application of CES reserves to support core budget	-1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000
		-10.254	2.819	0.570	-0.045
	BASE ADJUSTMENTS				
B2324CES001	Food Safety Enforcement grant rolled into main settlement 2023-24	0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000
		0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000
	COST NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS				
C2324CES001	Depreciation transfer	0.613	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CES002	Debt management transfer	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/ASS - PH 22/23 agreed new cross cutting transfers	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/CS - PH 22/23 agreed new cross cutting transfers	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - P&G GRT budget transfer to Corporate Property. Further transfer to be made for PG1002 and staff budgets.	0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - Removal of Mile Cross GRT site budget	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - IMT Fire Budgets to CES	0.127	0.000	0.000	0.000
	FCS/CES - Budget loaded to FF1700 Fire rev- spend will be on IMT Fire KT4300	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CES004	CES/FG - CFL062 Fire Emergency Vehicles Red Fleet	0.112	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CES005	CES/FG - CFL064 Fire Breathing Apparatus	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CES006	CES/CS - Repeat Removals Prevention	0.080	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324CES007	FCS/CES - Adult Learning	-0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - transfer of Better Broadband	-0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000
		1.354	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NET BUDGET	177.109	184.839	192.026	198.610

11. 2023-24 Budget proposals – Strategy and Transformation

Service Strategy and context

11.1. The Strategy and Transformation department provides a continuum of services from strategy development, organisational development and upskilling, HR and HSW core services and professional advice, innovation and transformation delivery, insight and performance, strategic communications and resource stewardship.

11.2. Following the departure of the Director of Governance in January 2023, the functions previously identified separately within the Governance Department have transferred into Strategy and Transformation. These areas support the Council to be an effective organisation, ensuring there is strong governance that keeps the organisation safe and legally sound supporting elected members to shape and deliver the Council's key priorities. The opening budget in the table below has been restated to reflect the inclusion of these budgets in 2023-24.

11.3. The enlarged department's key functional areas are Human Resources, Transformation, Communications and Marketing, Insight and Analytics, Democratic Services, Regulatory Services, and Legal Services. As well as providing a service to operational departments they also enable the delivery of change and benefits within those departments. As described elsewhere in this report, there will be further changes to the organisational structure following the departure of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services in April 2023 (see paragraph 12.2).

- A **strategic focus** – to provide advice and to support the political and managerial leadership of the Council in their strategic approach. At a time when resources are stretched, and a number of “unknowns” remain in the financial and government policy space, it is essential to have the capability to:
 - look to the future and anticipate change.
 - provide analytical and problem-solving expertise to the executive team and departments.
 - offer professional leadership to the organisation in key areas such as strategy, communications and intelligence and analytics, to drive insights and actions.
 - These capabilities are also offered to Norfolk Resilience Forum (NRF) partners, supporting their management and delivery.
- A **governance focus** – to ensure the organisation is safe, compliant and governed effectively and with strategic focus and purpose, with strong stewardship / control systems and processes, joining up across the local government system.

- A **transformational focus** – to support and enable change to deliver expected benefits and outcomes and drive innovation, through providing capacity and support to services by:
 - defining transformational solutions to strategic problems across all areas of processes, people and systems
 - delivering projects and transformation at pace where required
 - supporting the Council to improve its performance through, enhancing the governance of significant transformation activity and capital investment.
 - supporting our people to have the skills and behaviours needed to deliver
- An **enabling service focus** – providing more responsive internal services from all elements of the department to managers and staff while:
 - achieving lower costs through greater use of technology,
 - developing and implementing simpler and more streamlined processes that deliver the desired outcomes
 - supporting and driving evidence-based decision making
 - clear concise communications internally and externally to support service provision, drive the uptake of council services, and position the council in a leadership capacity
 - building the Council's positive reputation for delivery and influence positive behavioural change
- A **service delivery and income generating focus** – to create value for the Council through maximising the opportunities provided through public service provision, for genuine fee earning activities which don't deviate from, but enhance, our statutory purpose and core offer. The newly integrated functions of Nplaw and Registrars generate income, and budget proposals take into account the potential for fee earning. Other functions within Strategy and Transformation including HR, Communications and Insight and Analytics also have an important income generating dimension to their budgets

Service financial strategy and savings proposals 2023-24

11.4. To ensure best value for money, we continue to investigate and explore opportunities for a coordinated spend approach across the Council in all areas. The department's strategic approach to developing budget proposals is intended to:

- Maintain strong governance as efficiently and effectively as possible, which keeps the organisation safe and legally sound and supports elected members to shape and deliver the Council's key priorities.
- Balance opportunities to maximise income for genuine fee earning services against cost savings, without deviating from our core service offering.
- Work to drive our professional leads model and organisation design, in providing support across the organisation to maximise efficiency, and effectiveness.

- Ensure the realisation of benefits identified in the Strategic Review, Transformation and Smarter Working programmes. To support this activity, the budget proposals for 2023-24 include growth in the service's Transformation delivery and associated governance capacity, funded by capital receipts for the two years to 2025-26 to provide:
 - specialist resource to improve transformation delivery across the council
 - improved corporate oversight of the transformation and capital spend to support clear strategic alignment and resourcing of our programmes
- Provide clarity on HR core service delivery post MyOracle implementation.
- Acknowledge and invest in the role of manager capability and capacity in good people practice resulting in reduced HR intervention and advice.

11.5. Critical objectives and priorities for the year include to:

- Support the overall implementation year one of the Strategic Review and developing plans for future years that support an increased culture of delivery.
- Implement those changes identified in the Strategic Review that specifically relate to areas within Strategy and Transformation and identifying opportunities and synergies through this new grouping of services.
- Co-ordinate the preparation for mobilisation of the County Deal for Norfolk and leading on relevant areas.
- Create wider organisational capacity and capability in strategy, policy, innovation and operational performance, through enhanced direct support to services and deeper engagement into the organisation.
- Develop, implement and embed a new performance management framework.
- Increase the provision of insight, accessible information and resources in a timely and meaningful way so as to enable evidence and intelligence led decision-making in the delivery of our services.
- Create meaningful conversations with residents, employees, partners and stakeholders to highlight how the Council is bringing positive change.
- Continue to deliver the Smarter Working programme and realise benefits across the organisation.
- Strengthen the transformation, innovation and capital programme's governance framework, ensuring a direct connection to organisational performance and return on investment.
- Build a central transformation delivery capability to assure transformation delivery and ability to respond to an organisational priority.
- Developing better systems, processes and online resources which support self-service and improve access for the public, councillors and colleagues.
- Delivering regulatory services which are business-like and joined up, making a positive contribution to the Council's priorities.
- Pursuing opportunities to increase external legal work to increase trading surplus to be contributed to Council front line services.

- Making better use of technology to further improve legal support to customers and continue move away from paper-based systems.

Key issues and risks

- 11.6. The timescales for implementation and delivery of key projects including Strategic Review and MyOracle have implications for the delivery of savings across the Strategy and Transformation Budget, particularly where Strategy and Transformation capacity is needed to support delivery across other services both as part of their Strategic Review and other organisational change implementation. In addition, the Strategic Review will require new systems, processes, and ways of working to support the revised models for service delivery. There are specific risks in relation to the professional leads savings under the Strategic Review which are linked to wider Opportunity A schemes and mechanisms including centralisation of budgets.
- 11.7. The demand for insight and reporting continues to increase both in terms of volume and complexity, which reflects NCC's growing maturity in how it values the use of data to understand daily operation and insight to inform decision making. However, the growing demand will require more effective and efficient use of NCC's current analytical resources, which will be achieved through a different pan-NCC approach. However given the scale of efficiency savings in reducing capacity it will take time to deliver changes.
- 11.8. Changes within the target operating model for HR are designed to deliver a lean structure with no spare capacity for additional change and projects. As a result where there are one off demands for support, these will need to be funded as part of the business case for change. Where the change has already been planned there is a risk that this has not been accounted for putting additional pressure on the system.
- 11.9. The scale of change across the Council is significant and this brings reputational risks and challenges to keep a highly motivated and high performance work force.

Strategy and Transformation proposed budget 2023-24

Table 29: Detailed budget change forecast Strategy and Transformation 2023-27

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	Strategy and Transformation Opening Budget	8.759			
	Governance Opening Budget	1.960			
	OPENING BUDGET (Consolidated Strategy and Transformation)	10.720	12.761	13.025	13.697
	ADDITIONAL COSTS				
	Economic / Inflationary				

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
		£m	£m	£m	£m
	Basic Inflation - Pay (3% 22-23 onwards)	0.476	0.490	0.508	0.526
	Basic Inflation - Prices	0.007	0.006	0.006	0.006
G2324S&T001	Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	1.066	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324S&T002	Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-0.206	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Demand / Demographic				
G2021GOV001	Coroners - additional cost for storing bodies	0.080	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324GOV003	Coroners - increased pathologist fees	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NCC Policy				
G2324S&T004	Transformation service - growth pressure following Strategic Review (funded by capital receipt flexibility)	1.531	0.000	-1.531	0.000
G2324S&T003	County Deal - implementation costs including consultation, prior to capacity funding becoming available in December 2023, if the County Deal is approved	0.250	-0.250	0.000	0.000
G2324GOV006	8% Market Supplement for Nplaw Grades I to N until 31 October 2023	0.142	-0.142	0.000	0.000
G2324GOV005	Coroners resource / capacity increase to address volumes of work	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2021GOV002	Coroners Officers administrative team (12 FTE) transfer from Police	0.105	0.111	0.118	0.124
		3.752	0.215	-0.899	0.657
	SAVINGS				
SGD015	BC3 - HR & Finance System - Benefits realisation from HR & Finance System replacement in HR&OD - Benefits realisation work is still underway to quantify value of saving, but current forecast reflects savings of £0.280m in 2022-23	0.099	0.000	0.000	0.000
S&T002	Insight & Analytics budget saving and additional income. Deliver a saving by delaying recruitment and seeking alternative sources of funding for currently vacant posts.	0.097	0.000	0.000	0.000
S&T003	One off use of Strategy and Transformation reserves.	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
S&T005	National Insurance savings on employee support schemes - invest to save approach based on promoting uptake of salary sacrifice arrangements to deliver Employer's NI savings	-0.045	0.000	0.000	0.000
GOV005	Use of Governance reserves. One-off release of reserves to offset budget pressures following review of all reserves held.	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324S&T006 [SR]	Expansion of professional leads - Centralise and control spend on communications. This would include paid staff and/or non-pay procurement across the organisation	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324S&T007 [SR]	Expansion of professional leads - Work with other departments to agree the Council's desired level of activity and overall number of analysts required	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324S&T008 [SR]	One off use of Strategy and Transformation reserves.	-0.050	0.050	0.000	0.000
S2324S&T009 [SR]	Strategic Review - HR remodelling	-0.447	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324S&T010 [SR]	S&T - Transformation capitalisation saving	-1.571	0.000	1.571	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
		£m	£m	£m	£m
S2324GOV010	Increase in Registrars Income	-0.075	0.000	0.000	0.000
		-2.042	0.050	1.571	0.000
	COST NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS				
	S&T/FCS HR Admin Support Officer	0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324S&T001	S&T/FCS - HR Transactions Team	0.317	0.000	0.000	0.000
	FCS/GOV - IMT for support when Dem Serv use Council Chamber	-0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324GOV001	FG/GOV - Depreciation 81000	-0.015	0.000	0.000	0.000
		0.331	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NET BUDGET	12.761	13.025	13.697	14.354

12. 2023-24 Budget proposals – Finance and Commercial Services / Finance General

Service Strategy and context

12.1. Finance and Commercial Services provides capacity to enable the Council to act swiftly, innovatively, and effectively in a climate of continuous change. The Department continues to be focused on delivering the following key objectives:

- Enhancing financial performance;
- Supporting and training service managers;
- Effective management of property assets to make best use and maximise the return on investments;
- Efficient and effective contract management;
- Providing information which supports good decision making;
- Reducing the costs of our services whilst improving their effectiveness, utilising new technology and implementing smarter ways of working;
- Rolling out technological infrastructure, improving customer service and saving money; and
- Delivering savings through the Strategic Review by making sure that resources are organised in the most effective and efficient way, and by removing duplication.

12.2. As part of the Strategic Review, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services will be leaving the Council in April 2023. There will be further changes to the organisational structure of the Finance and Commercial Services Department as a result of this, however as the detailed implications remain to be confirmed, these are not incorporated in this report but will be reflected as far as possible in the 2023-24 Budget Book.

Service financial strategy and savings proposals 2023-24

12.3. The key objectives set out above have informed the Department's approach to identifying budget proposals which minimise the impact on front line services. Saving plans for 2023-24 are therefore focussed on achieving efficiencies and improvements, including realising the benefits of the HR and Finance System (MyOracle) in future financial years, and achieving savings from greater integration of activities within IMT. Alongside this, the Department is seeking to maximise income, for example from further commercialisation and maximising the return from the Council's property assets within the Corporate Property Estate.

Key issues and risks

12.4. The Department is directly managing, and supporting the wider Council with a number of key issues and risks:

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

- Supporting the response to the cost of living crisis and the legacy of COVID-19 including directly through Finance Exchequer Services activities;
- Providing and managing resilient IT infrastructure to support staff at all NCC sites and working remotely;
- Delivering major procurements;
- Rationalising and achieving best value from the Council's property portfolio;
- Supporting the Council to set and deliver services within planned budgets;
- Supporting the wider organisation to engage with funding reform and ensuring the Council's needs are understood by Government;

Finance and Commercial Services proposed budget 2023-24

Table 30: Detailed budget change forecast Finance and Commercial Services 2023-27

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	OPENING BUDGET	33.424	35.793	36.461	37.203
	ADDITIONAL COSTS				
	Economic / Inflationary				
	Basic Inflation - Pay (3% 22-23 onwards)	0.754	0.758	0.776	0.796
	Basic Inflation - Prices	1.120	0.320	0.326	0.332
G2324FCS001	Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	1.531	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FCS002	Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-0.247	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NCC Policy				
G2122FCS002	Revenue pressure for HR and Finance System replacement	-0.052	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FCS003	ICT support to enable WFH equipment provision	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FCS004	Green energy tariff via ESPO	0.161	0.000	0.000	0.000
		3.297	1.078	1.102	1.128
	SAVINGS				
FCS014	Benefits realisation from the HR & Finance System replacement project in Finance Exchequer Services - Benefits realisation work is still underway to quantify value of saving from the HR & Finance System replacement, but current forecast reflects savings of £0.4m in 2022-23 which will be delivered by a combination of reduction in posts and changes to licence costs. Expected full year effect of the project being implemented is currently estimated as a further £0.1m from 2023-24.	0.400	-0.150	-0.150	-0.200
FCS018	Benefits realisation from the HR & Finance system replacement (MyOracle) project. Recognising efficiency and other savings to be achieved within Budgeting and Accounting service from 2023-24.	0.000	-0.030	-0.030	-0.040
S2324FCS021	Further income from commercialisation of property assets including County Hall	-0.350	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
S2324FCS022 [SR]	Strategic Review – Opportunity A – Finance and Property	-0.700	-0.230	-0.180	0.000
S2324FCS023 [SR]	Strategic Review - Opportunity A - Procurement	-0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FCS024 [SR]	Strategic Review - Opportunity A - IMT / Digital	-0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
		-1.200	-0.410	-0.360	-0.240
	COST NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS				
C2324FCS001	Depreciation transfer	0.623	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324FCS002	Debt management transfer	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - P&G GRT budget transfer to Corporate Property. Further transfer to be made for PG1002 and staff budgets.	-0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - Removal of Mile Cross GRT site budget	-0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - IMT Fire Budgets to CES	-0.127	0.000	0.000	0.000
	FCS/CES - Budget loaded to FF1700 Fire rev-spend will be on IMT Fire KT4300	0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
	FCS/GOV - IMT for support when Dem Serv use Council Chamber	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000
	S&T/FCS HR Admin Support Officer	-0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CS/FCS - Semi Independent Accommodation	0.029	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324FCS004	FCS/CES - Adult Learning	0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324FCS005	S&T/FCS - HR Transactions Team	-0.317	0.000	0.000	0.000
	CES/FCS - transfer of Better Broadband	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000
		0.273	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NET BUDGET	35.793	36.461	37.203	38.091

Finance General proposed budget 2023-24

12.5. Finance General is a corporate budget, which includes council wide expenditure and income. This is a net income budget as total income exceeds total expenditure. A net income budget is shown as a negative figure.

12.6. Finance General includes employee related costs such as corporate pension payments due to changes following the actuarial valuation of the pension fund. Pension deficit recovery is identified as a cash sum and is budgeted for in Finance General. Other expenditure includes redundancy and pension payments arising from organisational review; grant payments; audit fees; member allowances; and capital financing costs. Income includes funding through the Business Rates Retention System; interest from investments; and depreciation on capital from services.

Table 31: Detailed budget change forecast Finance General 2023-27

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	OPENING BUDGET	-198.432	-214.029	-170.984	-145.303

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
	ADDITIONAL COSTS				
	Economic / Inflationary				
	Basic Inflation - Pay (3% 22-23 onwards)	0.526	0.381	0.391	0.402
G2324FG009	Basic inflation - Pay (2023-24 additional c2% central contingency, 1% 2024-25)	6.766	3.319	0.000	0.000
	Basic Inflation - Prices	0.109	0.068	0.070	0.072
G2324FG010	Remove 2022-23 inflation contingency not required	-0.296	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG002	Remove NI 2022-23 1.25% increase (abolition of H&SC Levy)	-0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG001	Pay award 2022-23 (£1,925 on all SCP)	0.025	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG011	Central provision for pay award 2022-23 allocated to services (originally assumed 3%)	-7.484	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG012	Insurance premium uplift pressures anticipated c15% (10% provided)	0.176	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Legislative Requirements				
G2021FG004	NCC Pensions valuation 31 March 2019 for 2020-21 to 2022-23	1.152	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2021FG005	Other Pensions valuation 31 March 2019 for 2020-21 to 2022-23	0.848	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2021FG001	Environment Agency Levy increase	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2021FG002	Increased IFCA Precept	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG003	Increase in the local levy to the Regional Flood and Coastal Committees of up to 3.00% (Cabinet 03/10/2022)	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG004	Additional costs of External Audit following PSAA re-procurement exercise 2022	0.188	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG013	Increase in Apprenticeship levy to reflect historic pay awards and actual costs	0.450	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Demand / Demographic				
G2324FG014	Provision for future Service Pressures	0.000	25.000	25.500	26.010
	NCC Policy				
G2324FG005	Minimum Revenue Provision	-4.555	2.497	1.720	1.954
G2021FG005	Increased Treasury Management costs	2.902	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG006	Implementation of council tax maximisation activities with partners	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2223FG011	Children's transformation provision removal	0.000	0.000	-2.000	0.000
G2223FG007	Provision to increase General Fund level to maintain at target 5% net Budget	0.500	0.250	0.000	0.000
G2223FG002	One-off application of 2021-22 underspends carried forward to support revenue budget pressures across all services	18.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2223FG008	Reduced ESPO dividend income	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG007	Interest payable from Repton	-0.900	0.000	0.000	0.000
G2324FG008	One-off interest payable / receivable Treasury Management adjustment	-2.200	2.200	0.000	0.000
		16.603	33.716	25.681	28.437
	SAVINGS				

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
FIN005	One off release from Organisational Change Fund. Annual budget provision is made for organisational change and redundancy costs. An assessment of the amount required to be held against organisational need(s), experience of actual costs incurred, and the likely organisational and staffing impact of emerging saving proposals for 2022-23, indicate that it would be possible to release £0.750m from this budget on a one-off basis.	0.750	0.000	0.000	0.000
FIN010	Additional saving from review of treasury management requirements. Latest borrowing undertaken, with review of borrowing needs and interest rates, will enable a further saving to be delivered from interest budgets.	-0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG012	Review of budget assumptions: Additional dividend income expected from ESPO.	-0.180	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG013	Review of budget assumptions: Additional Norse rebate income expected.	-0.450	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG014	Review of budget assumptions: Review of pension pressures previously assumed in the budget which are no longer expected to be required.	-2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG015	Review of budget assumptions: Review of Treasury Management budgets to reflect higher interest rates achieved on investment and treasury management activity.	-0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG011	Repton Property Developments Ltd dividend - Recognise an income budget from Repton Property Developments Ltd following successful commercial activity. Following the launch of the company and a period of development and growth, Repton is now expected to be in a position to deliver a dividend to the County Council of around £1m in 2023-24 and on an ongoing basis annually.	-1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG016	One-off application of Finance General reserves to support core budget	-1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG017 [SR]	Release pay provision held in Finance General following SR	-0.720	0.000	0.000	0.000
S2324FG018 [SR]	Strategic Review – Opportunity A – Finance and Property	-0.050	-0.050	-0.180	0.000
		-5.650	0.950	0.000	0.000
	BASE ADJUSTMENTS				
B2324FG001	New Homes Bonus Grant	1.205	0.628	0.000	0.000
B2324FG002	Change in Revenue Support Grant	-4.170	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2223FG006	Removal of 2022-23 "Services Grant" one-off (share of £1.5bn pa SR21 announcement)	10.687	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2324FG004	2023-24 Services Grant	-6.022	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2223FG002	Rebase Business Rates budget	-0.996	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2324FG005	CPI increase in Business Rates budget	-16.355	0.000	0.000	0.000
B2324FG006	One-off application of Business Rates Risk reserve to support 2023-24 revenue budget	-7.752	7.752	0.000	0.000
		-23.404	8.380	0.000	0.000
	COST NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENTS				
C2324FG001	Depreciation transfer	-3.065	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Ref		2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
C2324FG002	Debt management transfer	-0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324FG003	CES/FG - CFL062 Fire Emergency Vehicles Red Fleet	-0.112	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2324FG004	CES/FG - CFL064 Fire Breathing Apparatus	-0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000
C2223FG001	FG to CS Extended Rights to Free Travel grant	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000
		-3.146	0.000	0.000	0.000
	NET BUDGET	-214.029	-170.984	-145.303	-116.866

13. Public consultation

13.1. Under Section 3(2) of the Local Government Act 1999, authorities are under a duty to consult representatives of a wide range of local people when making decisions relating to local services. This includes council taxpayers, those who use or are likely to use services provided by the authority, and other stakeholders or interested parties. There is also a common law duty of fairness which requires that consultation should take place at a time when proposals are at a formative stage; should be based on sufficient information to allow those consulted to give intelligent consideration of options; should give adequate time for consideration and response and that consultation responses should be conscientiously taken into account in the final decision.

13.2. For the 2023-24 Budget the Council has consulted on proposals to:

- increase council tax, including the Adult Social Care precept, in 2023-24 with views sought about a range of options;
- reduce summer opening hours at Norfolk's recycling centres and close all recycling centres on Wednesdays;
- reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office; and
- reduce weed spraying activities on the highway.

13.3. The Council also invited comments on the approach to budget savings or any of the individual proposals themselves. No other specific proposals were anticipated to have an impact on service delivery.

13.4. The approach to consultation involved:

- Consultation took place between 21 October 2022 and 16 December 2022 with consultation feedback available for Cabinet in January 2023;
- Proposals were published and consulted on via the council's consultation hub, Citizen Space: <https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/budget2324/>;
- Letters were sent to key partners, stakeholders and parish/town councils;
- Parish councils were invited to attend a Zoom-platform webinar hosted in conjunction with the Norfolk Association of Local Councils (NALC);

- Consultation documents were made available in large print and easy read as standard, and other formats on request;
- The Council made every effort to find out the views of people who may be affected by the proposals and carry out impact assessments;
- Opportunities for people to have their say on budget proposals, council tax and precept were promoted through the Norfolk Resident's Panel, news releases, online publications, council website and multiple social media channels;
- Opportunities for council staff to have their say on budget proposals were promoted by Member briefings, management briefings, intranet/newsletters, Friday Takeaway and other cascades and channels as available; and
- Every response has been read in detail and analysed to identify the range of people's opinions, any repeated or consistently expressed views, and the anticipated impact of proposals on people's lives.

13.5. It should be noted that the consultation did not cover the proposals brought forward in the fourth round of savings development, undertaken in December 2022 as described in paragraph 7.3, or a number of the savings identified as part of the Council's Strategic Review. Details of the savings arising from these activities are also set out in Section 7. Those considered to be efficiency type savings which will not impact on front line service delivery (and therefore would not require public consultation) have been included in the proposed 2023-24 Budget. Savings proposals which may require consultation have been included on the basis set out in Section 10 of the covering Cabinet report dealing with Risk Implications/Assessment, and described in paragraph 10.5 onwards. Saving proposals linked to the Strategic Review, with potential implications for staffing levels, will be the subject of staff consultation during February and March 2023, as described in paragraph 10.7 of the covering Cabinet report.

Your views on our budget consultation 2023-24: consultation feedback

13.6. We received 805 responses in total. Full details of respondent numbers and analysis are provided in [Appendix 5](#).

13.7. The feedback in relation to each section of the consultation is as follows:

COUNCIL TAX (proposal to increase council tax, including the Adult Social Care precept, in 2023-24 with views sought about a range of options)

There were 293 responses to the council tax proposal.

Increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 2.99% in 2023-24.

- One hundred and thirteen people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement include:
 - additional money is necessary to maintain important social services (38)
 - proposed increase is acceptable or reasonable (35)
 - proposed increase reflects current economic conditions in which all costs are rising (25)
- One hundred and one people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement include:
 - people cannot afford to pay more (43)
 - negative impact of wider economic factors on people's finances (24)
 - the requirement for NCC to operate more efficiently (21)

Increasing Norfolk County Council's share of the council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 4.10% in 2023-24

- Fifty-three people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement include:
 - additional money is necessary to maintain important social services (28)
 - proposed increase is acceptable or reasonable (13)
 - proposed increase reflects current economic conditions in which all costs are rising (10)
- One hundred and fifty-eight people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement include:
 - people cannot afford to pay more (70)
 - negative impact of wider economic factors on people's finances (33)
 - the need for NCC to operate more efficiently (32)

Increasing Norfolk County Council's share of the council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 10.1% in 2023-24 – in line with rates of inflation as of September 2022

- Twenty-six people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reason for agreement is:
 - services required a lot of financial support to be maintained or improved (13)
- One hundred and ninety-eight people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement include:
 - people cannot afford to pay more (97)

- negative impact of economic factors on people's finances (50)
- NCC's reasoning behind the proposal (47)
- the need for NCC to operate more efficiently (37)

RECYCLING CENTRES (proposal to reduce summer opening hours at Norfolk's recycling centres and close all recycling centres on Wednesdays)

There were 332 responses to this proposal.

The proposal to reduce summer opening hours.

- One hundred and forty-four people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement include:
 - the same opening hours all year round would provide consistency for people using the centres (27)
 - proposal is acceptable or reasonable (24)
 - seen as an effective way to save the council money (20)
- One hundred and fifty-five people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement include:
 - worries that the proposal will lead to more flytipping (52)
 - comments about how longer opening hours in the summer benefit people (37)
 - shorter opening hours would affect respondents who work during the day (35)

The proposal to close all Norfolk recycling centres on Wednesdays.

- Ninety-two people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. Only two reasons were cited over 10 times. These were the same that the proposal is acceptable or reasonable (14) and the proposal is seen as an effective way to save the council money (12).
- One hundred and ninety-nine people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement include:
 - possible increase in flytipping (78)
 - concern that the staff at centre may have their employment affected, during a cost of living crisis (38)
 - proposal is short sighted and could have knock on effects which would create more problems (37)

NORFOLK RECORD OFFICE (proposal to reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office)

There were 60 responses to this proposal.

- Thirty-nine people indicated that they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement include:
 - proposal as a way of making needed savings (7)
 - proposal as fair and reasonable (5)

- proposed changes would not have a significant impact on them or others (4)
- Twenty-one people indicated that they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement include:
 - belief that the NRO is a key and vital service (8)
 - concern over the fact that the NRO has already experienced a reduction in opening hours (7)
 - concern over the restriction of public documents to the public (6)

HIGHWAYS (proposal to reduce weed spraying activities on the highway)

There were 111 responses to this proposal.

- Sixty-three people indicated they **strongly agree or agree** (56.75%) with the proposals to reduce weed spraying, and **9 people shared that they neither agree or disagree** (8.11%). The main reasons given for agreement include:
 - reducing weed spraying is better for the environment (30)
 - understanding that NCC must prioritise and make savings (11)
 - agreement, as long it does not compromise safety (10).

13.8. A full analysis of the consultation feedback on the proposals above can be found at Appendix 5. This also includes a summary of the comments that people made in respect of our overall approach to budget in departments and specific budget proposals.

14. Representatives of non-domestic rate payers

14.1. The Council has a statutory duty under Section 65 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to consult with representatives of non-domestic ratepayers. In January 2023, a package of material including a summary of key issues relating to the 2023-24 Budget was circulated to representatives of the business sector via the [Chambers of Commerce](#) and the [Norwich Business Improvement District](#), with feedback and questions invited to HaveYourSay@Norfolk.gov.uk. Representatives were provided with a summary of the financial challenges facing the Council in 2023-24, and an overview of the proposals for budgets.

15. Capital programme

15.1. A summary of the proposed Capital Programme is set out in the separate Capital Programme report elsewhere on this agenda. Where relevant the implications of capital proposals, including the required level of Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) budget, have been reflected within the proposed Revenue Budget.

16. Robustness of the Budget and compliance with the Financial Management Code

16.1. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is required by section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 to report to Members if it appears that the expenditure the authority proposes to incur in a financial year is likely to exceed the resources available to it to meet that expenditure. In addition, duties under section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 establish a requirement to report on the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the calculation of the precept (and therefore in agreeing the County Council's budget).

16.2. As a result, these duties require a professional judgement to be made by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services as the officer ultimately responsible for the authority's finances. The Executive Director takes a view of the robustness of the Council's budget across the whole period covered by the Medium Term Financial Strategy and this is set out in full in the Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-24 to 2026-27 ([Appendix 4](#)).

16.3. At this closing stage of the budget setting process, and with reference to the new saving proposals developed for next year and set out in this report, the assessment by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services in relation to this duty is that a balanced budget can be proposed for 2023-24. This reflects the following key considerations and assumptions:

- The new savings proposals developed to date for 2023-24, contribute to establishing a solid foundation for the development of a robust budget in future years, but a number of key risks remain.
- The current monitoring position for 2022-23 indicates an overspend of £2.054m, but a balanced position is expected to be achieved by the end of the financial year.
- Initial forecasts from District Councils suggest that the council tax base and collection position has proven more resilient than previously forecast and has provided additional funding which has assisted in closing the 2023-24 gap.
- Having regard to the Local Government Finance Settlement and prospects for 2024-25 funding, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services considers that a balanced budget for 2023-24 can be set with an overall council tax and Adult Social Care Precept increase of 4.99%, with the same 4.99% level of increase assumed for planning purposes for 2024-25 to support a sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy position. A lower increase in council tax in future years would require material additional deliverable, recurrent savings to be identified.
- Significant risks therefore remain around the scale of the likely gap for 2024-25 and future years, subject to the level of one-off options required to balance the 2023-24 budget.
- The assessment of the robustness of the Budget remains highly sensitive to the detail of Government decisions about funding made at future

Spending Reviews and Budgets and also the progress of Local Government Finance reforms.

16.4. In addition to the above, this judgement takes into account the fact that significant emerging pressures have been included in the final Budget proposals in January 2023 where they have been shown to be appropriate, but risks remain around a number of other areas:

- The level of the 2023-24 pay award for local government agreed nationally;
- Further exceptional inflationary pressures including for energy, fuel, and utilities as a result of wider international economic instability;
- Pressures within adults and children's social care including growth in demand, additional cost of purchasing care provision, delays in delivery of savings, the overall position of the care market and the impact of the National Living Wage;
- Risks linked to expectations around hospital discharge activities and associated funding;
- Potential future cost pressures linked to Government social care reforms;
- Other demographic pressures including home to school transport;
- Impact of policy decisions
- Property cost pressures;
- Government funding ceasing;
- Wider pressures linked to the National Living Wage; and
- Other decisions with cost implications, legislative and other changes.

16.5. Further risks are also emerging around the long term economic impacts of issues including the invasion of Ukraine, and the ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, disruptions to the food supply chain could result in additional costs related to the need to provide support to vulnerable members of society. Children's services, in both social care and education (particularly the High Needs Block), continue to be under very significant stress. There remains a risk that many of these pressures continue to increase in the medium-term as a result of both additional needs and higher unit costs.

16.6. While recognising that the forecast budget gap for 2024-25 is smaller than that bridged for 2023-24, it remains a material and challenging gap with limited prospects for additional Government funding in 2024-25. Taking all of this into account, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' current advice is that the Council needs to develop the 2024-25 Budget in a way which offers flexibility to respond to changes in the wider environment and operating context. This includes an early and thorough process to identify deliverable recurrent savings for 2024-25. The overall Budget position will need to be kept under review as budget planning progresses, informed by consideration of the adequacy of the overall General Fund balance, the need for a general contingency amount within the revenue budget, uncertainty about Government funding, and the further implications of the key issues discussed in this report alongside the Council's wider value for money position. Due to the size of the budget gap, it is recommended that this process starts in April/May 2023 and is supported by a series of savings reports to Cabinet through the

year, in order to ensure that Cabinet can be assured that there will be a sufficient quantum of savings deliverable savings in place from the beginning of 2024-25.

16.7. As in previous years, the 2023-24 Budget has been prepared with reference to the [Financial Management Code](#) (the FM Code) published by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA). The FM Code provides guidance about the principles of good and sustainable financial management, and requires authorities to demonstrate that processes are in place which satisfy these principles. It identifies risks to financial sustainability and sets out details of a framework of assurance which reflects existing successful practices across the sector. In addition, the Code establishes explicit standards of financial management, and highlights that compliance with these is the collective responsibility of elected members, the chief finance officer and the wider Corporate Board.

16.8. The code builds on elements of other CIPFA codes and in particular has clear links with The Prudential Code for Capital Finance, the Treasury Management in the Public Sector Code of Practice and the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom. The code is based on the following principles:

- Organisational **leadership** – demonstrating a clear strategic direction based on a vision in which financial management is embedded into organisational culture.
- **Accountability** – based on medium-term financial planning that drives the annual budget process supported by effective risk management, quality supporting data and whole life costs.
- Financial management is undertaken with **transparency** at its core using consistent, meaningful and understandable data, reported frequently with evidence of periodic officer action and elected member decision making.
- Adherence to professional **standards** is promoted by the leadership team and is evidenced.
- Sources of **assurance** are recognised as an effective tool mainstreamed into financial management, including political scrutiny and the results of external audit, internal audit and inspection.
- The long-term **sustainability** of local services is at the heart of all financial management processes and is evidenced by prudent use of public resources.

16.9. Details of how the Council considers it achieves compliance with the FM Code are set out in the table below.

Table 32: Assessment of compliance with Financial Management Code

Section	Statement	Summary of assessment of compliance
1	The responsibilities of the Chief Finance Officer and Leadership Team	
A	The leadership team is able to demonstrate that the services provided by the authority provide value for money	<p>Executive Directors keep their services under continuous review and seek to achieve value for money. The requirement to deliver savings as part of the annual budget setting process helps to ensure that a focus on value for money is maintained. Various sources of benchmarking are used by different teams and services where appropriate across the organisation.</p> <p>A scheme of delegation has been imbedded into the monthly financial monitoring and the annual budget setting process.</p> <p>As part of the annual audit of the Council's Statement of Accounts, the External Auditors consider the Council's arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources.³⁸ No issues have been identified as part of this exercise.</p>
B	The authority complies with the <i>CIPFA statement on the role of the Chief Finance Officer in local government</i>	The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is CCAB qualified and complies with CPD requirements. Financial Regulations clearly set out the role and responsibilities of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services including requirements of Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972, and the Council's compliance with the CIPFA Statement on the Role of the CFO in Local Government ³⁹ . The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is leaving the Council in April 2023 as a result of the Strategic Review. Alternative arrangements to fulfil the duties of the Section 151 Officer will be put in place at that time. These new arrangements will be established in compliance with the requirements of the FM Code and will be subject to approval by Full Council. Financial Regulations will be updated with any consequential changes as required to reflect the new arrangements.
2	Governance and financial management style	
C	The leadership team demonstrates in its actions and behaviours responsibility for governance and internal control.	<p>The authority has a clear framework for governance and internal control.</p> <p>The Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2015 (as amended by The Accounts and Audit (Coronavirus) Amendments Regulations 2020 (SI 2020/404)) require the Council to conduct a review of the effectiveness of its system of internal control at least once a year. The Chief Internal Auditor reviews the effectiveness of the system of internal control throughout the year and reports annually to the Audit Committee. As part of the production of the Annual Governance Statement⁴⁰ which accompanies the Statement of Accounts,</p>

³⁸ <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/our-budget-and-council-tax/statement-of-accounts>

³⁹ <https://www.cipfa.org/policy-and-guidance/reports/the-role-of-the-chief-financial-officer-in-local-authorities>

⁴⁰ <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/budget-and-council-tax/statement-of-accounts/draft-annual-governance-statement-2021-22.pdf>

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Section	Statement	Summary of assessment of compliance
		<p>Executive Directors complete an Annual Positive Assurance Statement and supporting departmental assurance table. Action plans are put in place where any strengthening may be required.</p> <p>The Council's Financial Regulations establish the role and responsibilities of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services and explain how these interact with responsibilities of Members, other Executive Directors, and officers. Executive Directors have responsibility for managing their budgets within the amounts approved by County Council. They have been charged with reviewing all their cost centres to ensure that, where an overspend is identified, action is taken to ensure that a balanced budget will be achieved over the course of the year.</p>
D	The authority applies the CIPFA / SOLACE <i>Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: Framework</i> (2016).	<p>The Council has approved and adopted a Code of Corporate Governance consistent with the principles of the International Framework: Good Governance in the Public Sector (CIPFA/IFAC, 2014).</p> <p>The authority seeks to apply the principles, behaviours and actions set out in the Framework within its own governance arrangements, including the Financial Regulations which form part of the County Council Constitution. These are supported by the Financial Procedures which are more detailed. This is further supported through regular reporting to the Audit Committee (including high priority findings) and the development of the Internal Audit Strategy.</p>
E	The financial management style of the authority supports financial sustainability.	<p>Financial Regulations and Budget reports collectively set out the Council's approach to prudent, sustainable financial planning and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' role in commenting on the robustness of estimates, and duties under section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988.</p> <p>A balanced revenue Budget is prepared annually and Members have historically taken decisions on available council tax increases which ensure future sustainability. The Medium Term Financial Strategy also considers a longer term horizon.</p> <p>The wider financial management style of the authority supports financial sustainability in that reports taken to Cabinet have to consider and document the financial implications of any material decision taken.</p> <p>Cabinet regularly receive financial monitoring and forecasts.</p> <p>Managers are encouraged to enhance their financial literacy through a suite of online training and support from finance professionals.</p>
3	Medium to long-term financial management	
F	The authority has carried out a credible and	The Council underwent a Local Government Association Corporate Peer Review / Challenge in October 2019 ⁴¹ , which included consideration of financial planning and viability. Findings included that

⁴¹ [Plan to develop Peer Challenge Recommendations into Action Plan, \(Item 16\), Cabinet, 2 December 2019](#)

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Section	Statement	Summary of assessment of compliance
	transparent financial resilience assessment.	<p>the “<i>council has successfully addressed the financial challenge to date in balancing its budget. In meeting this challenge, the authority has demonstrated both a prudent approach and a willingness to take difficult decisions.</i>”</p> <p>The authority undertakes a high level annual resilience review, as part of the budget setting process, including a sensitivity analysis for key aspects of the Budget.</p>
G	The authority understands its prospects for financial sustainability in the longer term and has reported this clearly to members.	<p>The authority has a robust understanding of the risks to its financial sustainability and reports regularly to Corporate Board, Cabinet and other relevant committees to highlight the impact of these in relation to short, medium and long term decision making.</p> <p>Issues relating to long term financial sustainability are considered in detail in the annual Budget setting reports to Cabinet and County Council, and are regularly articulated to Government via consultation responses and other engagement.</p> <p>The Council has considered its position as evidenced in CIPFA's Financial Resilience Index, which provides a tool for recognising potential signs of risk to councils' financial stability and can be used to assess the organisation's position relative to its peers.</p>
H	The authority complies with the CIPFA <i>Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities</i>	<p>Norfolk County Council prepares and publishes an annual Capital Strategy as part of the budget setting process, covering four years. This is summarised in the MTFS and published alongside the revenue budget papers.</p> <p>The authority has a set of prudential indicators included within the Treasury Management Strategy, in line with the Prudential Code and has suitable mechanisms in place for monitoring performance against those set.</p>
I	The authority has a rolling multi year medium-term financial plan consistent with sustainable service plans.	The Council has an annually produced, rolling four-year medium term financial strategy which also looks at the longer term (10 years) to establish potential risks and sensitivities within the budget setting process. The annual Budget sets out links to annual Departmental Plans and priorities. Annual Strategic Planning activity makes the link between budget-setting and the Council's wider strategy and transformation activity within Service Departments. The Budget Book also details budgets to a lower level of analysis and incorporates planned savings.
4	The annual budget	
J	The authority complies with its statutory obligations in respect of the budget setting process.	<p>The authority is aware of its statutory obligations in respect of the budget setting process and sets a balanced budget for the current year within the required timeframe.</p> <p>The proposals set out within this report will enable the Council to set a balanced budget for the forthcoming year.</p>
K	The budget report includes a statement by the chief finance officer on the robustness of the estimates and a statement on the adequacy of the	The adequacy of reserves and provisions budget report includes details of the earmarked reserves held, explains the purpose of each reserve, the estimated opening balances for the year, details of planned additions/withdrawals and the estimated closing balances.

Appendix 1: Norfolk County Council Revenue Budget 2023-24

Section	Statement	Summary of assessment of compliance
	proposed financial reserves.	Information and details of the assumptions used to support the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' statement on the Robustness of the Estimates (budget report) provides assurances to Members prior to recommending and agreeing the revenue and capital budgets and plans.
5	Stakeholder engagement and business cases	
L	The authority has engaged where appropriate with key stakeholders in developing its long-term financial strategy, medium-term financial plan and annual budget.	<p>The authority knows who the key stakeholders are and has processes in place to ensure they are engaged with throughout the year, and as part of the annual budget setting process. The effectiveness of this engagement is kept under review to ensure improvements can be made where necessary.</p> <p>Further details about the approach to engagement are provided within this report and Appendix 5</p>
M	The authority uses an appropriate documented option appraisal methodology to demonstrate the value for money of its decisions	<p>The capital prioritisation process is set out in the annual Capital Programme. Significant decisions are subject to review of business case and approval by Members in line with Financial Regulations.</p> <p>A Capital Programme Quarterly Review Board is in place to co-ordinate and provide oversight of the Council's overall capital programme. It is led by the Cabinet Member for Finance and attended by officer representatives from each major service. The board provides a forum to discuss, co-ordinate and, if necessary, prioritise new schemes to be added to the programme, as well as on-going schemes.</p>
6	Performance monitoring	
N	The leadership team takes action using reports enabling it to identify and correct emerging risks to its budget strategy and financial sustainability.	<p>The Council produces regular revenue finance monitoring reports for members, based on forecasting by budget holders which is considered by senior managers. Reporting includes details of the monthly monitoring position against the budget, forecasts general balances and reserves for the end of the financial year, and highlights any other pertinent information relating to the overall financial position of the council. These reports also detail relevant service specific financial and operational issues.</p> <p>Financial information is also aligned with and reported alongside corporately significant vital signs, which provide details of the Council's current performance towards achieving its strategic outcomes. Vital signs support the Council to review current performance, validate the actions being taken to address gaps in performance and identify further opportunities for improvement</p>
O	The leadership team monitors the elements of its balance sheet which pose a significant risk to its financial sustainability.	The authority routinely monitors and reports the material elements of the balance sheet that may give indications of a departure from financial plans.
7	External financial reporting	
P	The chief finance officer has personal and statutory responsibility for ensuring that the statement of	The role of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is set out within the Financial Regulations. The statement of accounts produced by the local authority complies with the reporting requirements of the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in

Section	Statement	Summary of assessment of compliance
	accounts produced by the local authority complies with the reporting requirements of the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom.	the United Kingdom. Statements in the Statement of Accounts confirm compliance.
Q	The presentation of the final outturn figures and variations from budget allows the leadership team to make strategic financial decisions.	Outturn figures are presented as part of the monthly financial monitoring and forecasting process, so shape strategic decisions going forward. The final outturn is presented within the Statement of Accounts along with supporting narrative. These figures then form a part of the decision making within the following year's annual budget setting process.

17. Summary

17.1. Collectively, the proposals in this report represent a prudent, robust Budget for 2023-24, which is closely aligned to the delivery of the Council's key priorities as set out in its Vision and Strategy. The Budget for 2023-24 incorporates very significant cost pressures, which are higher than experienced in previous years and driven largely by external factors. The development of a balanced position has required the identification of material savings proposals for the year, and the successful achievement of these will require major organisational effort.

17.2. Looking forward, the Budget makes provision for the identified cost pressures across all services in order to establish a foundation for the delivery of a balanced position for 2023-24 and the development of a sustainable MTFS position. However, material risks and significant uncertainties remain for 2024-25 as described in the report, and an early and robust process will be required to support the preparation of a balanced 2024-25 Budget.

Norfolk County Council

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-27

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2023-27 replaces the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022-26. It outlines the different factors that contribute towards the financial context in which the County Council operates and the expected future impacts. It offers reassurance that our spending plans are sustainable and affordable over the medium term (the next four years).
- 1.2. There have been many developments globally during 2022 that continue to have a material impact on the ability to forecast the Council's future financial position. No longer dominated by Covid recovery, the medium term fiscal outlook for the country has significantly worsened since the beginning of the year.
- 1.3. We could not have predicted the war in Ukraine, changes of leadership of the national government, a steep rise in inflation, higher interest rates and a global energy crisis, which have all profoundly impacted the wider economy and increased demand for services, as households and communities struggle with the rising cost of living.
- 1.4. Locally, a County Deal for Norfolk has been negotiated, in principle, with the Government. Under a deal, Norfolk would receive £20 million investment fund every year for 30 years. Public consultation will be undertaken in early 2023, further details are outlined in the local economy section below.
- 1.5. The Local Government Finance Settlement announced in December 2022 covered one year; 2023-24, with indications given in the preceding Policy Statement for a rollover settlement for 2024-25. The financial implications for Local Government for the latter two years of the MTFS (2025-27) in particular are largely unknown, and therefore remain subject to considerable change and uncertainty. Initial assessments show a particularly challenging financial landscape in 2025-26, as there is major uncertainty linked to Government's plans to reform local government funding and linked to the delivery of the levelling up agenda.
- 1.6. In the context of this uncertainty, the MTFS sets out the latest available information about national and local factors which are likely to impact upon budget planning decisions.
- 1.7. The MTFS forms a key part of the Council's financial management approach and supports the identification and management of the key risks to the Council's financial sustainability. As such it details funding changes and explains the strategy for how the Council intends to manage these, to make transformative change, and plan new initiatives, while continuing to meet its statutory responsibilities in the medium term.

- 1.8. As detailed more fully in the Revenue Budget paper, the funding of social care remains a major issue for the County Council. Pressures are being experienced in key areas within Adults and Children's Services, with increased spending on social care services due to a range of factors including; managing new and existing demand (due to a post pandemic backlog) market stability, staff recruitment and retention (both within care providers and social care workers), pressures of hospital discharge requirements, cost of care packages exceeding inflation, additional complexity of cases and court system delays.
- 1.9. As detailed later within the MTFs, recent inflationary increases have contributed to the announcement within the Autumn Budget 2022 to increase the National Living Wage by 9.7% to £10.42 (from £9.50) which will have a significant impact on our contracted / procured services.
- 1.10. As a result, the council will need to develop early and robust responses, including significant further realistic and deliverable savings plans, during future budget planning rounds and the Medium Term Financial Strategy will need to remain flexible to adapt to changing circumstances.

2. National Factors

Government Funding

- 2.1. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) announced the provisional Finance Settlement for Local Government on 19 December 2022, which covered 2023-24 and (in outline) 2024-25.
- 2.2. In overall terms, the Provisional Settlement reflects an increase in Core Spending Power (CSP) for the County Council, as expected following the Autumn Statement and the Policy Statement. The increase in CSP is largely being delivered via increased funding for social care and a higher threshold for council tax increases, including the Adult Social Care precept. The percentage change in CSP excluding council tax assumptions is 6.7%. These CSP increases are accompanied by significant cost pressures including high inflation rates and the increase in the National Living Wage.
- 2.3. It has also been announced that **Fair Funding** will be delayed until 2025-26 at the earliest. It is disappointing as it had initially appeared that the direction of travel was generally favourable for upper tier shire authorities. The Council continues to engage with the government to ask that the Fair Funding Review be concluded to provide an adequate overall quantum of funding for local government within the system, update the relative needs formula, and fully recognise the costs associated with rurality and sparsity.
- 2.4. The overall level of uncertainty means that the financial environment for local government remains extremely challenging for the foreseeable future. Local authorities continue to face a growing gap between funding and service pressures, driven in part by demographic changes, burdens such as the 9.7% increase to the National Living Wage, central Government policy expectations, and the needs of vulnerable social care users becoming increasingly complex.

- 2.5. Children's services, in both social care and education, are also under very significant stress. This pressure has been impacted in the medium-term post pandemic, as a result of additional needs driven by the associated lockdowns and restrictions and the impact of court system delays.
- 2.6. Other services such as transport, planning, environment, and trading standards have been subject to significant funding restrictions which have also seen increasing pressure placed on discretionary and preventative services.

Government policy and economy forecasts

- 2.7. At the time of preparing this Strategy in January 2023, the last major fiscal event was when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Jeremy Hunt, announced the Autumn Budget in November 2022.
- 2.8. Alongside this, the OBR have published an updated Economic and Fiscal Outlook⁴² in November 2022 to set out forecasts for the economy and Government plans. The OBR forecast indicated that with high inflation and rising interest rates weighing on demand, the UK economy is expected to enter a recession lasting just over a year from the third quarter of 2022. However more recent statistics indicate that the last quarter of 2022 could see small growth or be flat.⁴³
- 2.9. The OBR reports inflation at a 40 year high, peaking at 11% in this quarter (and that is after allowing for a 2.5% benefit arising from the energy price guarantee) before falling sharply to potentially negative territory and then stabilising at the target rate of 2% by the end of 2027.
- 2.10. The level of commissioning undertaken by the council sees a wide range of services being delivered by partners and through private sector contracts. Contractual obligations are often linked with the Consumer Price Index (CPI), meaning these rates will impact on the council's budget setting activity and medium term planning
- 2.11. Alongside the Autumn Statement⁴⁴, in November 2022, the Government published an update to its preferred measure of illustrative core spending power, which suggests that Local Government's core spending power (assuming authorities increase their Band D by the maximum allowed) will increase by 9.2% in 2023-24 and 7.9% in 2024-25.
- 2.12. For Norfolk, a large proportion of the increase in core spending power of 10.5% is driven by assumed council tax increases. When the assumed level of Council tax is excluded, Norfolk's spending power increases by 6.7%, which is below current levels of inflation. The remainder of the increase in CSP largely derives from additional funding for Social Care.

⁴² [Economic and fiscal outlook – November 2022 \(obr.uk\)](https://obr.uk/economic-outlook-november-2022/)

⁴³ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-64267126>

⁴⁴ [Autumn Statement November 2022](https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/autumn-statement-2022)

2.13. The Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) sets monetary policy to meet the 2% inflation target, and in a way that helps to sustain growth and employment. At a meeting on 14 December 2022, the MPC voted to increase the Bank rate to 3.5%⁴⁵.

2.14. The Government implemented a National Living Wage (NLW) from 2016-17, starting at £7.20. From April 2023, it will be increased by 9.7% to £10.42 (currently £9.50). The exact level at which the National Living Wage will be set in future years has not been confirmed. Although assumed cost pressures relating to the National Living Wage have been included in medium term forecasts, there is a risk these could change significantly in the future.

European Union withdrawal (Brexit)

2.15. One of the challenges for economic growth is the ongoing impact of Brexit. On 17 November 2022, the OBR updated its forecast alongside the Autumn Statement, reflecting an assumption that Brexit will result in the UK's trade intensity being 15% lower in the long run than if the UK had remained in the European Union (EU). The latest evidence suggests that Brexit has had a significant adverse impact on UK trade, reducing both overall trade volumes and the number of trading relationships between UK and EU firms. Subsequent trade deals have had negligible positive effect and, in some cases, add further to the stresses businesses already face - especially farmers and other food producers.⁴⁶

2.16. Brexit has also intensified a post-pandemic labour shortage, with the current immigration policy posing particular challenges to the care and agricultural sectors in the county. It is therefore doubly important that Norfolk is able to access post-Brexit government funding to address identified challenges, including supporting small and medium enterprises (SMEs).

Coronavirus Pandemic

2.17. The COVID-19 pandemic, and the public health measures taken in response to contain it, delivered one of the largest shocks to the UK economy and public finances in recent history. While the immediate impacts of the pandemic have now begun to recede, there has been a legacy impact on the Council in respect of both higher costs which have effectively become mainstreamed into the base budget (for example more expensive and different ways of delivering services to maintain health and safety standards), and higher levels of demand. In particular, many of the main issues we faced before COVID-19 have been exacerbated including population changes, social, economic and health inequalities, rising demand for services and support, workforce challenges in key sectors such as the care market, and planned

⁴⁵ [Monetary Policy Summary for the Monetary Policy Committee meeting on 15 December 2022 | Bank of England](#)

⁴⁶ [Economic and Fiscal Outlook - November 2022 \(obr.uk\)](#)

national living wage increases. Nationally, no funding to support ongoing COVID-19 cost pressures is being provided in 2023-24.

3. Local Factors


- 3.1. In responding to these national pressures, Norfolk County Council is operating in the context of significant change in both the scope and scale of public services, while simultaneously absorbing the impact of historic sustained reductions in levels of funding. This pressure on resources has come at a time of increasing levels of demand, and complexity of needs, for many of the services the council provides.
- 3.2. The County Council played a vital role in delivering the Norfolk response to COVID-19, and as we move firmly into the recovery phase the council is now responding to the wider cost of living crisis while remaining focussed on meeting the twin challenges of increasing demand and limited central government funding, whilst minimising the impact on the front-line delivery of services, and delivering the updated strategy [Better Together, for Norfolk](#). This Medium Term Financial Strategy has been developed to support this work to ensure that the council's gross budget of £1.5bn is spent to best effect for Norfolk people.
- 3.3. There are a number of local factors that impact upon services provided or commissioned by Norfolk County Council and therefore affect the budget, yet are (at least in part) outside of the council's control. The most significant of these relate to demographics, the local economy, and ecological pressures.

Demographics

- 3.4. Norfolk's population is an estimated 916,100 in the census 2021⁴⁷ – an increase of around 58,200 since the previous Census in 2011.
- 3.5. Since the previous Census, Norfolk's population has increased by 6.8%, compared with an increase of 6.6% for England.
- 3.6. In terms of broad age groups, Norfolk's population is made up of 15.3% of under 15-year-olds; 60.3% of 15 to 64-year-olds; and 24.4% of those aged 65 and over.
- 3.7. The Census 2021 data confirms that Norfolk's population has a much older age profile than England as a whole, with 24.4% of Norfolk's population aged 65 and over, compared with 18.4% for England. This is seen in more detail by looking at the five-year age groups.

⁴⁷ ONS Census 2021

MTFS Figure 1: % of population by 5-year age groups (Census 2021)



3.8. The ONS 2018-based population projections are trend-based⁴⁸, and on this basis, Norfolk's overall population is projected to increase from 2018 to 2028 by around 60,600 people– this is an increase of 6.7% which is below the East of England projected increase of 5.0% and the England projected increase of 5.0%.


3.9. Norfolk's oldest age groups are projected to grow the quickest over the ten years to 2028, with numbers of 75 to 84-year-olds projected to increase by around 37% and numbers of those aged 85 and over projected to increase by around 24%. This age group is the most likely to require social care, so increases in the size of this older group are likely to have a high impact on the demand for social care services.

3.10. Looking further ahead, there is projected growth from 2018 to 2041 of around 99,500 people in Norfolk – this is an increase of 11.0% which is below the East of England projected increase of 13.6% and above the national projected increase of 10.6%.


3.11. Further demographic information is provided below, relating to the proportions of adults (aged 18 and over) and children (aged under 18) in Norfolk's population, compared with the proportions who are social care service users, along with their respective social care status.

⁴⁸ ONS 2018-based subnational population projections

MTFS Chart 1: Adults demographic information



MTFS Chart 2: Children’s demographic information



Population data from Census 2021; service data 2021-22.

Local Economy

3.12. The Council’s work to drive economic growth is contextualised within the [Norfolk Investment Framework](#), which Cabinet endorsed in June 2022 and aligned to the [New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership \(NALEP\)’s Economic Strategy for Norfolk and Suffolk](#), the Council’s business plan, and [Better Together for Norfolk](#). Based on detailed data and analysis, the Framework is a set of high-level investment priorities designed to tackle the high-level challenges Norfolk faces. By focussing our investments in a few key areas, rather than spreading our efforts too thinly, we can maximise Norfolk’s potential and be ready to target funding as it becomes available.

- 3.13. The Government replaced EU funding with the £2.6bn UK Shared Prosperity Fund^[2] (SPF) and the £4.8bn Levelling Up Fund (capital). Including funding for a national adult numeracy programme ('Multiply'), Norfolk's SPF allocation for 2022-25 is £10.4m, an average of £1.49m per district for the three-year period. Three-year investment plans for the funding, submitted by Norfolk's district councils, were agreed by Government on 5 December 2022. The Government's flexible approach means that councils and local partners will have the opportunity to adapt each plan to reflect new economic priorities over the period to 2025.
- 3.14. Of the £4.8bn Levelling Up Fund, which supports town centre and high street regeneration, local transport projects, and cultural and heritage assets, £1.7bn was allocated in the first round, following a competitive bidding process. The second bidding round has closed, and it is not yet known whether any of Norfolk's bids have been successful.
- 3.15. The Rural England Prosperity Fund was announced in September – an additional fund to support the SPF's priorities on Supporting Local Business and Community and Place, with nearly £5.9m allocated across six Norfolk districts (all except Norwich) to 2025. As for the main SPF allocation, district council investment plans have yet to be agreed by government.
- 3.16. If a county deal is agreed for Norfolk in December 2023 (see next paragraph), SPF will form part of the multi-year funding managed by the County Council, in consultation with a wide range of partners, including district councils, from April 2025.
- 3.17. On 8 December 2022 agreement was secured from the Government to pursue a County Deal for Norfolk. Under the deal, Norfolk would receive a £20m investment fund, every year for 30 years. There would also be specific funding for integrated transport, brownfield development (£7m), adult education, and infrastructure (£5.9m for housing, regeneration and development, during this Spending Review period). The deal would also see the County Council taking on the management of SPF for the county from April 2025.
- 3.18. Full Council and Cabinet considered the Deal in January 2023 following which a public consultation will be held in early 2023, and if the consultation is favourable, Full Council will be asked in December 2023 whether they support the move to an elected leader and cabinet system of governance.
- 3.19. Securing a funded medium-term plan to support the Council's aspirations to improve transport, accessibility and clean energy outcomes is considered of critical importance considering the council's Net Zero commitments and the desire to support sustainable housing, jobs and economic growth. Investing in the development of an approved pipeline of projects to enhance external funding opportunities will create pathways to net-zero and decarbonisation.

^[2] <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8527/CBP-8527.pdf>

3.20. Looking briefly at 2022-23 achievements – in addition to securing Government approval of our county deal proposal, and developing the Norfolk Investment Framework - our programmes have continued to deliver strongly and to help businesses and people recover from the pandemic:

- The contract to build out the Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Campus at Great Yarmouth was awarded, with construction set to start in January 2023. The campus set to create 288,700 square foot of lettable space and up to 650 jobs, as well as drive investment in the renewable energy sector in the region. A video and 3D visualisation, to help promote the Campus to an international audience, was launched in November 2022 at Europe's leading offshore energy exhibition in Amsterdam.
- Our €6.7m C-Care project, responding to Covid, together with funding from Norfolk's district councils, enabled over 1000 businesses to date to do more business online. The project offers bespoke advice and support for small to medium sized businesses, including access to £500 in funding to increase their digital capabilities.
- Our Employer Training Incentive Programme (ETIP), supporting businesses to train staff, allocating over £0.303m - which with match funding from employers equated to £0.444m of funds spent on training of which over 80% was spent with locally based training providers, delivering 1,689 interventions funded and 344 businesses supported. The programme also won the FSB East of England Local Government Award for Support to Small Businesses in the Covid Response category.
- We have allocated £1.9m of funding to support businesses in increasing apprenticeship opportunities in Norfolk, including £0.437m in grants supporting businesses to take on young apprentices, incentive packages to support the progression of young people from the Government's Kickstart scheme into an apprenticeship, and support for disadvantaged young people to take on an apprenticeship.
- We have almost completed delivery of our successful £9.9m LEADER programme, which supports farms to diversify into new markets: The programme has contracted with beneficiaries to create 278.82 FTE jobs in Norfolk's rural economy.
- We are delivering the £2.6m Delivering Rural Investment for Vital Employment (DRIVE) programme, which supports rural businesses, and has funded 46 projects and 64 jobs are contracted to be created, to date.
- To support green growth, the Low Carbon Innovation Fund 2 made 26 investments in 17 businesses in the wider region, valued at c.£5m. These levered £35m of private investment. In addition, the programme has reported a decrease of 636,587 tonnes of greenhouse gas.

3.21. The €315m INTERREG France (Channel) England programme which we manage, will continue through to fruition, closing formally in 2025. The

Programme remains subject to EU regulations in accordance with the legal framework in place pre-Brexit. EU programme funding ends 31st December 2023, as such we are working closely with both the French and UK Government representatives to ensure adequate funding is available from 1st January 2024 until the end of the programme to deliver to all EU regulations.

Adult Social Care: Care Market Workforce

3.22. The high level Skills for Care data for 2021-22 for Norfolk estimated that there were 28,000 filled posts in adult social care with a vacancy rate of 8.5% (estimated 2,400 vacancies). The turnover rate of staff working in the adult social care sector in Norfolk was 34.8% over a year. For staff delivering care directly, the % was higher still at 41.2%. Both figures were higher than the England average. Turnover was especially high for nursing home staff (50.9% all roles/57.4% direct care roles/51% registered nurses) and residential care home staff (38.6% all roles/44.2% direct care). The turnover percentages for community based services were lower, yet still concerning, at 35.4% (all roles)/39.2% (direct care roles). The following areas of Norfolk had the most acute turnover percentages: NN1-Fakenham, Holt and Sheringham; Fens & Brecks-Villages around Downham; Gorleston; Aylsham; Swaffham and Downham; and Mid Norfolk-Dereham. Other areas, namely Norwich and Great Yarmouth & Northern Villages, had comparatively low staff turnover percentages. 39% of Norfolk staff had been in their roles for less than three years, reflecting a difficulty retaining new staff. However, many of those that left their roles remained within the sector, as on average 64% of recruitment was from within adult social care and 10 years working in the sector was the county average. Despite this, staff leaving one employer and starting with another was likely to have caused disruption to both, including to continuity and quality of care delivery. Demographically, 29% of the Norfolk workforce was aged 55 and above with only 8% aged under 25, which is likely to cause further workforce issues in future if recruitment and retention issues are not addressed. Average pay for direct care staff was marginally (66p per hour) above the National Living Wage at £9.57 in 2021/22, meaning that jobs outside of social care were likely to be an appealing alternative. 39% of the workforce directly delivering care in Norfolk had a qualification relevant to social care which was the same as the England average.

3.23. Development Skills in Health and Social Care Programme, a £7.580m European Social Fund match funded project delivered by Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils, is being implemented, with a focus on training and enhancing the competencies of the health and social care workforce. The project is aiming to upskill the workforce and to ensure a better quality of care, whilst also contributing through a dedicated mentoring service to increased retention of care staff, which continues to remain a key to achieve a stable care market.

Environment

3.24. Norfolk County Council is fully behind the UK-wide effort to tackle climate change and reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. The council has set its own commitments, set out in its Environment Policy, to lead by

example through making its own estate net zero by 2030 and working in partnership to support the county-wide transition towards a low carbon future.

- 3.25. The council's estate target focuses on its buildings and streetlights. Significant progress has been made to date, with these emissions having been cut by nearly half (48%) between 2016/17 and 2021/22. However, there is still some way to go, and a number of initiatives are under way to maintain this momentum.
- 3.26. Streetlighting is the single largest source of estate emissions at present. To address this, NCC is converting its streetlights to LED technology, which improve the lamp energy efficiency by 60-70%. By the end of this financial year (2022/23) two-thirds of the streetlighting stock will be LED, and work has also started towards securing an agreement with PFI partners to convert the remaining lamps. It is forecast that completing these conversions, together with the reducing carbon intensity of grid electricity supply, will bring a 57% drop in streetlighting emissions by 2026/27 and a 79% drop by 2030-31.
- 3.27. Achieving a net zero estate will also require raising the energy performance of our buildings and transitioning away from gas and oil heating systems towards low carbon alternative such as air-source heat pumps. Steps are under way here, with technical assessments of NCC buildings nearing completion which will provide a clear picture of the potential to retrofit each building. These insights will be costed so that the council can make a fully informed decision as to how best to move forward with these works and what resource it will require. In addition to the existing resource already committed to meet climate related delivery of our environmental policy, the 2023-24 proposals include committing further revenue budget of £0.150m in both 2023-24 and 2024-25.
- 3.28. Significantly, Norfolk County Council is also developing an overarching Climate Strategy which, alongside our estate emissions, will outline its approach to addressing the following:
- Scope 3 emissions, such as those from the council's supply chain, leased assets, wholly-owned companies, staff commuting and business travel
 - County-wide emissions, particularly under the themes of: transport, energy, waste, buildings and planning, digital connectivity, and the industrial and commercial sectors
 - Promoting a green economy
 - Climate adaptation
 - Nature recovery
 - Engagement and collaboration
- 3.29. In setting out how carbon reduction is being embedded as business as usual across the council's activities, the strategy will clarify a set of priorities for the medium term. This is due to be delivered to Cabinet in Spring 2023.

Waste

- 3.30. The County Council is responsible for dealing with the left over rubbish (residual waste) collected by all local authorities in Norfolk and for the provision of recycling centres and payments to the District, City and Borough Councils for the recycling they collect.
- 3.31. Increases in household numbers and the effects of economic growth mean that the amount of left over rubbish and recycling collected are expected to increase significantly, and the associated increase on costs of the expected increases are compounded by the effects of indexation. To help mitigate these effects, the aim of the waste service is to reduce the amount of waste, increase reuse and recycling, and reduce unit costs. These objectives require measures to be put in place by all councils in Norfolk and they are actively working on this together as the Norfolk Waste Partnership.
- 3.32. The combined effect of long term trends for household numbers in Norfolk, as well as effects of the general economy, changing working routines, consumer confidence and behaviours and weather patterns remain uncertain. These variables, as well as things such as service changes by other councils in Norfolk or changes in legislation, can all have a major effect on the cost of the County Council's waste services, meaning that the suitable approach to managing budgets for this service area is to make justifiable and evidence based allowances in medium and longer term plans that are continually subject to review.
- 3.33. In relation to potential changes in legislation, developments on national waste policy are expected which could directly affect the County Council's cost in the short, medium and long term. The expected introduction of an Extended Producer Responsibility scheme for packaging in 2024 would mean that those, including all councils, that deal with packaging as waste or recycling would have the costs of that met directly by producers. Other changes linked to this development could be the amending or ending of current requirements around the payment of recycling credits to the District, City and Borough councils.
- 3.34. In the longer term, between 2025 and 2030, there is a prospect of incineration being included in a national emissions trading scheme, which could add a significant and unknown extra cost to each tonne of waste that is incinerated. And in relation to recycling centres there remains uncertainty about the long term financial implications of Defra's requirements, as whilst it consulted on proposals on charging for DIY waste in 2022, and gave wider consideration to the consistency of council services in earlier consultations, there have been no subsequent changes to legislation.

Flooding

- 3.35. Norfolk is identified in the Norfolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy⁴⁹ as the area 10th most at risk of local flooding in England. The county has approximately 34,000 properties at flood risk from local sources during a rainfall event with a 1 in 100 annual chance of occurring. These local sources

⁴⁹ [Norfolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy](#)

include flooding from surface runoff, groundwater and from over 7,500 km of watercourses within Norfolk. The County Council's two core aims as Lead Local Flood Authority are to reduce the existing local flood risk for communities and to prevent new development from increasing flood risk. Whilst not directly the authority's responsibility, the county also has nearly 100 miles of coastline and is vulnerable to tidal inundation and surges.

3.36. In the event of a major flooding incident, it is likely that the council would have recourse to the Bellwin scheme of emergency financial assistance to Local Authorities⁵⁰. This would enable the council to be reimbursed for 100% of eligible expenditure above a threshold set by the government. The most recently published threshold for Norfolk was £1.164m in 2017-18 (i.e. this is the maximum liability for the County Council in the event of a major incident eligible for support under the Bellwin rules). However, the annual threshold is 0.2% of the net revenue budget for the year. If the scheme is activated more than once during the year, the threshold is compared with the cumulative expenditure.

3.37. Following the flooding events which affected large parts of Norfolk in late December 2020 and January 2021, the Council set up the Norfolk Strategic Flood Alliance (NSFA) with a remit to ensure that the residents of Norfolk have confidence that inland and coastal flood risks are as low as reasonably practicable. Additionally, Cabinet approved changes to the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and agreed⁵¹ to extra funding to assist with the immediate response, clear up operation and repairs to the existing drainage systems damaged or broken by the floodwater. The required works needed were and continue to be extensive. Flood investigations⁵² into the 350+ properties that suffered internal flooding were completed and Flood Investigation Reports published during 2021-22. These reports identified areas where improvements should be made to reduce the future risk of surface water flooding. 28 priority sites were agreed by the NSFA where multi agency efforts are needed to develop and deliver solutions to flood risk.

4. Organisational factors

Organisational structure and governance changes

4.1. The County Council is under Conservative control and moved to an Executive Leader and Cabinet governance structure in May 2019. The senior management and organisation structure is currently being examined as part of the Council's Strategic Review, as discussed elsewhere within the Budget reports. At the time of writing, the outcomes of the Review are not fully known, but the Director of Governance has left the Council in January 2023 and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services will be leaving the organisation in April 2023. As a result the service areas in these departments will move within the overall organisational structure. The transfer of the

⁵⁰ Bellwin Scheme thresholds published October 2017

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bellwin-scheme-guidance-notes-for-claims>

⁵¹ [Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Review, Agenda Item 11, Cabinet, 12 January 2021](#)

⁵² [Flood investigations - Norfolk County Council](#)

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

Governance department into Strategy and Transformation is reflected in these reports. Further changes will be shown as far as possible within the 2023-24 Budget Book.

- 4.2. The annual pay award and National Living Wage increases in 2022-23 for both the Council's directly employed staff and contracted services are an important cost driver. The 2022-23 pay award was confirmed in November 2022 as a flat rate of £1,925 and an additional day annual leave per full time employee. No announcements about national negotiations for 2023-24 pay awards have been made, although there is likely to be significant upward pressure on pay given wider inflation rates. The Budget makes contingency provision for a pay award of circa 5% for all staff in 2023-24, 4% for 2024-25 and 3% per year in the final two years of the MTFS. The pay award remains subject to confirmation at this point.
- 4.3. The Council's treasury management objectives remain safeguarding the timely repayment of principle and interest, whilst ensuring liquidity for cash flow and the generation of investment yield. The Council works closely with its external treasury advisors to determine the criteria for high quality institutions, including high quality banks and financial institutions, and local authorities. The Council applies a minimum, acceptable credit-rating criteria to generate a pool of highly creditworthy UK and non-UK counterparties which provides diversification and avoids concentration risk. These are detailed further in the Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24.
- 4.4. The Council makes non-treasury investments for policy purposes, for example capital loans to subsidiaries and other companies. These are addressed further in the Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24.

The Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System (ICS) – formally the Norfolk and Waveney Health and Care Partnership

- 4.5. Integrated care systems (ICSs) are partnerships that bring together providers and commissioners of NHS services across a geographical area with local authorities and other local partners to collectively plan health and care services to meet the needs of their population. The central aim of ICSs is to integrate care across different organisations and settings, joining up hospital and community-based services, physical and mental health, and health and social care. All parts of England are now covered by one of 42 Integrated Care Systems.
- 4.6. Norfolk and Waveney together are in one of four ICSs within the Eastern Region, and has agreed three key goals:
1. **To make sure that people can live as healthy a life as possible.** This means preventing avoidable illness and tackling the root causes of poor health. We know the health and wellbeing of people living in some parts of Norfolk and Waveney is significantly poorer – how healthy you are should not depend on where you live. This is something we must change.

2. **To make sure that you only have to tell your story once.** Too often people have to explain to different health and care professionals what has happened in their lives, why they need help, the health conditions they have and which medication they are on. Services have to work better together.
3. **To make Norfolk and Waveney the best place to work in health and care.** Having the best staff, and supporting them to work well together, will improve the working lives of our staff, and mean people get high quality, personalised and compassionate care.

4.7. The Norfolk and Waveney ICS brings together a range of partners including;

- Norfolk and Waveney NHS (previously the CCG)
- 3 acute hospitals (Queen Elizabeth, James Paget and the Norfolk & Norwich)
- 2 Community Healthcare providers (East Coast Community Healthcare and NCH&C)
- Norfolk County Council
- Suffolk County Council
- 8 District Councils; (Breckland, Broadland, Norwich City, South Norfolk, Kings Lynn & West Norfolk, Great Yarmouth, North Norfolk and East Suffolk District Councils)
- Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VSCE) providers of care and health related service
- 17 Primary Care Networks

4.8. The ICS promotes the principle of subsidiarity, making decisions close to the communities they effect. Work takes place at a system level as well as a place level and neighbourhood level (Primary Care Network footprints).

4.9. There are 5 Place Boards in the ICS bringing together colleagues from across health and social care to integrate services, focussing on effective operational delivery and improving people's care.

4.10. Eight Health and Wellbeing Partnerships based in district council footprints bring together district and council colleagues, health services and wider VCSE organisations and partners that have an impact on people's health and wellbeing, to progress work on tackling the wider determinants of health.

4.11. Provider collaboratives bring together NHS providers to reduce unwarranted variation and inequality in health outcomes, access to services and experience; improve resilience and ensure specialisation and consolidation occur where this provides better outcomes and value. All local providers are working towards these expectations with the overarching aim of enabling the best health outcomes for the population of Norfolk and Waveney.

4.12. An ICS has two named bodies, an **Integrated Care Board (ICB)** and an **Integrated Care Partnership (ICP)**:

- **Integrated Care Board (ICB)** is a statutory body that is responsible for planning and funding most NHS services in Norfolk and Waveney, leading integration within and across the NHS to deliver healthcare. The role of the ICB is to allocate the NHS budget and commission services for the population, taking over the functions previously held by clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) and some of the direct commissioning functions of NHS England. The ICB is directly accountable to NHS England for NHS spend and performance within the system.
- **Integrated Care Partnership (ICP)** provides leadership to the wider health and social care system, bringing together health and social care providers, local government, the voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) sector, and other partners. It drives and enhances integrated approaches to address challenges that the health and care system cannot address alone. This includes prioritising prevention, reducing health inequalities, and addressing the wider social and economic factors affecting our communities. The ICP, which is a statutory committee of the ICS, is responsible for setting an integrated care strategy for improving the health care, social care and public health across the whole of the Norfolk and Waveney ICS population. The ICB is required to have regard to this strategy when making its decisions.

4.13. **The ICB is responsible for:**

- Setting the NHS Joint Five Year Forward Plan
- Delivering the health elements of the Integrated Care Strategy.
- Holding the executive to account for monitoring the performance of the body against core financial and operational objectives, and providing effective financial stewardship.
- Promoting effective dialogue between the ICB and other partners, including NHS England, the ICP, providers, councils, representatives of local committees and people who use services.
- Putting in place effective arrangements for place-based working with partners. Ensuring that the ICB develops arrangements for effective clinical and care professional leadership.
- Creating an organisational culture that encourages and enables system working, building partnerships with people and communities and utilising feedback to improve services.
- Ensuring legal duties are discharged effectively and foster the development of policies, processes and initiatives that promote equality and address health inequalities.
- Ensuring workforce strategies are built on the commitments in the NHS People Plan and People Promise.
- Developing a compassionate and inclusive leadership model.
- Aligning the ICB assets to contribute to population health and improvement as anchor institutions.

4.14. **The ICP is responsible for:**

- Leading the Integrated Care Strategy, reflecting the priorities of all partners, to improve health and care outcomes for Norfolk and Waveney people for which all partners will be accountable.
- Driving improvement in the care, health and wellbeing of all residents from babies and young people, working age adults and older people
- Playing a critical role in supporting place-based partnerships and coalitions with community partners to help people live more independent, healthier lives for longer.
- Improving the wider determinants that drive inequalities including employment, housing, education, environment and reducing offending.

4.15. The Council's Cabinet at its meetings in [October 2020](#) and [September 2021](#) have agreed the Council's leadership role within the ICS.

4.16. Alongside the Council's budget position, wider NHS partners have identified an increasing and underlying recurrent deficit. The ICS has also developed principles for medium to long-term financial planning, that could be congruent with NCC's objective to support a sustainable health and care system, including:

- a) working transparently and sharing understanding of financial pressures
- b) working collaboratively to identify and deliver efficiency and productivity schemes, with no one party pursuing any scheme that may have a detrimental impact on another party without agreement
- c) engaging transparently and early in respect of emerging financial plans.

4.17. Whilst there are significant opportunities presented by working together on resource allocation, there are also risks that will need to be mitigated. These risks apply to all individual organisations in an ICS. The Norfolk and Waveney Health and Care system is currently operating with a significant financial deficit. The aspiration continues to be work through the financial needs for the system as a whole and developing whole system solution. Critical to the approach will be the overall principle that the Council retains ultimate control and accountability for its budgets and would retain its ability to adjust resource across the county to meet need.

Consultation with citizens and equality and rural impact assessments

4.18. The council has undertaken **public consultation** and produced **equality impact assessments** in relation to the 2023-24 Budget and MTFS proposals. Detailed information about the findings of these are included in the Revenue Budget paper ([Appendix 1](#)) and in [Appendix 5](#) and [Appendix 6](#).

Resource plans, funding, service pressures and savings

4.19. The plans and assumptions in the Council's budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy have been reviewed as part of the preparation of the 2023-24 Budget to ensure that they are robust and deliverable. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' recommendation of a 4.99%

council tax increase is made on the basis that this will enable a more robust budget for 2023-24 and for future years, however the outlook for 2025-27 remains extremely challenging.

4.20. Experience of the implementation of savings plans demonstrates that in some cases the cost, complexity and time required to deliver transformational change is likely to be greater than that originally allowed. As a result, the removal or delay of a number of previously agreed savings has been proposed over the life of the MTFS. Where it has not, this reflects expectations that non-delivery is due to delays in implementing savings and the realisation of these planned savings on a sustainable ongoing basis will be fundamental to the delivery of the 2023-24 Budget.

4.21. As set out elsewhere, the Provisional Settlement has provided clarity about funding levels for 2023-24, with indications about 2024-25 for local authorities. However, there remains very considerable uncertainty around the final two years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (2025-27).

General and Earmarked Reserves and provisions

4.22. General reserves are an essential part of good financial management and are held to ensure that the council can meet unforeseen expenditure and respond to risks and opportunities. The amount of reserves held has been set at a level consistent with the council's risk profile and with the aim that council taxpayers' contributions are not unnecessarily held in provisions or reserves. The Medium Term Financial Strategy assumes an increase in the level of general balances in 2023-24 rising to £29.090m by 2026-27 to reflect the increased level of risk around budget assumptions, such as pay awards, where the longer forecasting horizon increases the level of uncertainty, the increased levels of risk relating to council tax base assumptions and uncertainty about government funding allocations.

4.23. Earmarked Reserves support the Council's planning for future spending commitments. Historically, the planned use of Earmarked Reserves has allowed the council to smooth the impact of funding reductions and provided additional time for the implementation of savings plans. As part of the year-end closure of accounts, a detailed review of the reserves and provisions held by the council is undertaken. The Medium Term Financial Strategy assumes an overall decrease in the level of Earmarked Reserves in each year of the MTFS until March 2026, then only rising slightly by March 2027. Further details of the anticipated use of Earmarked Reserves are included in the Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27 ([Appendix 3](#)).

4.24. When taking decisions on using reserves, it is important to acknowledge that reserves are a one-off source of funding. Once spent, reserves can only be replenished from other sources of funding or reductions in spending. Therefore, reserves do not represent a long term solution to the historic funding reductions and continuing cost pressures facing the council.

5. Local Government Funding


5.1. Local Government funding has three major components:

- money received through **council tax**;
- money received through partial retention of locally generated **Business Rates**; and
- money redistributed by Government in the form of **Revenue Support Grant (RSG)** and **specific grants**.

5.2. Councils also generate income through sales, fees and charges. The breakdown of this **budgeted funding** in 2022-23 is shown in the pie chart below.

5.3. In recent years, the government has provided a larger proportion of funding through one-off specific grants, which makes it increasingly difficult to plan services for the long term.

MTFS Chart 3: Council funding sources 2022-23



Business Rates (10%)

5.4. Since April 2013, councils have no longer received Formula Grant, but instead received funding from a mix of locally retained business rates and government grants that are allocated from centrally retained business rates.

5.5. The introduction of the business rates retention scheme resulted in a direct link between local business rates growth and the amount of money councils have to spend on local people and local services. The scheme provides incentives

for local authorities to increase economic growth, through retention of a share of the revenue generated from locally collected business rates. This does not alter the way that business rates are set, and they continue to be set nationally by central government.

- 5.6. Local authorities benefit from 50% of business rates growth (or indeed suffer the consequences of business rates decline) in their area. The scheme is complex, involving a system of tariffs, top-ups and levies, however, at its simplest, for every £100 change in rates in Norfolk, £50 would go to central government, £40 to the district councils and £10 to Norfolk County Council.
- 5.7. Baselines are fixed in-between reset periods and only adjusted for inflationary increases to allow local authorities to retain generated growth for a period of time. Upper tier authorities are restricted in gains but also protected from reductions somewhat, as a large proportion of income is received through index linked top-ups.
- 5.8. Challenges within the current Business Rates scheme include the level of financial risk that councils face due to appeals and business rate avoidance, with little scope for these risks to be managed under the current arrangements. Some councils are of the view that the risks outweigh the rewards available to councils through incentives to grow the local economy. Risks to business rates income are considered to be higher due to the impact of COVID-19 and the level of uncertainty around continued Government support for businesses.
- 5.9. Since the introduction of the Business Rates Retention Scheme in 2013-14, Norfolk has not seen any significant growth or decline in the amount of business rates collected. This is a significant concern for Norfolk for future years, when considering the increasing levels of demand, any move towards Business Rates localisation and the potential changes to Revenue Support Grant. Most significantly, local authorities have relatively limited ability to influence some of the major factors which can impact on the level of business rates collected, including for example the impact of Covid-19 on business rates income.
- 5.10. Within the provisional settlement, it was confirmed that local government will be fully compensated for the Government's decision to "freeze" the business rates multiplier, which will remain at 49.9p in 2023-24. Given that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) was 10.1% (September 2022), the cost of providing full compensation is considerable (about £1.5bn) and was not certain when the Autumn Statement 22 was announced.
- 5.11. All local authorities in Norfolk have agreed to continue the 2022-23 Norfolk Business Rates Pool in 2023-24. The Pool allows Norfolk to retain additional business rates funding in the county through retaining levy payments which otherwise would have been paid over to central government.
- 5.12. In respect of the 2023-24 budget, updated District Council forecasts are being collated and the level of income the Council will receive is not yet confirmed.

Changes to the Business Rates Retention Scheme

- 5.13. The Government has confirmed that potentially significant funding reforms, including reforms to the Business Rates system and Business Rates reset, have been delayed until at least the 2025-26 financial year.
- 5.14. A key issue for the County Council will be to ensure that reforms going forward include a review of funding needs which accurately captures the pressures faced by Norfolk, particularly in respect of social care, demographic issues, and the specific local pressures arising from sparsity, rurality and social mobility.

Revenue Support Grant (RSG) (3%)

- 5.15. The amount of funding the Council receives is published as the Settlement Funding Assessment. In comparison to other councils, Norfolk remains somewhat reliant on Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and therefore cuts to this funding stream would have a significant impact on the budget. Following the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement, the council's budget planning assumes that RSG is uplifted by CPI in 2023-24.
- 5.16. Details are shown within the revenue budget report regarding the Settlement Funding Assessment 2023-24 funding allocations. There is currently limited information about Settlement Funding for 2024-25 and beyond and the MTFS gap assumes this will be unchanged from the assumed 2023-24 allocations.

Specific government grants (14%) and schools funding (23%)

- 5.17. The table below summarises the amount of specific grants due to be received in 2022-23, along with provisional figures for 2023-24. In most cases the allocations for the years beyond 2023-24 have not yet been confirmed by the Government and there is therefore limited information available about amounts beyond next year. Ring-fenced funding below includes funding to schools, over which the County Council has no control.

MTFS Table 1: Grants and Council Tax

	2022-23 (restated comparative) £m	2023-24 Provisional £m
Un-ringfenced	297.696	351.423
Ring-fenced (schools)	729.191	787.655
Ring-fenced (Public Health)	42.261	43.318
Council tax	464.123	493.707
Local Business Rates	27.122	27.884

- 5.18. Details of significant specific grants are set out below:

Ring-fenced grants

- 5.19. **Public Health** – Public Health grant continued to be ring-fenced grant in 2022-23 for public health services. The Government has not yet confirmed grant allocations for 2023-24. The Spending Review 2021 announced that public health grant would increase in line with inflation, but given such high levels this year, it seems unlikely – our budget assumptions are that there will be a 2.5% increase in the grant. Allocations will be announced separately in early 2023. Public Health covers a wide range of services that may be provided directly to communities or to other organisations that deliver services supporting the health and wellbeing of our population.
- 5.20. **Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)** – Schools funding is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and other grants. The DSG is allocated to local authorities who then delegate the funding to schools in accordance with the agreed formula allocation. Grants are allocated by local authorities to schools as per the Department of Education (DfE) conditions of grants, which vary depending upon the purpose and aims of the funding. The Local Authority receives its DSG allocation based on the new National Funding Formula. Pupil premium will continue as a separate, ring-fenced grant.
- 5.21. It is the local authority's decision how the Schools Block is distributed as, at present, there is no requirement upon local authorities to allocate the block as per the national funding formula unit values. However, central government policy has indicated in the past that there will be a move towards a 'hard' formula in future and, therefore, the implications of this have needed to be considered by local authorities when determining their local formula. Government policy has now been updated so that 2023-24 is the first year of transition to the direct schools National Funding Formula (NFF). In 2023-24, local authorities will only be allowed to use NFF factors in their local formulae, and must use all NFF factors, except any locally determined premises factors. Local authorities will also be required to move their local formulae factors 10% closer to NFF values unless they are already mirroring NFF. Norfolk's formula has been closely aligned to NFF factor values and methodologies since 2019-20. The options for the local formula for Norfolk were co-produced with Norfolk Schools Forum and all schools were consulted on the options available.
- 5.22. The Government has announced⁵³ DSG for 2023-24 totalling £787.655m (2022-23 totalling £729.191m⁵⁴).
- 5.23. Norfolk is currently carrying an outstanding Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) deficit from previous financial years, with a forecast £71.6m cumulative deficit forecast for the end of 2022-23. On the basis of the accounting treatment introduced in 2020 by the Government:
- the DSG is a ring-fenced specific grant separate from the general funding of Local Authorities (LAs);

⁵³ [Norfolk \(skillsfunding.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.skillsfunding.service.gov.uk)

⁵⁴ Total DSG allocation including; Schools, central school services, early years and high needs block.

- any deficit an authority may have on its DSG account is expected to be carried forward and is not required to be covered by the authority's general reserves;
- the deficit should be repaid through future years' DSG income.

5.24. High Needs Block (HNB) funding is intended to provide the most appropriate support package for children and young people (from early years up to aged 25) with special educational needs and disabilities in state special schools, independent schools, and Alternative Provision (AP), taking account of parental and student choice.

5.25. Norfolk has worked intensively during Summer 2022 with the DfE and their appointed financial and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Advisors as part of the Safety Valve programme, the DfE mechanism to work with LAs who have the highest levels of High Needs Block (DSG) pressure/overspend, to develop a DSG Management plan and to negotiate potential DfE investment. The core aim for DfE and NCC alike is to achieve an in-year balanced budget to enable the cumulative deficit to be addressed. Through these discussions with the DfE, a plan has been prepared to bring the in-year deficit into surplus and to reduce the cumulative deficit over six years.

5.26. As part of this plan, the Council submitted a disapplication request in respect of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2022-23 for 1% transfer in addition to the 0.5% transfer from the Schools Block (SB) to the High Needs Block (HNB) agreed by Schools Forum on 16 November 2022. The Council is awaiting notification from the Secretary of State as to whether the request has been accepted or declined, alongside whether the Minister has approved Norfolk's Safety Valve programme.

5.27. Further details of the HNB impact on the overall Dedicated Schools Grant position are set out in the Revenue Budget report (Appendix 1) and in the Dedicated Schools Grant Budget report elsewhere on the agenda.

5.28. **Pupil Premium Grant (PPG)**⁵⁵ – 2023-24 allocations will increase by 5% above the 2022-23 rates and for disadvantaged pupils will be as follows: primary allocated £1,455, which is aimed to help primary schools raise attainment and ensure that every child is ready for the move to secondary school. £1,035 was allocated for disadvantaged secondary pupils. Disadvantaged pupils are those who have been registered for free school meals at any point in the last six years.

5.29. The pupil premium plus (for children looked after) is £2,530 per pupil. The eligibility for this includes those who have been looked after for one day or more, and (from 2015-16) children who have been adopted from care or have left care under a special guardianship or child arrangement order. Schools receive £2,530 for each eligible pupil adopted from care who has been registered on the school census and the additional funding will enable schools to offer pastoral care as well as raising pupil attainment.

⁵⁵ [Pupil premium: conditions of grant 2022 to 2023 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\) published December 2022](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pupil-premium-conditions-of-grant-2022-to-2023)

- 5.30. Children with parents in the armed forces continued to be supported through the service child premium, which will be £350 per pupil.

Un-ring-fenced grants

- 5.31. **NHS funding (Better Care Fund⁵⁶)** – Since 2015, the Government's aims around integrating health, social care and housing, through the Better Care Fund (BCF), have played a key role in the journey towards person-centred integrated care. This is because these aims have provided a context in which the NHS and local authorities work together, as equal partners, with shared objectives. The plans produced are owned by Health and Wellbeing Boards, representing a single, local plan for the integration of health and social care in all parts of the country.

- 5.32. **The national conditions are:**
- **A jointly agreed plan between local health and social care commissioners, signed off by the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB)**
 - **NHS contribution to Adult Social Care to be maintained in line with the uplift to the NHS minimum contributions**
 - **Invest in NHS commissioned out of hospital services**
 - **Implementing the BCF policy objectives.**

- 5.33. The BCF is developed alongside Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) (and District Councils in relation to the effective deployment of disabled facility grant, which is passported in full to District Councils). The service continues to work closely with health partners within the ICS to agree the budget plans reflect priorities within the programme. In 2021/22 NCC led a joint review of the BCF with the ICB in Norfolk to shape a future BCF that further delivers local priorities; acts as a strengthened delivery arm of joint commissioning; and focus' strategy and funding on the most important priorities for integration. A new local set of principles for services in the BCF have also been agreed:

- a) **Funding services which move us towards meeting our local and national priorities**
- b) **Funding whole services through BCF, to better understand system impact**
- c) **Funding services which are meaningfully joint health and social care**

- 5.34. We presently await the 2023-24 planning guidance relating to the Better Care Fund (BCF) which should confirm the mandatory minimum contributions from Integrated Care Boards (ICB) towards the protection of Social Care. Our 22-23 plan was recently agreed as part of the annual BCF assurance cycle.

⁵⁶ [2022 to 2023 Better Care Fund policy framework - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\) updated November 2022](https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/better-care-fund)

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

- 5.35. Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) allocations are transferred to District Councils through the BCF. This enables Housing Authorities to meet their statutory duty to provide adaptations to the homes of people with disabilities to help them live independently for longer. From 2016-17 the DFG allocations have included amounts to offset the discontinuation of the Social Care Capital Grant. The DFG will also continue to be worth £573m nationally in 2022-23 and set out the planning requirements. Details for 2023-24 have not yet been confirmed.
- 5.36. **Social Care Grant** – The provisional settlement confirmed a £1.345bn national expansion of this grant, in addition Government has rolled into this grant the former Independent Living Fund (£161m), the combination of these two changes, when added to the sums continued from 2022-23, takes the total fund to £3.852bn. This provides a further £23.651m for Norfolk (plus £1.379m of Independent Living Grant rolled in), and brings our total grant for 2023-24 to £66.525m (2022-23 £41.495m). This grant is ringfenced towards helping to address cost pressures across both Adults and Children's social care. Nationally, £1.185bn of the additional funding has been distributed based on the adult social care relative needs formula and £160m has been used to "equalise" the impact of the distribution of the adult social care council tax precept in 2023-24. This methodology is favourable to Norfolk due to the comparatively lower tax base.
- 5.37. **Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF)** The provisional settlement confirmed no increase to the iBCF and our allocation remains at £39.619m for 2023-24. The grant must only be used for "meeting adult social care needs; reducing pressures on the NHS, including seasonal winter pressures; supporting more people to be discharged from hospital when they are ready; ensuring the social care provider market is supported". As grant recipient, we work with our local Integrated Care Board and providers to ensure the grant conditions are met. In 2019-20 the government announced that the winter pressures funding previously provided as a distinct grant would be rolled into the iBCF. In addition, the governance changed with a requirement to pool this grant alongside the wider Better Care Fund. The Adult Social Care budget reflects the spending plans for the grant.
- 5.38. **Local Reform and Community Voices grant** – allocations for this grant, which consists of three funding streams (Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards in Hospitals; local Healthwatch funding; and funding for the transfer of Independent NHS Complaints Advocacy Service to local authorities) have not been announced for 2023-24 it is therefore assumed that this funding continues in 2023-24 and in future financial years, however if not received, a pressure of £0.599m will arise.
- 5.39. **Independent Living Fund (ILF)** – the ILF provides support for disabled people with high support needs, to enable them to live in the community rather than in residential care settings. From April 2023 this funding will be rolled into the Social Care Grant at 2022-23 levels.

- 5.40. **Social Care in Prisons grant** – the Social Care Act establishes that local authorities are responsible for assessing and meeting the care and support needs of offenders residing in any prison, approved premises or bail accommodation within its area. This grant is to provide additional funding to undertake this new burden. Allocations have not yet been announced for 2023-24 onwards but it is assumed that the funding continues. If the funding is not received a pressure of £0.345m will arise in Adult Social Care for this and future financial years.
- 5.41. **War Pensions** – In the 2016 Budget, the government announced that a change would be made to the care and support charging arrangements in England to treat the schemes more consistently. This was done by requiring regular payments made to veterans under the War Pensions Scheme to be disregarded (i.e. not taken into account) when local authorities conduct the Adult Social Care financial assessment. This grant compensates local authorities who lost income from this change in charging policy. Allocations for 2023-24 have not been published and it is therefore assumed that this funding continues in 2023-24 and in future financial years, however if not received, a pressure of £0.248m will arise.
- 5.42. **Adult Social Care Discharge Grant** – A new grant for 2023-24 offering £300m of national funding to which Norfolk will receive £5.554m of funding. It is provided to upper tier authorities to ensure those people who need to draw on social care when they are discharged from hospital can leave as soon as possible. The Discharge Funding must be pooled as part of the Better Care Fund. Guidance on this fund is yet to be received but it is envisaged that it will be used to continue some of the initiatives established utilising the Winter 2022 discharge funding.
- 5.43. **Adult Social Care Market Sustainability and Improvement Grant** – A new grant for 2023-24 offering £562m of national funding to which Norfolk will receive £9.785m. £2.820m of this funding is being rolled into this grant from the former Market Sustainability and Fair Cost of Care fund. This funding is provided to upper tier authorities to enable tangible improvements to be made to adult social care.
- 5.44. **New Homes Bonus Funding** – New Homes Bonus (NHB) is a grant paid by central government to local councils for increasing the number of homes and their use. NHB is paid for each new home, linked to the national average of the council tax band, originally for a period of six years. As part of the provisional Settlement, the Government has confirmed that NHB will continue in 2023-24 and will be paid on the same basis as 2022-23. The legacy payments that will end in 2022-23 will be used to fund the new 3% funding guarantee. In two-tier areas, the annual payment will continue to be split: 80% for shire districts and 20% for shire counties. It is unclear whether New Homes Bonus will continue after 2024-25, ministers have promised a new consultation on the Future of the New Homes Bonus before the 2024-25 settlement. Our NHB allocations have reduced by £1.205m in 2023-24 (£0.608m) compared with 2022-23 (£1.833m).

5.45. **Rural Services Delivery Grant** – Rural Services Delivery Grant (RSDG) recognises the extra costs of delivering services in rural areas. The provisional Settlement confirmed that 2022-23 allocations of Rural Services Delivery Grant will be rolled forward £85m nationally in 2023-24, given that inflation is currently 10.5% (December 2022, reported in January 2023. It peaked in October 2022 at 11.1%), this equates to a real term year on year reduction in this grant.

5.46. **Services Grant 2023-24** - Service Grant will reduce by £4.665m in 2023-24, reflecting removal of funding for the cancelled increase in National Insurance Contribution and provision to increase funding for the Supporting Families programme. Services Grant will be distributed by the Settlement Funding Assessment.

COVID funding

5.47. Up to 2021-22 the Council received one-off emergency funding in relation to the pandemic to meet the additional costs arising due to COVID-19. No further COVID-19 funding has been provided since 2022-23. The Government has now confirmed that any remaining COMF funding can be carried forward to 2023-24.

Council Tax (28%)

5.48. Council tax is a key source of locally raised income. This helps make up the difference between the amount a local authority needs to spend and the amount it receives from other sources, such as business rates, government grants, and fees and charges.

5.49. In 2016-17 the Government introduced a new discretion for local authorities providing adult social care to raise additional council tax as an Adult Social Care precept. This gave authorities the option to raise an additional precept of 2%, on top of their existing discretion to raise council tax within the referendum limit (at the time also 2%). In 2017-18, the Government further extended the flexibility around the Adult Social Care precept, allowing councils to raise it by 3% in 2017-18 and 2018-19, but in this event having no rise permitted in 2019-20. The council took advantage of this flexibility to raise the maximum Adult Social Care precept by 2018-19 meaning no increase was applied in 2019-20. In 2020-21, a further 2% was raised through the Adult Social Care Precept.

5.50. In 2021-22 the Government included within the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement⁵⁷ (December 2020), a core council tax referendum principle of up to 2% and an adult social care precept of 3% on top of the core principle, with the opportunity to split this over two years. Members chose to split the available 3% adult social care precept increase with 2% applied in 2021-22 and 1% in 2022-23.

⁵⁷ [Provisional local government finance settlement 2021 to 2022: consultation - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/provisional-local-government-finance-settlement-2021-to-2022)

5.51. For 2022-23 the Government announced a core council tax referendum principle of 2% and an additional 1% adult social care precept, which could be taken in addition to the deferred element of the 2021-22 amount (1%). The Council opted not to take the deferred element (1%) for 2022-23.

5.52. Current forecasts suggest that between 2016-17 and 2022-23, Norfolk will have experienced average growth in the tax base of 1.55% per year. However the increase forecast in 2023-24 is lower at 1.27% and projected increases are significantly smaller at 1% for the duration of the current MTFS (2024-27) as shown in **Table 2** below.

MTFS Table 2: Council Tax assumptions

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
Assumed increase in general council tax	2.99%	2.99%	1.99%	1.99%
Assumed increase in Adult Social Care precept	2.00%	2.00%	1.00%	0.00%
Total assumed council tax increase	4.99%	4.99%	2.99%	1.99%
Assumed Council Tax Base	308,569	311,654	314,771	317,919
Assumed increase in Council Tax Base (%)	1.27%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

5.53. It should be noted that in the event of an increase in the referendum limit, or given the scope to further increase the Adult Social Care precept, it is likely that the Section 151 Officer would recommend the maximum available council tax be raised in future years, in view of the Council's wider financial position. Further background information about council tax is provided below and in the Revenue Budget report.

Council Tax assumptions within Core Spending Power for 2016-17 onwards

5.54. In 2016-17 the Government introduced a measure of "core spending power", intended to reflect the resources over which councils have discretion. However, in reality, the council has limited discretion over how much to raise council tax, and cannot significantly influence whether businesses pay Business Rates, or the level of allocated central government funding.

5.55. Core spending power risks painting an unrealistic picture of how well a council might be faring. For example, Norfolk's indicative core spending power has risen from £606.3m in 2015-16 to £857.1m in 2023-24, an increase of £250.8m, however the vast majority of this increase has been delivered through increased council tax, effectively transferring the burden to local council tax payers. During this time the council has also had to plan to make substantial savings to meet wider cost pressures and reductions in funding and enable the setting of a balanced budget.

5.56. The assessment of core spending power was used in 2016-17 as a mechanism to distribute reductions in Revenue Support Grant for the period up to 2019-20 to ensure that within each tier of Local Government (upper-tier, lower-tier, fire and rescue, and GLA other services), authorities of the same type received the same percentage change in settlement core funding. The inclusion of council tax in this calculation represented a significant change in Government policy. The Spending Review document at the time stated that this was intended to “*rebalance support including to those authorities with social care responsibilities by taking into account the main resources available to councils, including council tax and business rates.*”⁵⁸

5.57. Nonetheless, by previously using core funding as a mechanism for the distribution of funding in the settlement, the Government has effectively assumed that councils will raise council tax at the referendum threshold, will raise the Adult Social Care precept, and that historic levels of tax base growth will persist. As a result, any decision to raise council tax by less than the maximum available will lead to underfunding when compared to the Government’s expectations, and may make it more difficult to lobby for additional central government funding.

6. Revenue strategy and budget

6.1. The primary objective of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2023-27 is to show a balanced four-year position. At present further savings or additional revenue funding need to be identified to meet the significant shortfall shown in the period 2024-25 to 2026-27 below:

MTFS Table 3: Provisional medium term financial forecast budget shortfall

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Additional cost pressures and forecast reduction in Government grant funding	169.523	74.750	57.109	61.317
Forecast council tax increase	-29.584	-27.414	-20.949	-16.316
Identified saving proposals and funding increases	-139.939	-1.415	-0.669	-2.285
Budget shortfall	0.000	45.920	35.491	42.716

6.2. The council’s revenue budget plans deliver a balanced budget for 2023-24, but a significant shortfall remains in the subsequent years 2024-25 to 2026-27 (an **overall deficit in the Medium Term Financial Strategy of £124.127m**). The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) is intended to aid forward planning and help mitigate financial risk. The detailed timetable for the identification of

⁵⁸ *Spending Review and Autumn Statement 2015*, para 1.242, p59, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/479749/52229_Blue_Book_PU1865_Web_Accessible.pdf

the required savings and future year budget setting is set out in the Revenue Budget report ([Appendix 1](#)).

6.3. The Strategic Review is discussed elsewhere in the Budget report. Phase two of the Strategic Review is expected to make a material contribution of c.£10m towards reducing the forecast 2024-25 gap.

6.4. Uncertainty remains around several key areas which could impact on the MTFS in future years:

- Pressure on budgets from needs led services, relating to adults and children's social care, where the number of service users and the complexity of need continues to increase;
- The long term impact of the pandemic on social care, backlogs built up on top of new demand, alongside staff shortages due to changes in immigration caused initially by Brexit but compounded by the pandemic;
- Delayed adult social care charging reforms (including the cap on care costs) where the full implications of Government decisions remain to be understood;
- The above inflation increasing price of care packages, as providers struggle to meet soaring energy and food prices and high wage inflation;
- The level of Dedicated Schools Grant funding provided to deliver High Needs Block SEND provision, and the progress in recovering the deficit position on these budgets; awaiting the outcome of whether the Safety Valve programme proposal has received ministerial approval;
- The impact of the decision to leave the EU on local government funding and the wider economy; workforce shortages in key sectors, supply bottlenecks have been exacerbated by changes in migration and reductions in trading;
- Workforce recruitment and retention and shortage of labour in key sectors;
- Exceptionally high levels of inflation (including national living wage, energy and fuel);
- Significant delays to Business Rates reform and the fair funding review not expected until 2025-26 at the earliest;
- The uncertainty concerning the quantum and distribution of funding in the future years of the MTFS; and
- The ability of local tax payers to continue to absorb increases in council tax and the Adult Social Care precept.

6.5. CIPFA's Financial Management Code sets out a requirement for councils to consider a long-term financial view which recognises financial pressures. This should include an assessment of the sensitivity of the council's position to a range of alternative scenarios. The table below therefore provides a summary long term financial outlook for the council, based on currently known pressures and an assumption that government funding continues at the same level as 2023-24.

6.6. Norfolk County Council has a strong history of good financial management. An assessment of our compliance with the Financial Management Code is included within [Appendix 1 Table 32](#).

6.7. The 6 Principles of Good Financial Management set out in the FM Code are:

- Organisational leadership – demonstrating a clear strategic direction based on a vision in which financial management is embedded into organisational culture.
- Accountability – based on medium-term financial planning that drives the annual budget process supported by effective risk management, quality supporting data and whole life costs.
- Financial management is undertaken with transparency at its core using consistent, meaningful and understandable data, reported frequently with evidence of periodic officer action and elected member decision making.
- Adherence to professional standards is promoted by the leadership team and is evidenced.
- Sources of assurance are recognised as an effective tool mainstreamed into financial management, including political scrutiny and the results of external audit, internal audit and inspection.
- The long-term sustainability of local services is at the heart of all financial management processes and is evidenced by prudent use of public resources

MTFS Table 4: Long term financial forecast budget position

	Medium Term Financial Strategy				Long Term Financial Outlook						Total
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33	
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
<u>Growth Pressures</u>											
Economic and inflationary	41.528	24.436	21.702	22.229	23.409	24.097	24.815	25.406	26.148	26.893	260.662
Legislative requirements	31.069	6.760	-0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	37.629
Demand and demographic	20.495	42.150	37.150	37.010	11.000	11.000	11.000	11.700	11.100	11.100	203.705
Policy decisions	55.746	0.776	-1.543	2.078	0.000	0.766	-6.266	0.000	0.000	0.000	51.556
Funding decreases	16.115	0.628	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	16.743
<u>Savings and funding increases</u>											
Identified savings	-59.704	6.197	-0.669	-2.285	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-56.461
Funding increases	-75.665	-7.612	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-83.277
Council tax changes	-29.584	-27.414	-20.949	-16.316	-16.807	-17.313	-17.834	-18.371	-18.924	-19.493	-203.003
Forecast Gap (Surplus)/Deficit	0.000	45.920	35.491	42.716	17.602	18.551	11.715	18.735	18.324	18.500	227.554


6.8. The long term outlook suggests a cumulative budget gap in excess of £225m by 2032-33, if no mitigating actions are taken. However, the level of this gap is highly sensitive to changes in assumptions and is ultimately likely to be materially different. In particular, the level of uncertainty within these forecasts inevitably increases for later years. The sensitivity of the budget in 2023-24 to changes in key assumptions is shown in the following table.

MTFS Table 5: Assumption sensitivity 2024-25

Change in assumption	£m
10% savings non delivery	+/- 5.970
+/-1% pay inflation	+/- 3.100
+/-1% general inflation	+/- 5.183
+/-1% Revenue Support Grant	+/- 0.451
+/-1% Business Rates baseline	+/- 1.608
+/-1% Council tax base	+/- 4.914
+/-1% Council tax	+/- 4.914

6.9. The graphic below illustrates the range of sensitivity around the central MTFS forecast shown in **MTFS Table 4**. The graphic indicates that if all upside assumptions occurred, there would be no gap in 2032-33, however if all downside risks materialise, the gap could potentially be in excess of £700m. The reality is likely to be somewhere around the central forecast, but this provides a sense of the uncertainty linked to potential variation and level of risk over the longer term planning horizon.

MTFS Chart 4: MTFS Gap Sensitivity Analysis



7. Capital strategy and budget


7.1. The Capital Strategy provides a framework for the allocation of resources to support the Council's objectives. The capital strategy is intended to:

- give a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of services along with an overview of how associated risk is managed and the implications for future financial sustainability; and
- demonstrate that the authority takes capital expenditure and investment decisions in line with service objectives and properly takes account of stewardship, value for money, prudence, sustainability and affordability.

7.2.A proposed capital programme for 2022-27+ of £1,240.555m is included elsewhere on the agenda, of which £956.971m relates to future years.

7.3. The bar charts below show the split of capital spend and how it is funded.

MTFS Chart 5: Capital Programme expenditure 2022-27+



MTFS Table 6: Capital Programme funding 2022-27+

Service	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
Adult Social Care	14.130	14.130	12.473	22.482	15.401	13.200
Children's Services	38.977	38.977	118.296	61.323	21.325	36.294
CES Highways	150.836	150.836	107.926	105.658	153.090	106.757
CES Other	32.296	28.896	58.706	23.483	1.200	1.217
Finance and Commercial Services	47.801	50.312	53.654	19.989	20.180	4.320
Strategy and Governance	0.432	0.432	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	284.472	283.583	351.054	232.934	211.196	161.787

8. Summary

8.1. As in previous years, the Medium Term Financial Strategy sets out details of the high level national and local factors which are considered likely to impact on budget planning over the next four years. It provides information about how the Council intends to respond to these challenges and needs to be considered when the County Council makes decisions about the Budget. The MTFS provides an overview of the likely implications of 2023-24 budget decisions for

the future years 2024-25 to 2026-27 and outlines the potential longer-term issues facing the Council.

- 8.2. The overarching purpose of the Medium Term Financial Strategy is to support the Council in developing balanced budget plans over a four year period, and to support this objective a proposed planning timetable for setting a balanced budget for 2024-25 is included within the 2023-24 Revenue Budget report.
- 8.3. The Medium Term Financial Strategy links closely with the CIPFA Financial Management Code implemented in 2021-22 and as such it is an important component of the authority's financial management framework. In particular, the Medium Term Financial Strategy is one of the tools which supports the Council to develop plans which will assist in forming a view of, understanding, and maintaining financial resilience in the medium to longer term. The Strategy is therefore aligned with the requirements of the Financial Management Code.

Norfolk County Council

Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-24

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This report sets out the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' statement on the adequacy of provisions and reserves used in the preparation of the County Council's budget. As part of budget reporting to Cabinet and the County Council, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is required under the Local Government Act 2003 to comment on the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves. Members must consider the level and use of reserves and balances to inform decisions when recommending the revenue budget and capital programme.
- 1.2. Reserves are an essential part of good financial management and are held to ensure the council can meet unforeseen expenditure and to smooth expenditure across financial years. They enable councils to manage unexpected financial pressures and plan for their future spending commitments. While there is currently no universally defined level for councils' reserves, the reserves a council holds should be proportionate to the scale of its future spending plans and the risks it faces as a consequence of these. Norfolk County Council's policy has been to set limits consistent with the council's risk profile and with the aim that council taxpayer's contributions are not unnecessarily held in provisions or reserves.
- 1.3. This report sets out the County Council policy for reserves and balances and details the approach to setting a risk assessed framework for calculating a recommended level of general balances. This explicitly identifies the risks, over ten categories, and the quantification of those risks, in arriving at the recommended level. Taking into account the overall position, it is considered that the current level of general balances should be increased to a minimum level of £25.340m.
- 1.4. Details of the County Council's other reserves and provisions are also provided alongside an assessment of their purpose and expected usage during 2023-27.

2. Purpose of holding provisions and reserves

- 2.1. The council holds both provisions and reserves. **Provisions** are made for liabilities or losses that are likely or certain to be incurred, but where it is uncertain as to the amounts or the dates on which they will arise. The council complies with the definition of provisions contained within CIPFA's Accounting Code of Practice. Reserves (or Earmarked Reserves) are held in one of three main categories:

- Reserves for special purposes or to fund expenditure that has been delayed – reserves can be held for a specific purpose, for example where money is set aside to replace equipment or undertake repairs on a rolling cycle, which can help smooth the impact of funding.
- Local Management of Schools (LMS) reserves that are held on behalf of schools – the LMS reserve is only for schools and reflects balances held by individual schools. The balances are not available to support other County Council expenditure.
- General balances – reserves that are not earmarked for a specific purpose. The general balances reserve is held to enable the County Council to manage unplanned or unforeseen events. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is required to form a judgement on the level of the reserve and to advise Cabinet accordingly.

2.2. Reserves are held for both revenue and capital purposes. However, some are specific e.g. Usable Capital Receipts can only be used for capital purposes. The following section of this report constitutes the council's policy on reserves and provisions and can be used to provide guidance in assessing their level.

3. Norfolk County Council Policy on Reserves and Provisions

3.1. Objective

- 3.1.1. The objective of holding provisions, reserves, and general balances is to ensure the council can meet unforeseen or uncertain expenditure, and to meet specific future commitments as they fall due.
- 3.1.2. The level of provisions and reserves are continually reviewed to ensure that the amounts held are within reasonable limits. Those limits should be consistent with the council's risk profile and should ensure that council taxpayers' contributions are not unnecessarily held in provisions or reserves.

3.2. Provisions

- 3.2.1. Provisions are made for liabilities or losses that are likely to be incurred, or certain to be incurred, but uncertain as to the amounts or the dates on which they will arise. The council complies with the definition of provisions contained within CIPFA's Accounting Code of Practice.
- 3.2.2. The provision amounts are reported to Cabinet on a regular basis and are continually reviewed to ensure that they are still needed and that they are at the appropriate amount. If necessary, the amount is increased or decreased as circumstances change to ensure that the provisions are not over or understated.

3.3. Reserves

- 3.3.1. The council's reserves consist of the following main categories:

- Earmarked Reserves (Reserves for special purposes or to fund expenditure that has been delayed)
- Local Management of Schools (LMS) reserve
- Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reserve
- General balances (Reserves that are not earmarked for a specific purpose)

3.3.2. Further detail of these categories is set out below. The council complies with the definition of reserves contained within CIPFA's Accounting Code of Practice.

3.3.3. Similar to provisions, reserves are reported to Cabinet on a regular basis and are continually reviewed in the context of service specific issues and the council's financing strategy. Reserves are held for revenue and capital purposes. Some reserves, such as general balances, could be used for either capital or revenue purposes, whilst others may be specific e.g. Usable Capital Receipts can only be used for capital purposes.

3.3.4. Reserves for special purposes or to fund expenditure that has been delayed.

Reserves can be held for a specific purpose. An example of a reserve is repairs and renewals. Money is set aside to replace equipment on a rolling cycle. This effectively spreads the impact of funding the replacement equipment when the existing equipment is no longer fit for purpose.

3.3.5. LMS reserve

The LMS reserve is only for schools and reflects balances held by individual schools. These balances are not available to support other County Council expenditure.

3.3.6. DSG reserve

The DSG reserve represents the cumulative position of the ringfenced DSG funding provided by the DfE. From the 2018-19 outturn, DSG reserves or deficits have been reported as a separate ring-fenced reserve. A DSG deficit does not need to be covered by an equivalent amount in a local authority's general reserves.

3.3.7. General balances

The general balances reserve is held to enable the County Council to manage unplanned or unforeseen events. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services is required to form a judgment on the level of this reserve and to advise Cabinet and County Council accordingly.

In forming a view on the level of general balances, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services takes into account the following:

- Provision for Unforeseen Expenditure
- Uninsured risks
- Comparisons with other similar organisations
- Level of financial control within the Council

3.3.8. Provision for Unforeseen Expenditure

Unforeseen expenditure can be divided into two categories:

- Disasters
- Departmental Overspends

In a disaster situation, the council can have recourse to the Government using the Bellwin rules under which the council would have to fund the first £1.164m of costs (2017-18 threshold). Central government would provide grant funding of 100% for eligible expenditure incurred above this amount. Examples of natural disasters are severe flooding and hurricane damage.

The council also needs to be able to fund a departmental overspend, should one occur.

3.3.9. Uninsured risks

A combination of external insurance cover and the council's insurance provision provides adequate cover for most of the council's needs. Considerable emphasis has been placed upon risk management arrangements within the council in order to minimise financial risks.

However, there are some potential liabilities, such as closed landfill sites, some terrorism cover, and some asbestos cover, where it is not economical or practical to purchase external insurance cover. The County Council needs to have some provision in the event of such a liability arising.

3.3.10. Comparisons with similar organisations

As part of assessing the minimum level of general balances to be held, comparisons are made with other County Councils. Based on the latest Cabinet monitoring report, the forecast level of general balances at 31 March 2023 is £24.340m, prior to allowing for the revenue budget year end position. The County Council holds balances of 5.2% as a percentage of its net 2022-23 Council Tax Requirement. This percentage can only be used as a guide as each council's circumstances are different. However, the percentage of general balances compared to the net revenue expenditure is below average in comparison to other County Councils, which is 6.8%. In the medium term, the Council aspires to continue to hold a general balance equivalent to 5% of the net Budget.

3.3.11. Level of financial control within the council

Factors that are taken into account in assessing the level of financial control are:

- The state of financial control of the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme;
- The adequacy of financial reporting arrangements within the council;
- Adequate financial staffing support within the council, including internal audit coverage;
- Working relationships with Members and Executive Directors;

- The state of financial control of partnerships with other bodies; and
- Any financial risks associated with companies where the council is a shareholder.

In evaluating the level of general balances, as part of producing the 2022-23 Budget, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services has used a framework based on considering all risk areas and then quantifying the risk using the related budget and applying a percentage factor, which will vary according to the assessed level of risk. The total value against each risk provides an estimate of the level of balances required to cover the identified risk and overall provides an assessment of the level of general balances for the County Council.

The ten areas of risk considered in the general contingency are set out in the report to the Cabinet budget meeting, including an explanation of the potential risks faced by the council. The report also details the calculation of the general balances. The balances reflect spending experience and risks to which the council is exposed.

3.3.12. **Minimum Level of General Balances**

Taking all of the above factors into account, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services currently advises that the council holds the following minimum level of general balances for 2023-24 and indicative minimum levels for planning purposes for 2024-25 to 2026-27.

Reserves Table 1: Norfolk County Council general balances requirement

2021-22 (31/03/2023 Forecast)		2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
£m		£m	£m	£m	£m
24.340	Assessment of the level of General Balances	25.340	26.590	27.840	29.090

Having considered the adequacy of the overall general fund balance, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services considers that it is not appropriate to make further budget reductions to accommodate an increase in the level of general balances, but having regard to the reserves and balances risk assessment, any additional resources which become available in 2023-24 should be added to the general fund balance wherever possible.

Executive Directors are expected to comply with financial regulations and deliver their services within the budget approved by the County Council and therefore departments are not expected to draw upon the £25.340m.

If the level of general balances is reduced to below the minimum balance, currently £24.340m, the shortfall will need to be replenished as soon as possible or as part of the following year's budget.

4. Current context

- 4.1. The minimum level of general balances is recommended at £25.340m for 2023-24. The projected actual level at 31 March 2023 is £24.340m, prior to allowing for the revenue budget year end position, which is currently forecasting an overspend of £2.054m (period 8 as per the monitoring report to Cabinet 30 January 2023). Executive Directors are continuing to take action to secure achievement of a balanced outturn position for the year. The budget proposals for 2023-24 do not include any use of general balances. The level of minimum balance is informed by an assessment of the financial risk to which the council is exposed, whilst also taking account of the level of financial controls within the council. Financial management and reporting arrangements are considered to be effective and this has been commented on by the external auditors in relation the 2020-21 accounts.
- 4.2. Norfolk County Council's provisions and reserves are reported to Cabinet on a monthly basis and are subject to continual review. As previously discussed, in comparison with other County Councils, the Council holds a lower than average percentage of general balances and this is borne out by the position shown in the published CIPFA Financial Resilience Index as discussed in further detail in of [section 3](#) Appendix 4.
- 4.3. In setting the annual budget, a review of the level of reserves is undertaken, alongside any under or overspend in the current year, to determine whether it is possible to release funding to support the following year's budget or whether additional funding is required to increase the level of reserves. That review is informed principally by an assessment of the level of financial risk to which the council is exposed and an assessment of the role of reserves in supporting future spending plans.
- 4.4. The overall level of general balances needs to be seen also in the context of the earmarked amounts set aside and the council's risk profile. Whilst it is recognised that all county councils carry different financial risk profiles, the position in Norfolk is that the level of its general balances is below that of most other counties. The Executive Director of Finance has therefore **recommended general fund balances are increased by £1.000m in 2023-24 followed by an increase of £1.250m in 2024-25 and in future years** and that any additional resources which become available during the year should be added to the general fund balance wherever possible (as set out in further detail in key risks and assumptions – (section 4 of Appendix 1). The recommended general balance position for 2023-24 has in particular been set with reference to considerable uncertainty about the wider financial environment for local authorities. Wider inflationary pressures and financial and policy uncertainty at the national level have all had implications in terms of additional costs, levels of demand and financial planning. The Budget and MTFS seeks to maintain the general fund balance at or around 5% of the Council's Net Revenue Budget for the year.

5. Assessment of the level of general balances

5.1. The framework for assessing the level of general balances is based on considering all risk areas and then quantifying the risk using the related budget and applying a percentage factor, which will vary according to the assessed level of risk. The total value against each risk provides an estimate of the level of balances required to cover the identified risk and overall provides an assessment of the level of general balances for the County Council. It takes into consideration the most significant risks and issues including the following:

- Level of savings and transformation. One of the most significant risks continues to be the level of transformation that has to take place across the council to deliver the required budget savings. Risk has been considered as part of the assessment of the robustness of the budget proposals, and reflected in the reprofiling and removal of some savings. The remaining risks will be monitored within and across services as part of the council's ongoing risk management process and mitigating actions will be identified and monitored. Robust financial monitoring controls are in place and additional monitoring of the transformation programme is being undertaken.
- Managing the cost of change. The council will need to budget for the cost of any redundancies necessary to achieve the required budget savings and service restructuring to the extent they are not contained in the budget proposals. The council has a separate redundancy reserve for this purpose.
- The effect of economic and demand changes. There is always some degree of uncertainty over whether the full effects of any economy measures and / or service reductions will be achieved. Whilst the budget process has been prudent in these assumptions and those assumptions, particularly about demand led budgets, should hold true in changing circumstances, an adequate level of general contingency provides extra reassurance the budget will be delivered on target. Changes in the economic climate may also influence certain levels of income to be received at a lower level than previous years.
- Cost of disasters. The Bellwin Scheme of Emergency Financial Assistance to Local Authorities provides assistance in the event of an emergency. In a disaster situation, the council can claim assistance from the Government using the Bellwin rules. Thresholds were set for 2017-18 and mean the council would have to fund emergency costs below £1.164m. Central Government would then provide 100% grant funding for any eligible expenditure incurred above this amount. Examples of natural disasters eligible for the scheme would include severe flooding and hurricane damage.
- Uncertainty arising from the introduction of new legislation or funding arrangements such as the moves towards retention of business rates.
- Risk of changes to the levels of grant funding and factors affecting key income streams such as council tax and business rates.
- Unplanned volume increases in major demand led budgets, particularly in the context of high and accelerating growth.
- The risk of major litigation, both currently and in the future.
- The need to retain a general contingency to provide for any unforeseen circumstances which may arise.

- The need to retain reserves for general day to day cash flow needs.

5.2. The ten areas of risk considered in the general contingency are detailed below with an explanation of the potential risks faced by the council.

Reserves Table 2: Key financial risks for Norfolk County Council general balances calculation

Area of risk	Explanation of risk
1) Legislative changes	<p>Key government policy and legislative changes will impact on the council's budget plans. Forecasts have been based on the latest information available but there is risk of variation and there is in particular greater risk in future years, where estimates cannot be based on firm government announcements. Key elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government grant: 2023-24 represents a one year funding allocation. Uncertainty about the outcomes of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR), Fair Funding Review (FFR), and Business Rates Retention Scheme (BRRS) means that the council faces a very significant level of uncertainty about funding levels from 2024-25. • Business Rates: Council funding is affected by the level of business rates collected. The council receives a share of the combined rates across all Norfolk councils, which helps smooth out any specific peaks and troughs, however the impact on businesses of Covid-19, appeals, revaluations and applications for relief can result in significant volatility. • Council tax base and collection fund: Council funding is impacted if there is a reduction in the tax base or in the amount collected by the billing authorities. The budget is based on a forecast 1.00% increase in tax base in 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27. • NHS/Social Care Funding: The improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) funding represents a mix of recurrent and one-off funding. Planning assumptions are based on funding of £39.617m announced in the provisional Settlement. The provisional Settlement confirmed that existing social care funding of £30.342m plus additionally announced social care funding of £25.030m, Discharge Support funding of £5.554m and ASC Market Sustainability funding of £9.785m will also be provided in 2023-24. The MTFS assumes these will be ongoing, but outcomes of the CSR and FFR are awaited to determine whether this is correct. • Pay: The National Living Wage was introduced from 2016-17, starting at £7.20. The rate for 2023-24 has been confirmed as £10.42. Further details are provided in the Statement on the Robustness of Estimates.
2) Inflation	<p>Pay inflation has been assumed at 3% for 2023-24 to 2026-27, with an additional contingency provision of 2% for 2023-24 and 1% 2024-25. The County Council is currently part of the national agreement</p>

Area of risk	Explanation of risk
	<p>and therefore pay awards for 2023-24 onwards will be determined by any agreements reached. Every 1% variation in pay amounts to around £3m for the council. There is therefore a risk that pay awards could vary from this assumption over the planning period.</p> <p>Price inflation has been included based on contractual need. There is a risk that inflation will be required during the planning period, even where there is no current contractual element. In addition, many contracts are negotiated post budget agreement and therefore forecast inflation levels may be different in practice.</p> <p>Inflation on fees and charges is set by NCC – a 2% increase has been assumed for 2023-24 and the following years. However, there is a risk that market forces may require this to be varied during the planning period.</p>
3) Interest rates on borrowing and investment	<p>Budgeted interest earnings on investments are based on guaranteed fixed deposit returns, available instant liquidity rates and market forecasts provided by our Treasury Advisors. Current interest rates are at a 14 year high and are forecast to increase further during the next 12 months, before beginning to reduce slightly once inflation has been brought back to target levels.</p> <p>The revenue cost of borrowing is based on the rates of interest payable on the council's existing debt and assumptions in respect of capital expenditure to be funded from borrowing which has yet to be borrowed.</p>
4) Government funding	<p>The provisional Settlement provided only indications for one year of funding allocations in 2023-24, which still remain to be confirmed in the final Local Government Finance Settlement. Uncertainty about the outcomes of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR), Fair Funding Review (FFR), and 75% Business Rates Retention Scheme (BRRS) means that the council faces a very significant level of uncertainty about funding levels from 2024-25. A number of issues may also impact on future funding levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effect of cost of living policy responses, the war in Ukraine and legacy of Covid-19 on public finances. • The impact of the UK to leaving the European Union and any consequential impact on the national economy, which may have a significant impact on the levels of funding for the public sector at national level. • The operation of the business rates retention scheme and increased risks to business rates income. • On occasion general issues arise on funding which place the council at risk of clawback. • Key funding for integrated health and social care is via the Department of Health and Social Care and is dependent on the agreement of plans and further information regarding payment by results.

**Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves
2023-27**

Area of risk	Explanation of risk
5) Employee related risks	Staffing implications of budget planning proposals have been evaluated and reflected within the financial plans, including the cost of redundancy. However, variations could occur as detailed implementation plans are developed.
6) Volume and demand changes	<p>Many of our largest budgets are demand led and these present long standing areas of risk. Forecasts for social care are based on current outturn predictions and applied to population forecasts. Costs could vary if the population varies, or if the proportion of people either requiring or eligible for care is different to the forecast.</p> <p>Budgets for children looked after and support for vulnerable children take into account the County Council's strategy for minimising the number of children in care. Financial risks include delivery of the strategy and external factors that can lead to an increase in the number of children looked after and/or the complexity of need due to societal changes.</p> <p>Waste forecasts are based on the latest available information. If tonnage levels increase, this will lead to an increased pressure.</p>
7) Budget savings	<p>The Medium Term Financial Strategy includes £56.461m budget savings to be delivered across four years. A full assessment of all proposals has tested the robustness of each saving to minimise the financial risk, however a risk remains that the programme is delivered at a slower rate, or that some savings are not achievable at the planned level.</p> <p>In addition, further savings need to be identified to close the £124.127m funding shortfall between 2024-25 and 2026-27.</p>
8) Insurance and emergency planning provision	<p>Unforeseen events and natural disasters can increase the level of insurance claims faced by the council.</p> <p>The council's insurance arrangements, including actuarial review of the fund, additional provisions for unforeseen and unreported claims, service risk management and emergency planning procedures minimise this risk.</p>
9) Energy, security and resilience	<p>Resilience risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were a disaster to occur, we must have a reserve in place to pick up the costs that will fall to the council. • Norfolk includes flood risk areas and emergency procedures are in place to manage this. • Resilience of IMT can create a risk that might have financial implications for the council.
10) Financial guarantees /legal exposure	<p>Certain contracts contain obligations that, if not fulfilled, would attract a penalty.</p> <p>The Council has PFI Schemes for street lighting and schools. However, there is no risk to the financing of these schemes at present.</p>

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

5.3. The following table details the calculation of the general balances having regard to the identified areas of risk.

Reserves Table 3: General balances calculation

Area of Risk	2023-24			2024-25			2025-26			2026-27		
	Budget	Risk Level	Value	Budget	Risk Level	Value	Budget	Risk Level	Value	Budget	Risk Level	Value
	£m	%	£m	£m	%	£m	£m	%	£m	£m	%	£m
Legislative Changes												
Government Grant (RSG)	45.055	0.00%	0.000	45.055	0.50%	0.225	45.055	0.50%	0.225	45.055	0.50%	0.225
Business Rates	188.214	0.50%	0.941	188.214	0.50%	0.941	188.214	0.50%	0.941	188.214	0.50%	0.941
Council Tax Variation to Base/Collection	493.707	0.00%	0.000	521.121	0.50%	2.606	542.070	0.50%	2.710	558.386	0.50%	2.792
NHS/Social Care Funding	121.481	0.00%	0.000	136.845	1.00%	1.368	136.845	1.00%	1.368	136.845	1.00%	1.368
Apprenticeship Levy	1.425	3.00%	0.043	1.454	3.00%	0.044	1.484	3.00%	0.045	1.515	3.00%	0.045
Landfill Tax - waste recycling (price)	27.486	1.00%	0.275	29.486	1.25%	0.369	31.486	1.50%	0.472	33.486	1.75%	0.586
	877.367		1.259	922.175		5.553	945.154		5.762	963.501		5.958
Inflation												
Employees	331.577	0.50%	1.649	339.076	0.50%	1.712	348.604	0.50%	1.735	359.062	0.50%	1.806
Premises	18.464	0.50%	0.092	19.265	0.50%	0.097	20.065	0.50%	0.100	20.467	0.50%	0.103
Transport	75.633	0.50%	0.376	79.530	0.50%	0.402	80.962	0.50%	0.405	82.581	0.50%	0.416
Supplies and Services	91.119	0.50%	0.453	97.183	0.50%	0.491	103.591	0.50%	0.518	105.663	0.50%	0.533
Agency and Contracted	563.077	0.50%	2.801	581.233	0.50%	2.924	599.090	0.50%	2.995	611.072	0.50%	3.080
Income (Fees and charges)	122.133	0.50%	0.608	124.097	0.50%	0.620	126.061	0.50%	0.630	128.582	0.50%	0.643
	1,202.004		5.979	1,240.384		6.246	1,278.373		6.384	1,307.427		6.580
Interest Rates												
Borrowing	31.430	0.25%	0.079	33.630	0.25%	0.084	33.630	0.50%	0.168	33.630	1.00%	0.336
Investment	1.081	0.25%	0.003	1.081	0.25%	0.003	1.081	0.50%	0.005	1.081	1.00%	0.011
	32.511		0.081	34.711		0.087	34.711		0.174	34.711		0.347
Grants												
Public Health Grant funding	43.318	0.25%	0.108	43.318	0.50%	0.217	43.318	0.75%	0.325	43.318	1.00%	0.433
Other General Fund Grants	23.897	0.25%	0.060	23.897	0.50%	0.119	23.897	0.75%	0.179	23.897	1.00%	0.239
	67.215		0.168	67.215		0.336	67.215		0.504	67.215		0.672

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Area of Risk	2023-24			2024-25			2025-26			2026-27		
	Budget	Risk Level	Value	Budget	Risk Level	Value	Budget	Risk Level	Value	Budget	Risk Level	Value
	£m	%	£m	£m	%	£m	£m	%	£m	£m	%	£m
Employee Related Risks												
Pensions actuarial valuation	17.187	0.00%	0.000	17.187	2.50%	0.430	17.187	5.00%	0.859	17.187	5.00%	0.859
	17.187		0.000	17.187		0.430	17.187		0.859	17.187		0.859
Volume / Demand Changes												
Customer and Client Receipts	122.133	0.75%	0.916	124.097	0.75%	0.931	126.061	0.75%	0.945	128.582	0.75%	0.964
Demand Led Budgets (Adult Social Care third party and transfer payments)	406.141	1.00%	4.061	413.375	1.00%	4.134	421.809	1.00%	4.218	430.245	1.00%	4.302
Demand Led Budgets (Children's Services third party and transfer payments)	81.217	1.00%	0.812	87.333	1.00%	0.873	91.949	1.00%	0.919	93.788	1.00%	0.938
Winter Pressures	3.179	10.00%	0.318	3.207	10.00%	0.321	3.235	10.00%	0.324	3.264	10.00%	0.326
Landfill Tax - waste recycling (volume)	27.486	1.00%	0.275	29.486	1.00%	0.295	31.486	1.00%	0.315	33.486	1.00%	0.335
Public Health third party spend	36.452	1.00%	0.365	35.370	1.00%	0.354	35.370	1.00%	0.354	35.370	1.00%	0.354
Social care and Better Care Fund Spend	121.481	1.00%	1.215	136.845	1.00%	1.368	136.845	1.00%	1.368	136.845	1.00%	1.368
	798.089		7.962	829.712		8.275	846.755		8.444	861.581		8.588
Budget Savings												
Budget Reductions	59.704	7.50%	4.478	0.000	7.50%	0.000	0.669	7.50%	0.050	2.285	7.50%	0.171
	59.704		4.478	0.000		0.000	0.669		0.050	2.285		0.171
Insurance/Public Liability Third Party Claims												
Uninsured Liabilities	0.000		4.250	0.000		4.500	0.000		4.500	0.000		4.750
Bellwin rules	1,163.554	0.10%	1.164	1,163.554	0.10%	1.164	1,163.554	0.10%	1.164	1,163.554	0.10%	1.164
	1,163.554		5.414	1,163.554		5.664	1,163.554		5.664	1,163.554		5.914
TOTAL			25.340			26.590			27.840			29.090

- 5.4. The required level of general balances is therefore identified as £25.340m in 2023-24, rising to £29.090m by 2026-27. It is essential in setting a balanced budget that the council has money available in the event of unexpected spending pressures. The “balances” need to reflect spending experience and risks to which the council is exposed.
- 5.5. The latest budget monitoring position reported to Cabinet forecasts general balances at 31 March 2023 of £24.340m, prior to allowing for the revenue budget end of year position, which is currently forecasting an overspend of £2.054m for 2022-23.
- 5.6. The increase in the minimum level of risk-based balances needed in the later years of the Medium Term Financial Strategy reflects the increased level of risk around budget assumptions, such as pay awards, where the longer forecasting horizon increases the level of uncertainty, the increased levels of risk relating to council tax base assumptions and uncertainty about government funding allocations, which add £4.890m to the assessed balance required by 2026-27. The actual level of balance ultimately required will reduce as the planning timeframe shortens and the uncertainty diminishes.

6. Review of Earmarked Reserves and Provisions

- 6.1. As part of the 2023-24 budget planning process, a detailed review has been undertaken in respect of each of the reserves and provisions held by the council. In general, the earmarked reserves and provisions are considered by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services to be adequate and appropriate to reflect the risks they are intended to cover. However, it is considered that changes could be made to some reserves, due to changing circumstances. Reserves Table 4 summarises the earmarked reserves for each service department. The balances for individual reserves are shown in the subsequent detailed table (Reserves Table 5).

Reserves Table 4: Summary of Earmarked Reserves and Provisions 2022-27

Department	Balance at 31/03/22 £m	Forecast at 31/03/23 £m	Forecast at 31/03/24 £m	Forecast at 31/03/25 £m	Forecast at 31/03/26 £m	Forecast at 31/03/27 £m
Adult Social Services	45.890	36.465	13.155	7.295	7.295	7.295
Children's Services	12.930	6.418	3.014	2.144	1.281	1.281
Community and Environmental Services	65.507	60.067	53.712	49.950	49.706	49.462
Strategy and Transformation Directorate	2.640	2.387	2.387	2.387	2.387	2.387
Governance Department	2.045	2.110	2.410	1.275	1.575	1.875
Finance and Commercial Services	3.793	2.724	2.724	2.724	2.724	2.724
Finance General	53.556	32.198	24.446	24.446	24.446	24.446
Total (excluding schools)	186.360	142.368	101.848	90.222	89.415	89.471
Reserves for capital use	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Schools	9.064	8.144	7.875	7.515	7.085	6.894
School – LMS	17.888	11.483	8.795	-1.322	-1.322	-1.322
DSG Reserve	-53.976	-73.613	-93.266	-108.341	-113.975	-109.006

Reserves Table 5: Detailed table of Reserves and Provisions 2022-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022 £m	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023 £m	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024 £m	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025 £m	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026 £m	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027 £m
Earmarked Reserves							
All Services							
Information Technology: The reserve is used by multiple services to set aside money for specific IT projects.	The reserve is used by multiple services to set aside money for specific IT projects.	3.001	2.259	2.112	2.112	2.112	2.112
Repairs and Renewals: This fund is to meet the cost of purchasing and repairing specific equipment.	The need for the reserve has changed over time as more equipment is procured via leases.	4.380	3.810	3.634	3.634	3.634	3.634
Unspent Grants and Contributions: This reserve contains the balances on the council's unconditional grants and contributions.	Mostly grants and contributions which will be used to fund spend over the budget planning period.	49.172	45.597	28.275	17.817	16.710	16.466
		56.554	51.665	34.021	23.563	22.456	22.212
Adult Social Services							
Business Risk Reserve: Reserves established to manage key risks.	Reserve which will be used to mitigate continuing financial risks in future years. Expected to be utilised in full in 2023-24.	13.025	8.822	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Prevention Fund: This includes the Living Well in the Community Fund, Prevention Fund and Strong and Well revenue funding as agreed by Members to support prevention work, mitigate the risks in delivering prevention savings and to help build capacity in the independent sector.	Some use expected to 2023-24.	0.554	0.664	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483
Social Services Residential Review: This reserve contains funds set aside to support delivery of Mental Health services within Adult Social Services.	Use of the reserve over the budget planning period is expected.	8.418	6.807	3.969	3.935	3.935	3.935
		21.997	16.293	4.451	4.418	4.418	4.418
Children's Services							
Business Risk Reserve: Reserves established to manage key risks.	Reserve which will be used to mitigate continuing financial risks in future years. Expected to be utilised in full in 2023-24.	1.825	1.759	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Children's Services Education Equalisation: To fund the variance in the number of Home to School/College Transport days in a financial year as a result of the varying dates of Easter holidays.	Use dependent upon the dates of future school years. Expected to be utilised in full in 2022-23.	2.872	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		4.697	1.759	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Community and Environmental Services							
Business Risk Reserve: Reserves established to manage key risks.	Reserve which will be used to mitigate continuing financial risks in future years.	1.724	1.724	0.724	0.724	0.724	0.724
Adult Education Income: The County Council is required to approve a budget for the Adult Education service five to six months in advance of the funding announcement by the Skills Funding Agency. In addition, the Skills Funding Agency can also impose penalties on the service in the event that targets are not met and these are dependent on results assessed at year end. This reserve enables the Council to manage risks associated with potential changes in Skills Funding Agency working.	Some use of this reserve is planned over the budget planning period.	3.274	2.049	2.049	2.049	2.049	2.049
Bus De-registration: This is funding to meet costs associated with the commercial deregistration of bus services.	There is no current planned use of this reserve.	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027
Economic Development and Tourism: This is primarily the Apprenticeship Scheme balance and committed EU project funding.	Funding for apprenticeships and EU Projects are mainly committed over the budget planning period.	7.212	3.789	3.789	3.789	3.789	3.789

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Fire Operational/PPE/Clothing: This reserve is to meet variable demands for new operational equipment and personal protective equipment.	The reserve is for items such as hazmat suits and training in dealing with chemicals.	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194	0.194
Fire Retained Turnout Payments: This reserve is to meet variable demands from larger incidents and higher than expected turnouts.	There is no current planned use of this reserve.	0.031	0.031	0.031	0.031	0.031	0.031
Highways Maintenance: This reserve enables a wide range of maintenance schemes to be undertaken. An annual amount is transferred to the works budget. The reserve is also used to carry forward balances on the Highways Maintenance Fund.	The balance mainly relates to commuted sums to meet future liabilities. These sums are paid by Developers to cover the additional maintenance work arising from their developments. The profile of use of the reserves reflects the future liabilities and planned general Highways expenditure.	10.579	9.743	9.743	9.743	9.743	9.743
Historic Buildings: This is used to buy and restore historic buildings at risk of being demolished and to make grants towards the restoration of buildings.	This reserve is used as and when required.	0.045	0.045	0.045	0.045	0.045	0.045
Park and Ride: The reserve is for future site works.	There is currently no planned usage of the fund, but it is retained to meet potential necessary site works.	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Prevention Fund: This includes a commuted sum from Developers to cover new bus routes and lump sums received from the Government for improvements to bus services.	There is no current planned use of this reserve.	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118
Residual Insurance and Lottery Bids: When a cash settlement was agreed with our insurers in respect of the library fire the proceeds were paid into an earmarked reserve. Subsequent costs have been funded from this source, and outstanding costs for buildings and books have been transferred to earmarked reserves. A few issues remain outstanding (e.g. Records conservation).	The reserve incorporates externally funded grants earmarked towards projects. Included within this are sums required to complete the conservation of damaged documents. The timings for use of this reserve are not yet known.	0.081	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034	0.034
Road Safety: This reserve reflects the surplus resulting from Speed Awareness Courses run by the council on behalf of the Police, to be reinvested within Road Safety.	There is currently no planned use of this reserve.	0.207	0.207	0.207	0.207	0.207	0.207
Street Lighting PFI Sinking Fund: This reserve has been created as a result of the Street Lighting PFI scheme and reflects receipt of government PFI grant and contributions which will be	Reductions in the level of this reserve are expected over the next four years.	5.013	3.743	3.743	3.743	3.743	3.743

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
needed in future financial years to meet contract payments.							
Waste Management Partnership Fund: This reserve is for waste management initiatives.	There is currently no planned use of this reserve.	0.425	0.425	0.425	0.425	0.425	0.425
		28.943	22.140	21.140	21.140	21.140	21.140
Strategy and Transformation							
Business Risk Reserve: Reserves established to manage key risks.	Some use of reserve is planned for 2022-23.	0.747	0.501	0.501	0.501	0.501	0.501
Strategic Ambitions Reserve: This reserve supports the council in achieving its aspirations and strategic ambitions for Norfolk.	Some use of reserve is planned for 2022-23.	0.385	0.315	0.315	0.315	0.315	0.315
		1.132	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.816	0.816
Governance							
NPLaw: This reserve has been created to support the development and increased activities of the business and smooth variations in trading.	The reserve has been built up from Nplaw Trading and as such belongs to the Partners of the scheme.	0.811	0.686	0.686	0.686	0.686	0.686

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Election Reserve: This is to cover the cost of holding County Council elections.	Regular ongoing contributions to the reserve are planned each year. The reserve will be used for the next election and will then be built up again. Usage will be dependent on the timing of elections.	0.534	0.834	1.134	0.000	0.300	0.600
		1.345	1.520	1.820	0.686	0.986	1.286
Finance and Commercial Services							
Archive Centre Sinking Fund: This reserve is to maintain the Archive Centre in accordance with a lease agreement between the County Council and the University of East Anglia.	This reserve is used as and when required.	0.247	0.328	0.328	0.328	0.328	0.328
County Farms: This reserve is to hold income related to the County Farms estate.	There is no current planned use of this reserve.	0.415	0.415	0.415	0.415	0.415	0.415
		0.661	0.743	0.743	0.743	0.743	0.743
Finance General							
Business Risk Reserve: Reserves established to manage key risks.	Reserve which will be used to mitigate continuing financial risks in future years.	5.275	4.275	4.275	4.275	4.275	4.275
Business Rates Risk Reserve: Reserves established to manage key risks.	To be fully utilised to support the 2023-24 budget.	7.752	7.752	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Corporate Covid Risk Reserve: Reserves established to hold funding for Covid related expenditure	Reserve use planned to support service delivery in 2022-23.	22.336	4.336	4.336	4.336	4.336	4.336
Insurance Reserve: This reserve reflects monies set aside for future potential insurance liabilities that are in excess of those provided for in the Insurance Provision.	There is no current planned use of this reserve.	0.134	0.134	0.134	0.134	0.134	0.134
Organisational Change and Redundancy Reserve: This reserve was created to provide one-off funding to support and invest in transformational change e.g. change initiatives such as Workstyle and to fund redundancy costs.	The timing of when the reserve is used is dependent upon future events and it is expected it will be mainly used to fund redundancy costs.	7.829	4.991	4.991	4.991	4.991	4.991
		43.326	21.488	13.736	13.736	13.736	13.736
Non-Schools Total		158.654	116.424	76.728	65.101	64.295	64.351
Reserves for Capital Use							
Usable Capital Receipts		1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Schools Reserves							
LMS Balances: This reserve represents estimated surpluses and deficits against delegated budgets for locally managed schools. These funds are retained for schools in accordance with the LMS arrangements approved by the DfE and are not available to the Council for general use.	The future usage will be part of individual school's financial plans.	17.888	11.483	8.795	-1.322	-1.322	-1.322
Norwich Schools PFI Sinking Fund: This reserve has been created as a result of the Norwich Schools PFI scheme and reflects receipt of government PFI grant and schools contributions which will be needed in future financial years to meet contract payments.	Some use of reserve expected in 2022-23. The reserve will then be replenished over the planning period.	2.101	1.848	1.579	1.220	0.789	0.599
Building Maintenance: This is money put aside to spend on building maintenance of schools.	Reserve balances are reviewed and utilised as required.	1.518	0.850	0.850	0.850	0.850	0.850
Unspent Grants and Contributions: This reserve contains the balances on the council's unconditional grants and contributions.	Utilised as grants are spent.	5.446	5.446	5.446	5.446	5.446	5.446
Schools Total		26.952	19.627	16.670	6.193	5.763	5.572

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
DSG Reserve: DSG is a ring-fenced grant, provided outside the local government finance settlement. The reserve represents the cumulative position of the ringfenced funding provided by the Department for Education.	The DSG deficit arises from the historic underfunding of the High Needs Block which supports high needs places in state special schools, independent schools and Alternative Provision as well as high needs provision in mainstream schools. The level of the deficit reflects our current forecasts.	-53.976	-73.613	-93.266	-108.341	-113.975	-109.006
Provisions							
Adult Social Services							
Provision for doubtful debts: A provision to cover bad debts.	This provision will change as bad debts are reviewed during the year, although the timing of this use cannot be predicted. A significant proportion is for specific debts with an element for general service-user related debts.	3.295	1.647	0.824	0.824	0.824	0.824

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Children's Services							
Provision for doubtful debts: A provision to cover bad debts.	This provision will change as bad debts are reviewed during the year, although the timing of this use cannot be predicted.	1.281	1.281	1.281	1.281	1.281	1.281
Community and Environmental Services							
Closed landfill long term impairment provision: Provision created to fund long term impairment costs arising from Closed Landfill sites, as per Government legislation and External Audit recommendation.	This is required to cover the legal requirements, but there is currently no specific call on the provision identified. A fixed amount from revenue is released each year to cover impairment costs.	12.914	12.914	12.914	12.914	12.914	12.914
Fire Service: This provision is held to meet variations on Fire Service staffing costs.	There is no current specific requirement for the use of this provision.	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.048	0.048
Finance and Commercial Services							
Provision for doubtful debts: A provision to cover bad debts.	This provision will change as bad debts are reviewed during the year, although the timing of this use cannot be predicted.	0.038	0.038	0.038	0.038	0.038	0.038

Appendix 3: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27

Title and purpose of Reserve / Provision	Planned future use	Opening Balances 31/03/2022	Forecast Balances 31/03/2023	Forecast Balances 31/03/2024	Forecast Balances 31/03/2025	Forecast Balances 31/03/2026	Forecast Balances 31/03/2027
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Finance General							
Insurance: Provision for insurance claims.	Contractual commitment based on reported claims and provision for incurred but unreported claims.	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	10.000
Redundancy: A provision to meet redundancy and pension strain costs.	This provision is forecast to be used in 2022-23.	0.132	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016
Non-Schools Provisions Total		27.707	25.944	25.120	25.120	25.120	25.120

6.2. The planned change in total non-school's reserves is a reduction of 48.94% over five years as shown in the following table.

Reserves Table 6: Change in reserves 2022-27

	March 31, 2022	March 31, 2027	Reduction %
	£m	£m	
General Balances	24.340	29.090	
Earmarked Reserves	158.654	64.351	
Total	182.994	93.441	48.94%
<i>The comparative figures for last year were:</i>			
	March 31, 2021	March 31, 2026	Reduction %
General Balances	23.763	26.018	
Earmarked Reserves	112.827	34.529	
Total	136.590	60.547	55.67%

6.3. When taking decisions on utilising reserves or not it is important that it is acknowledged that reserves are a one-off source of funding and once spent, can only be replenished from other sources of funding or reductions in spending. The practice has been to replenish reserves as part of the closure of accounts, however this can be difficult to predict, and these contributions are therefore not reflected in the figures shown. The forecast year end position of all reserves and provisions is reported to each meeting of Cabinet.

6.4. It should be noted that the Department for Education (DfE) consulted in November 2018⁵⁹ on proposals to require local authorities to report DSG reserves or deficits as a separate ring-fenced reserve in annual returns. What this meant for local authorities was that DSG deficits do not need to be covered by an equivalent amount in local authorities' general reserves. Consequently, new lines were added to the 2018-19 RO returns and local authorities are now expected to state their cumulative DSG deficit every year. In October 2019, the government consulted again⁶⁰ to clarify that DSG is a ring fenced grant separate from other general local authority funding. This consultation emphasised that the "Government's intention is that DSG deficits should not be covered from general funds but that over time they should be recovered from DSG income. No timescale has been set for the length of this process."

⁵⁹ Consultation on the implementation of new arrangements for reporting deficits of the dedicated schools grant, Department for Education, 12 November 2018:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/esfa-update-14-november-2018/esfa-update-local-authorities-14-november-2018#information-consultation-on-the-new-arrangements-for-reporting-deficits-of-the-dedicated-schools-grant-dsg>

⁶⁰ <https://consult.education.gov.uk/funding-policy-unit/revised-arrangements-for-the-dsg/>

- 6.5. The DSG deficit arises from the historic underfunding of the High Needs Block (HNB) which supports high needs places in state special schools, independent schools, and Alternative Provision. Norfolk is currently carrying an outstanding DSG deficit from previous financial years, with a forecast £93.266m deficit forecast for the end of 2023-24. On the basis of the accounting treatment established by government, this deficit DSG reserve position is not reflected in the reserve balances presented within this report but is included for completeness within the detailed Reserves Table 4 above.

7. Summary

- 7.1. Members could choose to agree different levels of reserves and balances, which could increase or decrease the level of risk in setting the revenue and capital budget. This would change both the risk assessment for the budget and the recommended level of balances.
- 7.2. The proposed level of reserves and balances set out in this report is considered to provide a prudent and robust basis for the Revenue Budget 2023-24 and will ensure the Council has adequate financial reserves to manage the delivery of services and the proposed savings in the financial years covered by the associated Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Norfolk County Council

Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-24 to 2026-27

1. Introduction

1.1. As part of the budget setting process, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services (Section 151 Officer) is required under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 to report on the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the calculation of the precept and therefore in agreeing the County Council's budget. The level of risk and budget assumptions underpin decisions when setting the revenue budget and capital programme, and affect the recommended level of general balances held. Members must therefore consider the details of these as set out in this report when recommending or agreeing the revenue budget and capital programme. This report includes the Section 151 Officer's formal statement and provides more detailed information on the risks, robustness of revenue estimates, and capital estimates used in the preparation of the County Council's budget.

2. Approach to providing assurance on robustness of estimates

2.1. The budget proposals are estimates of spending and income made at a point in time prior to the start of the next financial year. As such, this statement about the robustness of estimates does not provide an absolute guarantee but does provide Members with reasonable assurances that the draft budget has been based on the best available information and assumptions, and has been subject to scrutiny by relevant staff, Executive Directors, and Members.

2.2. The requirement to report on the robustness of estimates has been met through key budget planning processes during 2022-23, including:

- Departmental reviews of budgets including consideration of the deliverability of planned savings to inform decision making, which has led to the removal or delay of a number of savings to ensure that the proposed budget is robust;
- Review by finance staff of all cost pressures and regular reports to Executive Directors to provide challenge and inform approach;
- Issue of guidance to all services on budget preparation;
- Routine monitoring of current year budgets to inform future year planning;
- An organisational approach to planning with Cabinet providing guidance early on and throughout the process;
- Member review and scrutiny of developing proposals through budget challenge sessions which considered all services in May, July, September and December 2022.
- Member review and challenge via Cabinet in the July, October, and January meetings;

- Public review and challenge through budget consultation for specific proposals where required via the Council's consultation hub Citizen Space, including impact assessment of proposals;
- Assurance from fellow Executive Directors that final budget proposals to be considered by County Council are robust and are as certain as possible of being delivered;
- Member and Executive Director peer review of service growth and savings throughout the budget planning process.

2.3. In addition, and as set out in the Scheme of Authority and Financial Responsibility, Executive Directors are responsible for the overall management of the approved budget and the appointment of Responsible Budget Officers (RBOs) who are responsible for ensuring that authorised budgets are managed in the most effective and efficient manner in accordance with agreed plans and financial controls. Therefore managers with RBO responsibilities also play a key part in monitoring the financial position, identifying variances and financial risks and planning for service changes including forecast contractual, demographic, legislative and policy changes. In preparing estimates, considerable reliance is placed on Executive Directors and RBOs carrying out these responsibilities effectively.

3. CIPFA Financial Resilience Index and Financial Management Code

3.1. As set out in the Revenue Budget report ([Appendix 1](#)), CIPFA has published a [Financial Resilience Index](#)⁶¹ which sits alongside the Financial Management Code (FM Code). Both of these have helped to inform the council's 2023-24 budget setting process and the Executive Director of Finance has referred to the range of indicators shown in the index, and the requirements of the FM Code, in order to reach his conclusions on the robustness of estimate statement for 2023-24.

3.2. The index suggests that when compared to all other county councils:

- Norfolk holds a comparatively **low level of reserves**.
- Norfolk has a relatively **high level of gross external debt**.
- Norfolk **spends a relatively high proportion** of its net revenue budget⁶² **on social care** (for both Adults and Children).
- Council tax funds a relatively low proportion of net revenue expenditure (i.e. the council is **relatively more reliant on government grant**). This is linked to the relatively low tax base in Norfolk (a higher proportion of lower-banded properties compared to the England average).
- Norfolk **experiences relatively limited growth in business rates** income above the Business Rates Baseline.

⁶¹ <https://www.cipfa.org/services/financial-resilience-index-2022>

⁶² It should be noted that the index refers to net revenue expenditure as used in government financial returns, this includes central government funding e.g. Settlement Funding allocations and is therefore higher than the council's net revenue budget (which is council tax only).

3.3. It is important to note that the indicators within the index look at retrospective data and only provide an insight into the relative position of similar authorities. The council's level of reserves and external debt are considered annually as part of the budget setting process and monitored regularly throughout the year. Although for a number of historical reasons the council's level of reserves and external debt are respectively lower and higher than other county councils, this position reflects the council's overall strategies of avoiding holding taxpayers' resources unnecessarily in reserves and investing in strategic infrastructure projects. Both the level of reserves held, and the level of external debt, are considered appropriate in light of the council's strategy and the risks it is exposed to. Further details of these considerations are set out throughout the budget papers.

3.4. The council is well aware of the key financial risks that it faces, reporting on them regularly to members as part of both financial monitoring and within the council's risk register. All risks are kept under ongoing review. In addition, the council has taken a number of steps to minimise these risks and ensure that it remains financially resilient in the short to medium term. Actions have included:

- Regularly communicating financial pressures and risks to key stakeholders including to government as part of consultation responses and other lobbying activity.
- Fully engaging with Government including reporting requirements to identify financial pressures and maximise financial resources available to support Norfolk as a whole
- Making difficult decisions locally in order to maximise income and minimise cost pressures (for example, raising council tax and the adult social care precept, implementing difficult savings) to do everything in its power to protect its financial position.
- Submitting responses to consultations including the provisional Settlement, to seek to maximise the funding available for rural shire counties.
- Working with District Councils to reach a consensus position to pool business rates in 2023-24 in order to maximise business rates for Norfolk local authorities.
- Providing for budget pressures, while recognising that the system as a whole is not sustainable in the long term and a national funding solution is required.
- Considering and responding as appropriate to the value for money findings of external audit.
- Ongoing budget-setting work for 2023-24 to set a robust, balanced budget, and regular monitoring of the 2022-23 position including capital and treasury management.
- Annually undertaking a risk-based assessment of the level of general balances required and agreeing the Reserves policy.

3.5. The council keeps its financial position under careful review, and in 2023-24 will consider any further actions needed to enhance compliance with the CIPFA Financial Management code. The council's self-assessment of the current extent of compliance is set out within the Revenue Budget report ([Appendix 1](#)).

4. Risk Assessment of Estimates

4.1. The council manages risk registers corporately, for each service and for key projects. These incorporate all types of risk, including financial. In addition, a formal risk assessment has been undertaken of the revenue budget estimates in order to support the recommendation of the level of general balances. This risk assessment is detailed in the Statement on the Adequacy of Provisions and Reserves 2023-27 report ([Appendix 4](#)).

4.2. Budget proposals and emerging pressures were reported to Cabinet in November, along with identified key risks associated with these. This enables Members to assess the risk associated with achievability of the savings identified and supports consideration now of the overall robustness of the budget plans for 2023-24.

4.3. Early identification of risks enables Executive Directors to take mitigating action and to enable higher risk budgets to be more closely monitored during the year. The key budget risks that will require ongoing attention are:

- **Local sources of income:** In relation to council tax and business rates, District Council forecast figures are to be confirmed 31 January 2023;
- **Government funding:** The final 2023-24 settlement has not yet been published, meaning that some uncertainty remains about next year's allocations, as discussed in detail elsewhere. In addition, significant reforms to key government grant funding are unknown following the delayed Fair Funding Review and there is uncertainty about future plans for 75% Business Rates Retention. A list of revenue grants is included within Table 13 of the Revenue Budget 2023-24 report ([Appendix 1](#));
- **General pay and prices:** Inflationary pressures affecting the council's contracted spend and uncertainty about the level of future national pay awards;
- **Adult Social Services:** Managing increased demand for services and complexity of need, and facilitating adequate investment to deliver financially sustainable service provision;
- **Children looked after:** Meeting the challenge of delivering improvements within Children's Services to achieve both better outcomes and financial sustainability within the service, whilst also dealing with increased demand and complexity of needs;
- **High Needs Block (HNB):** Managing increased demand for high needs places in state special schools, independent schools, and Alternative Provision which currently represent a shortfall in funding within Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). Although the Government has now prescribed an accounting treatment for the DSG deficit and confirmed that in principle there is no expectation for local government to fund the DSG from council resources, this position is not guaranteed and will remain a subject of scrutiny for External Auditors. The Council has engaged in intensive negotiation over Summer 2022 with the DfE as part of its Safety Valve programme, intended to develop a plan to achieve an in-year balanced budget to enable the cumulative deficit to be addressed. Through these

discussions with the DfE, a plan has been prepared to bring the in-year deficit into surplus and to reduce the cumulative deficit over 6 years. The Budget provides for the Council's local contribution to this. If the council is unsuccessful in resolving the DSG deficit position over the medium term, the pressures and level of forecast overspend are such that it could represent a very real threat to the overall financial viability of the whole council. The position of the DSG budget in future years will therefore continue to have a very significant bearing on the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' judgement about the council's financial resilience and the robustness of its Budget.

- **Major capital schemes:** These include the Norwich Western Link, Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing, programme to improve SEND school provision, which are significant capital projects required to be met within planned capital funding; and
- **Organisational Change:** Managing significant transformation and staffing changes, including implementation of the outcomes of the Strategic Review.

4.4. The budget estimates span a four year period, 2023-27, and whilst forecast using the best available information, the planning assumptions and forecasts for future years will necessarily be based on less robust data and known factors. This is particularly exaggerated in 2024-25 for the reasons set out in more detail in the Revenue Budget report and Medium Term Financial Strategy. As part of the ongoing budget planning and monitoring cycle, these assumptions and emerging state of affairs are reviewed allowing the development of more detailed planning for the next financial years and revised medium term financial plans.

5. Robustness of Revenue Estimates

5.1. Within the framework set by the council's business plan, [*Better together, for Norfolk*](#), the service and budget planning process has focussed on the key priorities for service departments, including those services that are required by law, and involves a continuous review of the way that services are provided. Cost pressures to manage unavoidable inflationary, legislative and demand pressures have been included in the revenue budget estimates.

5.2. During May, July, September and December 2022, Cabinet members and Executive Directors undertook budget challenge sessions to consider budget plans and spending proposals. This provided an opportunity to evaluate initial proposals, risks arising from savings proposals, and emerging planning issues for services. The most significant spending implications affecting the Council continue to relate to Adults and Children's Services, and in particular:

- The majority of Children's Services spend is demand led, and across all areas of the children's agenda the council continues to see high and rising levels of need and demand. This includes a significant increase in the number of children with complex Special Educational Needs and Disabilities who require high levels of support and intervention whilst

living in the community as well as within residential settings, and significant pressures in placements and support budgets for children looked after, keeping children safe at home and care leavers. Following the recognition of a “good” Ofsted judgement, priorities for the service include transformation of children’s social care, and our Special Educational Needs and Alternative Provision transformation. A comprehensive strategy is in place to mitigate the increasing levels of demand, but the national pressures and trends result in risk remaining.

- Managing rising demographic pressures through embedding strategies for Adults service delivery to promote independence. In particular invest to save in early intervention and targeted prevention to keep people independent for longer, developing integrated arrangements with Health (Better Care Fund and the Integrated Care System (ICS)) including actions to improve delayed transfers of care. Supporting a stable care market though funding price inflation and market pressures (including national living wage and cost of care increases). Preparing for the new inspection regime, absorbing and adjusting to any new requirements and/or new burdens arising from the delayed implementation of social care reform.

5.3. As part of the budget process, Cabinet and Executive Directors have considered all the budget reductions and growth pressures and these are reflected in the proposed budget. In addition, some of the key risks identified, including risks relating to the achievability of savings, have been taken into consideration in the Cabinet’s budget recommendations, which will enable some budget risks to be managed down and this is reflected in the risk assessment of the recommended level of general balances.

5.4. Budget planning for 2023-24 has included extensive work to review the deliverability of savings and understand service pressures. As a result, the 2023-24 Budget sees a significant investment in Departmental budgets through both the provision of growth for cost pressures, and the removal of previously planned savings, to provide assurance about the robustness of the revenue budget and the deliverability of savings. This represents the net removal or delay of £3.040m previous budget round savings from next year’s budget.

5.5. The Council’s budget planning assumes that any undeliverable savings have been removed in the exercise detailed above and therefore that all the remaining savings included for 2023-24 are deliverable.

5.6. The table below shows the current budget position and the following three years based on the recommendations set out in the Revenue Budget report ([Appendix 1](#)) and the current budget forecast for 2022-23. The Medium Term Financial Strategy does not reflect plans to fully meet the funding shortfall between 2024-25 to 2026-27. As part of developing the budget for future years, work will continue to identify further proposals for service provision in order to identify ways to address these deficits in future years. The Revenue Budget report sets out in [Section 4](#) details of the assumptions which inform the Section 151 Officer’s judgement of the robustness of estimates and in particular confirms that **early planning to address the 2024-25 Budget gap will be essential**

along with the production of a realistic plan for reducing the budget requirement in future years through robust saving proposals, or the reduction of currently identified pressures.

Robustness Table 1: Forecast Budget Deficit 2022-23 to 2026-27

	2022-23 (Period 8 forecast)	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget	2026-27 Budget
	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
Forecast outturn budget deficit	2.054	0.000	45.920	35.491	42.716

5.7. Work is underway by Executive Directors and budget holders to deliver a balanced outturn position at year end as reported in period 8 Financial Monitoring report which currently forecasts an overspend of £2.054m will be balanced at year-end. The non-delivery of unachievable future year savings from the 2022-26 budget round has been addressed as part of the 2023-24 budget process, however any 2022-23 savings which have not been achieved in-year due to timing delays are assumed to be delivered in 2023-24.

5.8. The factors and budget assumptions used in developing the 2023-27 budget estimates are detailed over sixteen headings, including drivers of growth, savings and other planning assumptions and set out below.

Robustness Table 2: Summary of budget assumptions and approach

Budget Assumption	Explanation of financial forecast and approach
Growth Pressures	
1) Inflation	<p>Pay inflation has been assumed at 3% for 2023-24 to 2026-27, with a 2% contingency in 2023-24 and 1% in 2024-25. The County Council is currently part of the national agreement and therefore pay awards for 2023-24 onwards will be determined by any agreements reached. Every 1% variation in pay amounts to around £3m for the council. There is therefore a risk that pay awards could vary from this assumption over the planning period.</p> <p>Pensions – The 2022 actuarial valuation of the pension fund has set the employer contribution rates from 1 April 2023 at 15.5% (unchanged) plus a lump sum for each of the three years 2023-26.</p> <p>Price Inflation is provided where a contractual increase is required. This is at the contractual rate where appropriate.</p>
2) Demand and Demographics	<p>There are three key areas where demand and demographic pressures have a significant impact on the council's budget planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gross demographic pressures in Adult Social Care totalling £6.700m reflecting rising demand for services as people live longer

Budget Assumption	Explanation of financial forecast and approach
	<p>and transition of service users from Children's Services to adult social care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gross demand pressures of £11.650m in Children's Services reflecting additional costs including increasing demand and complexity of need for children looked after, keeping children safe at home and care leavers, alongside home to school transport pressures, particularly for children with special educational needs and disabilities. Demand and demographic pressures from increased maintenance costs of infrastructure assets.
3) Legislative changes	<p>The budget estimates include the following assumptions with regard to current and future legislative changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Government implemented a National Living Wage (NLW) from 2016-17, starting at £7.20. In April 2023 it will be increased to £10.42⁶³. The exact level at which the National Living Wage will be set in future years has therefore not been confirmed. Although assumed cost pressures relating to the National Living Wage have been included in budgets, there is a risk these could diverge in future. Cost pressures assuming an increase above the core price inflation for pay and price market pressures have been included. Cost pressures have been included associated with the increased income received for the Improved Better Care Fund.
4) Policy decisions	<p>The 2023-24 budget includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £9.000m to address pressures in Adult Social Services; £24.540m to address pressures in Children's Services; £5.780m to address pressures in Community and Environmental Services.
5) Interest Rates	<p>Budgeted interest earnings on investments are based on guaranteed fixed deposit returns, available instant liquidity rates and market forecasts provided by the council's Treasury Advisors.</p>
Savings	
6) Income	<p>Inflationary increases to fees and charges have been included within the budget proposals where appropriate. Other changes to income either through expected reductions in income, or initiatives to increase income generation, are reported as individual budget proposals.</p>
7) Savings	<p>Savings have been identified across all services and range from productivity efficiency savings, to reductions in service provision. All managers are responsible for ensuring that proposed savings are robust and delivered in accordance with plans. Measures throughout the planning process have supported review and challenge of the deliverability of savings and where appropriate a number of savings have been removed or re-profiled to later years.</p>

⁶³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/minimum-wage-rates-for-2023>

Budget Assumption	Explanation of financial forecast and approach
	Changes or delays in delivering savings will result in variance to the budget and as such savings will be closely tracked throughout the year as part of the budget monitoring process and reported to Cabinet, with management actions identified as necessary.
Other Planning assumptions	
8) Funding changes	<p>The provisional Settlement provided only indications for one year of funding allocations in 2023-24, which remain to be confirmed in the final Local Government Finance Settlement. Uncertainty about the outcomes (and indeed in some cases progress) of Local Government funding reforms including Social Care Reform, the Fair Funding Review (FFR), Business Rates Retention Scheme (BRRS), which have all been delayed until at least 2025-26, means that the council faces a very significant level of uncertainty about funding levels in future years.</p> <p>The provisional Settlement confirmed that existing social care funding of £30.342m plus additionally announced social care funding of £25.030m, Discharge Support funding of £5.554m and ASC Market Sustainability funding of £9.785m will also be provided in 2023-24. The MTFS assumes these will be ongoing, and indications are that they will continue until at least 2024-25, but a degree of uncertainty remains.</p> <p>The Revenue Budget report sets out the detail of key grants and highlights that many key areas of funding are yet to be confirmed for 2023-24.</p> <p>In relation to schools, funding is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and Pupil Premium, which is paid to the County Council and passed on to schools in accordance with the agreed formula allocation. It is assumed that all school pay and prices inflationary pressures will be absorbed within the DSG allocation.</p> <p>Norfolk faces severe pressures on High Needs Block (HNB) funding within DSG and submitted a disapplication request in respect of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for 2022-23 for 1% transfer in addition to the 0.5% transfer from the Schools Block (SB) to the High Needs Block (HNB) agreed by Schools Forum on 16 November 2022. The Council is awaiting notification from the Secretary of State as to whether the request has been accepted or declined, alongside whether the Minister has approved Norfolk's Safety Valve programme.. Further details are provided in the Dedicated Schools Grant Budget report elsewhere on this agenda. The accounting treatment for DSG cumulative deficits allows councils to carry a negative balance on these reserves. This treatment is dictated by Government but potentially remains a significant issue and will result in a material deficit balance in the council's Statement of Accounts until the DSG recovery plan has been delivered.</p>

Appendix 4: Norfolk County Council Statement on the Robustness of Estimates 2023-27

Budget Assumption	Explanation of financial forecast and approach
9) Financial risks inherent in any significant new funding partnerships; major contracts or major capital developments	Financial risks are included within the assessment of the level of general balances. The financial risks arising from major capital schemes such as the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing, Norwich Western Link and investment in specialist school places continue to be closely monitored and reflected within the County Council's capital budget proposals.
10) Availability of funds to deal with major contingencies	All provisions and earmarked reserves have been reviewed to test their adequacy and continued need. A risk assessment of the level of general balances has been undertaken and the budget reflects the assessed level of balances required. The council also has recourse to the Bellwin scheme in the event of disasters or emergencies.
11) Overall financial standing of the authority	<p>The council's treasury management activity manages both short term cash to provide security, liquidity and yield, and the council's longer term borrowing needs to fund capital expenditure through either long term borrowing or the utilisation of temporary cash resources pending long term borrowing. In accordance with the approved strategy, the council currently continues to borrow for capital purposes, while using cash balances on a temporary basis to avoid the cost of 'carrying' debt in the short term.</p> <p>At 31 December 2022, the council's outstanding debt totalled £896m. The council continues to maintain its total gross borrowing level within its Authorised Limit of £1,061m (prudential indicators) for 2022-23. The Authorised Limit being the affordable borrowing limit required by section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003.</p> <p>There are a number of treasury related indicators to restrict treasury activity within certain limits and manage risk. These include maturity profile of debt; and investments greater than 365 days. Monitoring is reported regularly to Cabinet on an exception basis.</p> <p>At the end of December 2022 (Period 9), the council's cash balances stood at £275m.</p>
12) The authority's track record in budget and financial management	<p>As at Period 8 the 2022-23 revenue budget is forecast to be overspent by £2.054m on a net budget of £464.123m (gross £1.637bn). Executive Directors are working to deliver a balanced outturn position at year-end.</p> <p>Ernst and Young, the council's external auditor, issued an unqualified opinion on the Council's 2020-21 accounts in December 2021 and concluded that the council made appropriate arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. The audit of the 2021-22 accounts has not yet been concluded due to the external auditors planned phased approach to delivering the 2021-22 audits. At the time of writing, it is anticipated that the Council's audit</p>

Budget Assumption	Explanation of financial forecast and approach
	committee will consider the results of the 2021-22 audit at its meeting in March 2023. ⁶⁴
13)The authority's capacity to manage in-year budget pressures	The level of general balances is assessed as part of the budget setting process, reviewed monthly and reported to Cabinet as part of the regular monitoring process. Review and challenge improves the accuracy of budget estimates, which aims to support management and the early identification of budget issues. The regular reporting of risk and monitoring of mitigating actions supports in-year budget management.
14)The strength of the financial information and reporting arrangements	Information on budget and actual spend is reported publicly and monitoring reports are published regularly throughout the year. The reports are on a risk basis, so that attention is concentrated on what is most important.
15)The end of year procedures in relation to budget under/overspends at authority and departmental level	Guidance on end of year procedures is reported annually and arrangements are monitored. Detailed year-end financial information is reported alongside services' performance monitoring. The proposed year end arrangements will be reported to Cabinet for approval.
16)The authority's insurance arrangements to cover major unforeseen risks	The County Council has a mix of self-insurance and tendered insurance arrangements. Premiums are set on an annual basis and reflected within the budget planning. Premiums are subject to annual variance due to external factors and internal performance, risk and claims management. General balances include assessment of financial risk from uninsured liabilities.

6. Robustness of capital estimates

6.1. As with the revenue budget, the capital programme is designed to address the authority's key priorities, including schemes which will help transform the way in which services are provided. To this end, the programme is prepared on the basis of a number of factors, including previously agreed projects, spend to save proposals, and infrastructure and property requirements.

6.2. Projects are costed using professional advice relative to the size and nature of the scheme. Where appropriate, a contingency allowance is included in cost estimates to cover unavoidable and unforeseeable costs. The programme is guided by a simple prioritisation model: schemes that score less than that achieved by the repayment of debt represent bad value for money. In this way, the Council will achieve the most economic use of its scarce capital resources.

6.3. The largest on-going capital programmes relate to transport infrastructure and schools. In both cases there is significant member involvement through Cabinet. For other large projects, appropriate oversight is put in place.

⁶⁴ <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/our-budget-and-council-tax/statement-of-accounts>

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

6.4. An estimate of potential capital receipts is made each year. The actual level of receipt in any one financial year can never be forecast in advance with any degree of certainty due to market conditions and interest from purchasers and reduced receipts may result in fewer capital projects going ahead or additional future revenue costs.

6.5. The risks associated with having to fund large unforeseen programme variations are addressed mainly as a result of the Council being able to amend the timing of projects between years. The ability to re-profile projects between years does not result in a significant funding risk because the vast majority of funding is not time-bound, although there are inflationary risks which have to be considered.

7. Summary

7.1. This appendix sets out details of the assessment of the robustness of the estimates used in preparing the proposed revenue and capital budget. There are no direct resource implications arising from this report, but it provides information and details of the assumptions used to support the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' statement on the Robustness of the Estimates and provides assurances to Members prior to recommending and agreeing the revenue and capital budgets and plans for 2023-27.

7.2. Members could choose to agree different assumptions and therefore increase or reduce the level of financial risk in setting the revenue and capital budgets. This would potentially change the risk assessment for the budget and the recommended level of general balances held.

Norfolk County Council

Budget Consultation findings report 2023-24

1. Background

Norfolk County Council has conducted an annual budget consultation for financial year 2023-24.

The budget consultation was open between Friday 21 October and closed on Friday 16 December 2022 and sought views from the public and stakeholders on the level of council tax, including the adult social care precept. We also consulted on three other savings proposals, namely:

- by reducing summer opening hours at Norfolk's recycling centres and closing all recycling centres on Wednesdays
- by reducing the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office
- by reducing weed spraying activities on the highway

No other outline budget proposals needed to go out to further public consultation as none were deemed to directly impact on service delivery. However, if it is apparent, once the budget is agreed and the Council starts to implement the proposals, that any of the proposals do impact on delivering services, then we may need to carry out detailed consultation on those proposals in the future.

2. Methodology

An online consultation was developed which ran for eight weeks, closing on the 16 December 2022. This was hosted on the County Council's Citizen Space consultation hub. Paper copies, large print copies and Easy Read copies were available to download from the online portal, and available on request by email and phone (with a Freepost returns process in place).

People could choose which proposals to comment on which is why there are individual reports per proposal. Some people also indicated that they did not want their comments made public in which case their feedback is integrated but no related verbatim commentary included.

3. Promotion

To ensure as many residents as possible could take part in the consultation it was promoted through the following channels:

- Press releases to all media partners/channels across Norfolk
- Email briefing to members of our Norfolk Resident's Panel.
- Social media promotion on Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, NextDoor
- Members briefing to all NCC councillors
- Information on the staff intranet and staff newsletters (including Friday Takeaway)

- Information on the Council's website www.norfolk.gov.uk
- Letters sent to key stakeholders
- Letter to 520 Parish Councils, and promotion via Norfolk Association of Local Councils
- Parish Council webinar (see details below in Section 3.1)

We asked respondents how they heard about this year's budget consultation for council tax and the response is tabled below.

Option	Total	Percent
Local media (e.g newspaper, radio)	92	31.40%
From a social media post (e.g Facebook)	48	16.38%
From a friend	9	3.07%
From a group I belong to	3	1.02%
From my place of work or education	13	4.44%
The Norfolk Residents' Panel	37	12.63%
District Council web page	0	0.00%
Norfolk County Council web page	29	9.90%
My Parish Council	7	2.39%
From an email I received	40	13.65%
Not Answered	15	5.12%
Total	293	100%

3.1. Parish Council Webinar Event

On 22 November 2022 we participated in a webinar hosted by the Norfolk Association of Local Councils (NALC) and delivered via the Zoom platform. Parish Council representatives were invited to this online meeting with Councillor Andrew Jamieson, lead Member for Finance and Joel Hull, Assistant Director for Waste and Water Management.

Participants were invited to find out more about our budget consultation and our specific proposals. Cllr Jaimeson and Joel Hull, gave a presentation outlining our proposals, followed by a questions and answers session with Cllr Jamieson. A recording of the event was made available after the session via the NALC. After the session closed, participants were invited to visit our consultation online and provide written feedback if they so wished. In total, representatives from 17 parish councils attended the event. The parish councils and other organisations that had representatives at the meeting were:

- East Rudham
- Framingham Earl
- Hoveton
- Marham
- Middleton
- Moving to Norfolk

- North Norfolk District Council
- Northwold and Whittington
- Roydon – Diss
- Stalham
- Swardeston
- Taverham
- Terrington St John
- Thornham
- Tilney All Saints

4. Analysis and reporting

Every response has been read in detail and analysed to establish the range of people's opinions, identify any repeated or consistently expressed views, and evaluate the anticipated impact of proposals on people's lives.

In most instances data is expressed in terms of the *number* of respondents owing to relatively small sample bases. Where *percentages* are used, totals may not necessarily add up to 100% because of rounding or multiple responses. The bases for each question vary owing to respondent selection of questions they wished to answer.

When summarising the feedback to the open questions relating to general council tax including adult social care precept and three savings proposals, we have selected quotations to help illustrate the spectrum of key themes emerging from the consultation feedback but these should not be taken to reflect the entirety of opinion. These quotes faithfully reflect an individual's articulation of that theme, and as such all quotations are given verbatim, with respective spelling/punctuation.

Please note that some respondents asked that we did not publish their comments. In addition, comments about individual services have been fed back directly to departments where felt appropriate or necessary.

5. Respondent numbers to our budget proposals

We received, in total **805** responses to our budget consultation. The number of respondents for each proposal are tabled below:

Budget Savings Proposal	Response Rate
Your views on our proposal to increase council tax in 2023-2024	293
Your views on our proposals to save money by reducing summer opening hours at Norfolk's recycling centres and closing all recycling centres on Wednesdays	332
Your views on our proposal to save money by reducing the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office	69
Your views on our proposal to save money by reducing weed spraying activities on the highway	111

6. Proposal 1: To increase Council Tax in 2023-24

Of the 293 responses received to the council tax consultation, the majority, 291 were online submissions to Citizen Space and two were via email. It should be noted that respondents could choose which questions they wanted to comment on, so not all respondents answered all questions; and as such, the bases for each question vary according to respondent question selection. We received exactly 293 responses to our council tax consultation. Of these, 265 people or 90.44% replied as individuals.

Option	Total	Percent
An individual/member of the public	265	90.44%
On behalf of a voluntary or community group	3	1.02%
On behalf of a statutory organization	0	0.00%
On behalf of a business	0	0.00%
A Norfolk County Councillor	1	0.34%
A district or borough councillor	2	0.68%
A town or parish councillor	1	0.34%
A Norfolk County Council employee	17	5.80%
Not Answered	4	1.37%
Total	293	100%

Responses by groups, organisations and businesses:

Three online consultation respondents told us which group, organisation or business they were responding on behalf of. The organisations cited:

- Broadland District Council
- North Norfolk District Council
- Voluntary organisation, Attleborough (name not provided)

Respondent Profile:

The profile of 'individual' respondents (293 individuals) is as below:

Option	Total	Percent
Male	139	47.44%
Female	123	41.98%
Prefer not to say	20	6.83%
Prefer to self-describe	3	1.02%
Not Answered	8	2.73%

Responses by age (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	4	1.37%
25-34	26	8.87%
35-44	38	12.97%
45-54	59	20.14%
55-64	66	22.53%
65-74	52	17.75%
75-84	17	5.80%
85 or older	1	0.34%
Prefer not to say	21	7.17%
Not Answered	9	3.07%

Responses by long-term illness, disability or limiting health problem (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	67	22.87%
No	175	59.73%
Prefer not to say	43	14.68%
Not Answered	8	2.73%

Responses by condition or disability (309 responses, some consultees have ticked more than one box)

Option	Total	Percent
Blind or partially sighted	4	1.37%
D/deaf or hard of hearing	10	3.41%
Limiting health condition e.g. heart disease, asthma, strokes, osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia and myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME) etc.	34	11.60%
Learning Disabilities	2	0.68%
Neurodiversity e.g. autistic spectrum disorders, dyslexia, dyspraxia	5	1.71%
Mental health conditions – e.g. depression, schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorders, eating disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder	10	3.41%
Physical disability e.g. limb disorder, amputee, wheelchair user, cerebral palsy, motor neurone disease, muscular dystrophy	12	4.10%
Other	14	4.78%
Not Answered	218	74.40%
Total	309	105%

Responses by ethnic group (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	233	79.52%
Irish	2	0.68%
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	1	0.34%
Roma	0	0.00%
Not Answered	57	19.45%

Responses by language spoken (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
English	276	94.20%
Not Answered	17	5.80%

Responses by district (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Breckland	31	10.58%
Broadland	53	18.09%
Great Yarmouth	15	5.12%
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	36	12.29%
North Norfolk	26	8.87%
Norwich	67	22.87%
South Norfolk	56	19.11%
Not Answered	9	3.07%
Total	293	100%


Responses from those with caring responsibilities (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
No	205	69.97%
Yes – for children with additional needs	17	5.80%
Yes – for older family members	39	13.31%
Yes – other	15	5.12%
Not Answered	17	5.80%

Responses from those outlining employment status (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Employed (full time)	128	43.69%
Employed (part time)	38	12.97%
Self employed	16	5.46%
Unemployed	2	0.68%
Student	0	0.00%
Looking after the family home	9	3.07%
Long-term sick	9	3.07%
Retired	78	26.62%
Not Answered	13	4.44%

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 2.99% in 2023-24?



Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	48	16.38%
Agree	96	32.76%
Neither agree or disagree	33	11.26%
Disagree	33	11.26%
Strongly disagree	76	25.94%
Don't know	2	0.68%
Not Answered	5	1.71%

One hundred and thirteen people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement are that additional money is necessary to maintain important social services (38); the proposed increase is acceptable or reasonable (35); and the proposed increase reflects current economic conditions in which all costs are rising (25). However, people who agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal also mentioned the financial hardship of paying more and referred to the need for NCC to operate more efficiently.

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 2.99% in 2023-24?		
Agree or strongly agree		
Theme	No	Comments
Comments about current services, demand for services, or paying for services.	38	I think it's hard to raise it at the moment, but the thought of cutting services - especially social care - is even worse. Because the money is needed to provide services to the most vulnerable. Unfortunately it is left to local government to fund social care. It is important that this is funded generously but well managed to protect other services that have an impact when this is not managed effectively. Because the quantity spent is not enough to match demand. I think it is vitally important that this area has the proper level of investment now and in future as it is one of the biggest challenges the country face with such an ageing population.
Comments about the proposed increase being fair, reasonable, or acceptable.	35	This is a fair increase for an essential service. This feels like a reasonable increase. I understand and accept that an increase is needed to ensure funding to support the council. It's what most people can afford.
Comments about wider financial factors which affect NCC such as cost of living or inflation.	25	Costs are rising for everyone including councils so they need the money to fulfill their obligations. Costs are rising, and the residents of Norfolk will have to share the burden. This seems like a reasonable increase, however you have to take in to consideration how most people are being affected by the cost of living crisis. Wages aren't increasing and more and more people in the area do not have a stable income.
Comments about people's inability to pay because of their personal financial situation.	17	I would reluctantly agree to this rise. I think most people can sorely cope with much more increases in household income. I am now classified as living in fuel poverty. In addition to this, council tax is now 15% of my total income, a record high and a huge burden on my already struggling finances. Any increase greater than 2.99% would cripple me.
Comments about efficiency savings, ways NCC could, or	14	I feel that adult social care should be protected. Councils should focus money on the services that really matter and see efficiencies wherever they can.


should save money.		An increase is required to cover increasing costs of providing Adult Care particularly given the increasing age of the population of Norfolk. Other efficiencies are required from the council though.
--------------------	--	--

One hundred and one people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement are that people cannot afford to pay more (43); the negative impact of wider economic factors on people's finances (24); and the requirement for NCC to operate more efficiently (21).

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 2.99% in 2023-24?		
Disagree or strongly disagree		
Theme	No	Comments
Comments about people's inability to pay because of their personal financial situation.	43	I am 81 years of age living totally alone with a wife in a care home for the past 6 years. I receive no benefits, and currently sit at night without both lights or heating, Tell me how I could possibly pay any more? Where are families meant to budget for this with all other costs going up. You are putting families in an impossible situation. People's income is not going up at the same level as the rising prices making an already bad situation worse. People simply cannot afford to pay more. With many people already having to decide between heating and eating any additional cost in council tax should be avoided.
Comments about efficiency savings, ways NCC could, or should save money.	24	Ncc are evidently failing at adult social care as reported in press. Perhaps find a more efficient way rather than throwing money at it. The council's of Norfolk are inefficient, ineffective talking shops that waste Council tax payers hard earned money. They do not meet or consult with tax payers and have little idea on how to effectively manage money. To much money is wasted in the wrong places on people who put in nothing.
Comments about wider financial factors such as cost of living or inflation.	21	Prices are at its highest in a long time and salaries are not even meeting the inflation so any additional increase to mandatory payments like council tax and energy bills are not appropriate. At a time of austerity and rising prices the expectation would be that the services manages within existing budget and reflects what is an essential or non essential services. Pay awards are falling way below the rate of inflation and cost of living.
Comments about the rationale behind the proposal.	15	Increasing Council Tax at all is abhorrent, particularly when you are then also talking about cutting services - so we pay more for less....does this make sense to you? Any increase at this time is unacceptable. Particularly when you fail to deliver so frequently and are looking to cut services at the same time as raising council tax
Comments about the concept of council tax as a form of taxation	13	The extra money should be raised by stopping the 25% council tax reduction given to single househo;ders. They receive the same service from the council as multi occupied householders.

		My immediate next door neighbour linked to my house is in a lower tax band. I have challenged my band with no success. So you now expect me to continue to pay tax?
--	--	---

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 4.10% in 2023-24?



Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	28	9.56%
Agree	40	13.65%
Neither agree or disagree	23	7.85%
Disagree	61	20.82%
Strongly disagree	132	45.05%
Don't know	3	1.02%
Not Answered	6	2.05%

Fifty-three people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement are that additional money is necessary to maintain important social services (28); the proposed increase is acceptable or reasonable (13); and the proposed increase reflects current economic conditions in which all costs are rising (10).

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 4.10% in 2023-24?

Agree or strongly agree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about current services, demand for services, or paying for services.	28	<p>Because we need to keep as many services going so this isn't too much of a hit to general tax payers.</p> <p>This has to be a top priority, but the extra money must be spent wisely with a view to providing services for the longer term</p> <p>Adult services are grossly underfunded and patients suffer as a result. I would like to see this spent on mental health services particularly.</p> <p>Services to vulnerable people at this time is of paramount importance.</p>
Comments about the proposed increase being fair, reasonable, or acceptable.	13	<p>Inflation has been soaring and a slightly higher increase does not seem unreasonable in these times.</p> <p>Realistically, this is probably the rate required.</p> <p>I agree that in the current economic situation a rise of 4% is reasonable. I do however feel that the proportion ringfenced as part of the adult social care precept should rise by at least 2% of this 4.1% increase.</p>
Comments about wider financial factors which affect NCC such as cost of living or inflation.	10	<p>Costs have gone up so our council tax will need to go up.</p> <p>Whilst I don't want my bill increasing I do understand with inflation everything is costing more. So out of the three option obviously I would prefer the lowest rise I would accept the 4.10%.</p>


One hundred and fifty-eight people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement are that people cannot afford to pay more (70); the negative impact of wider economic factors on people's finances (33); and the need for NCC to operate more efficiently (32).

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) by 4.10% in 2023-24?
Disagree or strongly disagree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about people's inability to pay because of their personal financial situation.	70	Because I can barely afford my own bills. 4.10% is a massive amount - as per previous comment this is just not possible. Who can afford this? Most people can't. I am on a pension and cannot afford such a large increase. I simply cannot afford a 4.1% increase and would rather go to jail than pay this amount. If you impose an increase of 4.1% I will be unable to heat my home and feed my family,
Comments about wider financial factors which affect NCC such as cost of living or inflation.	33	It is not justified in the light of the major crises the country is in. Because the rises in tax and living costs are greater than the rising wages or pensions. Because cost of living has increased dramatically. Households can't take any more. Because with high inflation and increases in mortgage rates people are already suffering and it is unfair.
Comments about efficiency savings, ways NCC could, or should save money.	32	The finances of the council are already poorly managed. Giving you more is not the answer. You all need to find savings in house. Stop wasting money on frivolous things and fund the important things people care about. There is too much waste at the Council. I think there are more manager savings that can be achieved by shortening the approval process for many council activities and less use of expensive consultants would be helpful too. Efficiency savings are required not increasing taxes.
Comments about the rationale behind the proposal.	28	I see no persuasive evidence to support that level of increase. It shouldn't be for the residents to bail out your poor accounting. You are ripping the good people on Norfolk off for your failures to run all that Norfolk County Council own in a way that is fair to it's residents'. You as a council cannot keep piling money on people bills causing stress and hardship on people forever.
Comments about the concept of council tax as a form of taxation	15	We're in a cost of living crisis. Tax the wealthiest. And outdated council tax bands are not an accurate estimator of wealth. Council tax bands are a regressive form of taxation. Council tax is sorely unfair anyway. It should be based on ability to pay, not how much your property is worth which is meaningless unless you sell.
Comments about current services, demand for	10	An increase too far, may cover the cost but doesn't address the inefficient service.

services, or paying for services.		The social care precept is simply used as an excuse to raise tax. It has already been increased significantly over recent years but the services it is said to support are as poor as they were before.
-----------------------------------	--	---

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) in line with current rates of inflation? (September 2022, listed the current rate of inflation at 10.1%)



Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	22	7.51%
Agree	14	4.78%
Neither agree nor disagree	21	7.17%
Disagree	56	19.11%
Strongly Disagree	174	59.39%
Not Answered	6	2.05%

Twenty-six people explained why they agree or strongly agree with the proposal. The main reason for agreement is that services require a lot of financial support to be maintained or improved (13).

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) in line with current rates of inflation in 2023-24?

Agree or strongly agree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about current services, demand for services, or paying for services.	13	<p>This is the burden we all need to share of we're going to keep the front line services you provide.</p> <p>So that adult social care can continue to be provided to those that need it.</p> <p>Need more money to maintain services.</p> <p>Totally agree should pay more for good social care make Norfolk the best social care in the entire country.</p>

One hundred and ninety-eight people explained why they disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement are that people cannot afford to pay more (97); the negative impact of economic factors on people's finances (50); NCC's reasoning behind the proposal (47); and the need for NCC to operate more efficiently (37).

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) in line with current rates of inflation?

Disagree or strongly disagree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about people's inability to pay because of their personal financial situation.	97	<p>Essentially I can't afford it.</p> <p>You have got to be kidding, how can you possibly expect people to pay any more on council tax when we can't afford to feed ourselves and keep warm. We have already cut back on anything that would be considered as non essential to try to survive. In the current circumstances it is absolutely disgusting that you would even raise this this question. You should be ashamed.</p> <p>Nobody has any bloody money!</p> <p>That is a ridiculous increase, people can't afford to eat, let alone keep warm and have hot shower.</p> <p>There is now I could afford such a large increase. My income has not gone up at all and there are other pressures i.e. food and heating costs. I could not afford to pay an increase of that magnitude.</p> <p>A 10% increase in my council tax is outrageous and would render me homeless and destitute.</p> <p>This is an outrageous option! As mentioned previously, people simply cannot afford this increase when salaries aren't rising at all, let alone matching inflation.</p>
Comments about wider financial factors	50	<p>Our pay rises are not inflation linked neither are pensions so why should the Council Tax be?</p>

Q: How far would you agree or disagree with increasing Norfolk County Council's share of council tax (including the Adult Social Care precept) in line with current rates of inflation? Disagree or strongly disagree

Theme	No	Comments
which affect NCC such as cost of living or inflation.	.	Current levels of inflation exceptionally high due to short term global problems, increasing in line will cripple household incomes and place further demands on statutory services. People have already been hit hard enough by the cost of living crisis, a rise of this much is too high. Too much in the current financial climate.
Comments about the rationale behind the proposal.	42	Taking the absolute bananas, no one will be able to afford it with rents, gas electric and food going up. Actually have some common sense. It's a ridiculous proposition to even come up with, even more so with the hardships people are facing. I don't know in what world you think that would be acceptable. Cannot believe the council are being that insensitive towards the public at a time of massive increases in cost of living.
Comments about efficiency savings, ways NCC could, or should save money.	37	The council cannot keep increasing CT at the current rate. The council needs to find efficiency savings first. Unaffordable you need to look at yourselves and save money on top salaries etc. Most council tax is wasted. We need less councils (3 is ridiculous), more police and street lights turning back on. I can't afford it so cut your costs in other ways. Get better value for money, reduce staff benefits.
Comments about the concept of council tax as a form of taxation.	12	Council tax bands are a regressive form of taxation. I appreciate central government refuses to raise and allocate funding from income tax, but can people really afford rising costs on all fronts?

Q: Do you have any comments about our budget savings and challenges?

One hundred and eighty-eight people answered question 8. The main theme to emerge was the need for NCC to operate efficiently, save money where possible, reduce waste, and review existing projects for possible savings (76). People also questioned the rationale underpinning the proposal (37) and noted the importance of services provided by NCC (28). Comments about retaining or reducing staff (26), ceasing transport infrastructure projects (24) and generating more income (21) were also made. As with the other budget proposals, people also expressed concern about their ability to pay more council tax (16) and referenced the negative effects of the broader financial environment (11).

Q: Do you have any comments about our budget savings and challenges?

Theme	No.	Comments
Comments about efficiency	76	The council will need to look at all areas of spending including areas where there is overspend and waste.

Q: Do you have any comments about our budget savings and challenges?		
Theme	No.	Comments
savings, ways NCC could, or should save money.		<p>Raising taxes isn't the answer, nor is cutting officers or services. The Council needs to look at culling unnecessary or underperforming contracts. It is also about time that the Council consider what changes can be made to the ceremonial functions and the number of councillors. The most impossible thing is to spend the money effectively. Reduce unnecessary administration. Simplify procedures. Become more accessible to residents.</p> <p>Openness and more detailed clear communications about the council's internal efficiencies is needed before and not whilst introducing proposed funding costs.</p> <p>Please look at how the council is spending the budget that it is afforded with. Stop waste and frittering it away on projects that serve no long term benefit such as designer corgi displays for the Queens jubilee. No justification can be given for spending money on something like that and then increasing council tax claiming that the budget of the council is limited and expect residents to produce extra from a magic money tree. Do the essentials and cut out the to haves. Help the environment and turn off street lights an our earlier. Hold less meetings and waste less money. Working for a local government organisation, I'm astounded by the amount of waste where for example deliveries go missing and things being reordered along with many all day off site meetings that are simply not needed snd stop people getting on with their job.</p>
Comments about the rationale behind the proposal.	37	<p>I just don't think these savings are realistic. I mean to take £8m out of adult social care and £2m out of Childrens services... what will be left?? Inflation is already killing these services.</p> <p>What happens to the money that you save does it get spent on other things or just balance the books or pay for inflation?</p> <p>You need to take a longer term view. What are you doing this year to ensure in 5 years time you can move taxes down?</p> <p>The budget challenge has resulted from a combination of chronic government underfunding, massive increases in social care costs and a chronic failure of the Health service to pay its share of this, and mismanagement by the governing party at NCC. None of this should be borne by the public.</p> <p>You are fixated on savings when we need more services.</p>
Comments about current services, demand for services, or paying for services.	28	<p>I am not happy to see that services that work with the most vulnerable and that are already operating badly (adult care in crisis) are being targeted for the biggest reductions.</p> <p>Cuts to adult social services seems excessive and should be evened out with appropriate cuts to children's services over the period 2024-2027. I think we should look at non essential services, if only to suspend them until the economic situation improves.</p>
Comments about retaining or reducing	26	<p>I strongly believe you can do more to reduce your senior management costs and remove layers. Money should be focused on front line jobs. I also think getting in external consultants when you have internal expertise</p>

Q: Do you have any comments about our budget savings and challenges?		
Theme	No.	Comments
staff (frontline or managers).		<p>is a waste of money simply done because Members and seniors will not listen to reason from existing staff.</p> <p>Institute an across the board pay freeze for council staff and suppliers and shrink headcount.</p> <p>Continuing to cut staff numbers only puts pressure on those who remain and leads to an increase in the numbers of experienced people leaving the service due to burn out. It's a vicious cycle that needs better thought and joined up work.</p>
Comments about stopping or reducing road building, cycle lane or other transport projects.	24	<p>Why don't you cancel the proposed NWL vanity project, save the money, and use it for Social Services?</p> <p>I don't agree that services should be cut though I do object to council tax being used to support environmentally damaging infrastructure projects which benefit a few people at the expense of many, such as the Western Link and the dualling of the A47.</p> <p>Stop wasting money on vanity projects like cycle lanes (I am a cyclist myself) and st Stephens.</p>
Comments about how NCC might generate income.	21	<p>Is Norfolk County Council able to look at more ways of income generation or business opportunities to help with other income streams?</p> <p>200% taxes on second homes - that would generate more revenue.</p> <p>Stop pandering to Tory government and fight for more funding.</p> <p>You need to charge second homes more and holiday homes and holiday lets. These are luxuries and need to be taxed higher.</p>
Comments about people's inability to pay because of personal financial situation.	16	<p>Only increase to the absolute minimum, to many people are living in poverty.</p> <p>Government needs to fund services - it shouldn't be for the general public to fund when we are already struggling - unless wages are increased to meet inflation we simply can't afford higher costs.</p> <p>You simply cannot increase the tax, when people cant pay it because they are having to heat their homes and keep a roof over their heads.</p>
Comments about wider financial factors which affect NCC such as cost of living or inflation.	11	<p>The budget challenge has resulted from a combination of chronic government underfunding, massive increases in social care costs and a chronic failure of the Health service to pay its share of this, and mismanagement by the governing party at NCC. None of this should be borne by the public.</p> <p>I recognise the financial constraints however solutions need to be found without a continuous resorting to the easy solution of council tax increase. It is morally wrong to put peoples bills up in the climate we are in.</p>

Equality Impact Assessment evidence

In total, there were five comments relevant to the EQIA: references to 'pensioners' are likely to relate to the protected characteristic of age.

EQIA Evidence	
Question	Comment
Q3 (2.99% rise) 1 comment	As pensioners , our total council tax bill already accounts for 10% of our total income which is excessive. We do not have the luxury of having our tax paid for us as our income is over the threshold for benefits.
Q5 (4.10% rise) 1 comment	This is far too much. You must think of pensioners and people on very low wages.
Q7 (in line with inflation rise) 2 comments	Because the government is considering abandoning the triple lock on pensions so where do I get the extra money for the council - why are they so much in debt anyway - need to do what pensioners do, budget properly. This will be seen by many to be unsustainable, given huge rises elsewhere, particularly food and fuel. There is no guarantee that pensions will rise by this level, given the turbulence in Government at the present time and the danger of losing the triple lock on pensions.
Q8 Other comments 1 comment	a balance is needed between essentials but what some consider essentials others don't. I have a disabled adult son to whom the alive at downham is essential but to others it is not.

Comments about the consultation process

There were 24 comments about the consultation process: a *sample* is shown below.

Comments about the consultation process
<p>Question 3 (2.99% increase) - 6 comments</p> <p>Because this feels like a foregone decision regardless You consult but go ahead anyway. But I'm sure you have already made up your minds, what the public say won't really count. Total waste of money that is poorly targeted and a tick box exercise. I could not see how much more money NCC would get by raising the precept by 2.99% as such I can't make a decision on if I feel it may benefit or not</p>
<p>Question 5 (4.10% increase) - 7 comments</p> <p>I don't believe you have fully explained the need to do this. Is it to improve services or is it because you feel the services will be threatened if you don't do it? Your calculations do seem a bit out as my council tax is (band D) is over £1800 per year. How much would be for the social care precept?</p>
<p>Question 7 (in line with inflation increase) - 3 comments</p> <p>Also, why is there a 'Don't know' option for this question as that is the one that I want to tick? I would prefer to know the exact amount going into adult social care.</p>
<p>Question 8 (other comments) - 9 comments</p>

C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\D25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

Comments about the consultation process

It is very hard to comment about these as I don't know what half of them mean or what the impact would have on frontline services.

Unclear how exactly savings are going to be achieved in adult social care and children services. Am suspicious of replacement F2F with a digital offer in these vulnerable groups. Why is the public only being consulted on <.5 mill minor services not the whole budget.

I'm sure you will do whatever you want to do regardless of people's concerns.

Incidentally the costs of this futile questionnaire is an unnecessary expenditure.

Get a better communications team to design a survey that is more user friendly, less wordy and will give people the chance to say what they want to say - not as this one is - one that leads them to answers you want to hear.

7. Proposal 2: Your views on our proposals to save money by reducing summer opening hours at Norfolk's recycling centres and closing all recycling centres on Wednesdays.

As part of the budget consultation, Community and Environmental Services (CES) put forward savings proposals affecting Norfolk's Recycling Centres, which were

- reducing summer opening hours at Norfolk's recycling centres
- closing all recycling centres on Wednesdays

These were both presented in the same consultation.

In total 332 responses were received to the Recycling Centre consultation page.

The consultation was promoted via social media, the Norfolk Residents' Panel, through the NALC and press releases. This consultation was also promoted via posters displayed at Norfolk's Recycling Centres to ensure direct 'reach' to service users.

Of the responses received, the majority were submitted online via Norfolk County Council's Consultation Hub. Five responses were received via the Council's 'Have your say' email address.

Of those that responded, 285 (85%) responded as individuals.

Option	Total	Percent
An individual/member of the public	285	85.84%
An employee of a recycling centre in Norfolk	14	4.22%
On behalf of a voluntary or community group	1	0.30%
On behalf of a statutory organisation	1	0.30%
On behalf of a business	7	2.11%
A Norfolk County Councillor	1	0.30%
A district or borough councillor	2	0.60%
A town or parish councillor	5	1.51%
A Norfolk County Council employee	6	1.81%
Not Answered	10	3.01%

Responses by groups, organisations and businesses:

Five online consultation respondents told us which group, organisation or business they were responding on behalf of. The organisations cited:

- Norse Environmental Waste Services
- Broadland District Council
- Henry piper (sole trader)
- Taverham Parish Council
- Fakenham Town Council

Respondent profile

The profile of 'individual' respondents (317 individuals) is as below:

Option	Total	Percent
Male	169	50.90%
Female	122	36.75%
Prefer not to say	25	7.53%
Prefer to self-describe (please specify below)	1	0.30%
Not Answered	15	4.52%

Responses by age (319 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	1	0.30%
25-34	18	5.42%
35-44	35	10.54%
45-54	51	15.36%
55-64	70	21.08%
65-74	98	29.52%
75-84	17	5.12%
85 or older	1	0.30%
Prefer not to say	28	8.43%
Not Answered	13	3.92%

Responses by long-term illness, disability or limiting health problem (some consultees may have ticked more than one box)

Option	Total	Percent
--------	-------	---------

Appendix 5: Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation report 2023-24

Blind or partially sighted	4	1.20%
D/deaf or hard of hearing	8	2.41%
Limiting health condition e.g. heart disease, asthma, strokes, osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia and myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME) etc.	27	8.13%
Learning Disabilities	0	0.00%
Neurodiversity e.g. autistic spectrum disorders, dyslexia, dyspraxia	4	1.20%
Mental health conditions – e.g. depression, schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorders, eating disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder	7	2.11%
Physical disability e.g. limb disorder, amputee, wheelchair user, cerebral palsy, motor neurone disease, muscular dystrophy	8	2.41%
Not Answered	287	86.45%

Responses by district (319 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Breckland	52	15.66%
Broadland	41	12.35%
Great Yarmouth	26	7.83%
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	57	17.17%
North Norfolk	62	18.67%
Norwich	39	11.75%
South Norfolk	37	11.14%
Not Answered	18	5.42%

Responses from those with caring responsibilities (297 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
No	232	69.88%
Yes – for children with additional needs	13	3.92%
Yes – for older family members	31	9.34%
Yes - other	21	6.33%
Not Answered	35	10.54%

Responses from those outlining employment status (311 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Employed (full time)	102	30.72%
Employed (part time)	35	10.54%
Self employed	36	10.84%

Unemployed	2	0.60%
Student	0	0.00%
Looking after the family home	10	3.01%
Long-term sick	5	1.51%
Retired	121	36.45%
Not Answered	21	6.33%

Responses by language spoken (304 individuals)*

Option	Total	Percent
English	304	91.57%
Not Answered	28	8.43%

*1 respondent said Dutch was their first language.

Responses by ethnic background

Option	Total
English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	262
Irish	2
Asian British	2
Indian	1
Black British	1
European*	4
Dual nationality*	2
Anglo-Celtic*	1
'Not Relevant'*	1
Prefer not to say	40
<i>*answer written in the 'other please state here box'</i>	


Recycling Centre Proposals - analysis

* Numbers in brackets show the number of times a comment is made.

** Only comments expressed ten or more times appear in the tables. Comments are presented verbatim as they were submitted.

Q. How often do you use your local recycling centre?


Three hundred and twenty-three people responded to this question, the majority (101) of whom said they used their local recycling centre every week.



Option	Total	Percent
Daily	24	7.23%
Weekly	101	30.42%
Monthly	92	27.71%
A few times a year	92	27.71%
Hardly ever	11	3.31%
Never	3	0.90%
Not Answered	9	2.71%

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to harmonise summer and winter opening hours, meaning recycling centres would open from 9am to 4pm all year round?

329 people responded to this question, with the majority (116) saying they 'strongly disagreed' with the proposal.



Option	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	65	19.58%
Agree	79	23.80%
Neutral	22	6.63%
Disagree	39	11.75%
Strongly disagree	116	34.94%
Don't know	2	0.60%
Not Answered	9	2.71%

One hundred and forty-four people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement are that the same opening hours all year round would provide consistency for people using the centres (27); the proposal is acceptable or reasonable (24); and the proposal is seen as an effective way to save the council money (20).

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to harmonise summer and winter opening hours, meaning recycling centres would open from 9am to 4pm all year round? Agree/Disagree		
Theme	No	Comments
Comments about the effect of consistent opening hours	27	<p>There is obviously not a great deal of use in the last hour of the day and it would ensure more simple opening time system for people to remember. If the times are harmonised for both summer and winter times, I believe it will give greater clarity to when the recycling centres are open. It makes sense to do this as it often confuses people who turn up to find the places closed.</p> <p>If the times were the same throughout the year it would be less confusing. We don't use the centres that regularly so if the time was consistent throughout the year it would be easier to remember. If your research shows that only 7% visit in the last hour of the day it doesn't really make sense to be open for that extra hour. I think being able to use the centres at weekends is more important.</p> <p>I sometimes visit the recycling centre in Wells and have been caught out a few times by the centre being closed. Harmonising times of all centres would make it much easier to remember when they are open and save a wasted journey.</p> <p>Consistency in opening times would benefit all.</p> <p>Universal hours seems like a good idea but 1000-1700 would be better.</p> <p>The recycle centres are very quiet at 0900 and first hour</p>
Comments about how the proposal is fair, acceptable, sensible or reasonable, can be 'resigned'	24	<p>These standard opening hours seem reasonable given cost restraints. The savings justify the inconvenience of being closed for one day. It seems the better option.</p> <p>It is a good way to save money. My only concern would be the effect on staff (Ashill) as ours are brilliant!</p> <p>If only 7% of visits are conducted during this hour, then this seems to be a reasonable adjustment to save funds.</p> <p>My visits are always in the late afternoons, and I have commented to staff how quiet it always is. Seems pointless to stay open the last hour may as well have set times through whole year.</p> <p>If money needs to be saved it does seem a sensible option for the reasons outlined above. However, it is important that if introduced the effects of this change is clearly monitored. In particular it must be monitored to see if there is an increase in fly-tipping as a result because the costs and impacts of this will just be transferred to district councils and I would not consider that to be acceptable.</p> <p>Reducing the hours so that they are consistent throughout the year seems a sensible option.</p> <p>On the basis that relatively low % of visits take place during the last hour of opening this appears a sensible/logical step.</p>

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to harmonise summer and winter opening hours, meaning recycling centres would open from 9am to 4pm all year round? Agree/Disagree		
Positive comments about savings, including agreement because it will save money/we need to save money and this is an OK way of doing it	20	<p>savings have to be mad somewhere and this is a relatively painless way to do it</p> <p>Council needs to make savings to reduce tax increases to house holders. The savings justify the inconvenience of being closed for one day</p> <p>It's a good saving and I can work with those hours</p> <p>If cuts are to be made then this makes sense, but not sure how the workers would manage with a cut in their pay.</p> <p>I see no reason why 1 hour less would affect people using the recycling centres. If its only 1 hour less and saves money, then fine.</p> <p>So long as we don't see a rise in Council Tax when you reduce these services?</p> <p>Appreciate the savings that can be made from a relatively small change</p>
Comments stating agreement with the proposals, but no reason cited	12	<p>It seems the better option</p> <p>I have no issue at all with 4pm closing of sites all year round.</p> <p>My visits are always in the late afternoons, and I have commented to staff how quiet it always is. Seems pointless to stay open the last hour may as well have set times through whole year.</p> <p>It makes sense</p>
Comments on the proposal, although there is no or minimal impact on the respondent or their family	11	<p>It won't affect me</p> <p>It's a good saving and I can work with those hours</p> <p>I feel the hour between 4 to 5pm will make very little difference to overall useage. Certainly in my case, as being retired, I can chose an appropriate time.</p> <p>I much prefer this option as I work 30 hours per week with a half day every Wednesday. I use the busy North Norwich RC most Wednesday afternoon's. A 4pm daily closing time would not unduly inconvenience me. However Full day closure on Wednesday's most certainly will do.</p> <p>Being retired it is easy for me to go to the recycling centre. As for working people that will only leave the weekend. However cuts have to be found and this is less of an inconvenience than other proposals.</p>

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to harmonise summer and winter opening hours, meaning recycling centres would open from 9am to 4pm all year round?

Agree/Disagree

Comments about the potential increased rise in fly-tipping	10	<p>I think it would be better for the public for the sites to remain open 9-4, as I think if the sites were shut on the wednesday, people wont remember and turn up to the sites closed, this could cause more fly tipping, which have to be cleared up, therefore money saved on closing sites will be spent clearing fly tip</p> <p>4pm closure throughout the year would be easier to understand however for those that visit after work and traders this could increase fly tipping. It would be unreasonable for the workers to receive a pay cut to facilitate this due to them being on a low wage and the amount of management, maybe a trim up of management and allow more decision making to be made on site rather than them having to go through supervisors</p> <p>It would save money but avoid the inevitable rise in fly-tipping</p> <p>For the working man it is already difficult to use the recycling centres during the week which leads to long queues at the weekends. These hours have already been cut in the past. This is again sending out the wrong message about the importance of recycling. This will encourage fly tipping which will cost more money to clean up or are we expecting landowners to pay for this removal. This council needs to stand up and demand more money from Central Government instead of kowtowing to cut after cut to services.</p> <p>I believe that Norfolk's recycling centre's should be open daily, to prevent illegal fly-tipping & to maximise the income generated by NCC through recycled materials.</p>
--	----	--

One hundred and fifty-five people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement were the worries that the proposal will lead to more flytipping (52); comments about how longer opening hours in the summer benefit people (i.e when disposing of garden waste) (37); and how shorter opening hours would affect respondents who work during the day (35).

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to harmonise summer and winter opening hours, meaning recycling centres would open from 9am to 4pm all year round?

Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about the potential increased rise in fly-tipping.	52	<p>Fly tipping is bad at the moment reducing peoples opportunities to dispose of waste in a controlled way will only increase this.</p> <p>Closing earlier would lead to fly tipping elsewhere as people get frustrated that the centre has closed early</p> <p>There is not enough recycling centre in Norfolk and fly tipping is becoming more noticeable</p>

		<p>The hours will give traders less time to visit so possibly cause more fly tipping and the staff will earn less money, personally I am a member of staff so I shall be looking for a new job depending on what happens. Fly tipping is increasing anything that makes recycling more difficult is unlikely to help the situation</p> <p>It could result in additional fly tipping.</p> <p>Reducing opening times will increase fly-tipping and be an inconvenience to the residents/council tax payers of Norfolk.</p> <p>If anything you should be extending the winter hours. It's easy to forget that the recycling centre closes at 4 in the winter and turn up to find it closed. The more accessible the centres are, the less flytipping there will be. What about opening till 6pm so that tradespeople can get there without having to cut their working day short, unless they want to?</p> <p>I feel that it reduces access and will result in an increase of fly tipping which is already evident in laybys surrounding my local recycling centre.</p> <p>Reducing opening times will not be cost effective if fly tipping increases.</p> <p>I use the tip a lot and feel this this will only encourage fly tipping, the excuse for cuts is not logical as higher up staff still get their bonuses</p> <p>There was a significant increase in fly tipping when hours were reduced during pandemic. We need to protect our wildlife and rural land</p>
Comments about the longer opening hours in summer, for example how people like it being open later so they can drop off garden waste.	37	<p>I believe these changes may create problems during summer time, a time of the year when people trim their hedges and cut their grass, on top of other garden home projects that require some waste recycling, even this summer I came across busy times when had to wait to get parked to offload my vehicle.</p> <p>In summertime people do more gardening and diy the daylight enables people to do more and often need to dispose of waste later. The sites are busier so more pinch points will happen.</p> <p>Major inconvenience in summer. Most people who work will do gardening g and jobs after work and then take the rubbish to the centre. It was much better when they were open until 19:00.</p> <p>Why not open later and close later.</p> <p>After working in the garden or at home in summer months it is much more convenient to visit a recycling centre as late in the day as possible.</p> <p>More access on summer evenings reduces congestion at peak times</p> <p>A lot of people work until 4pm which negates them using the centre unless it is on a specific rest day. Also a lot of green waste is generated during the summer months when people are working in their gardens and that extra hour per day allows extra flexibility to plan a visit.</p> <p>Daylight hours are longer in the summer than the winter. Householders can be expected to spend more time in the garden in the summer months, producing more garden waste.</p> <p>4 pm closure in Winter is OK because it is dark at that time and is a health and safety consideration. 5 pm closure in Summer is no good as people will still be loading stuff to dispose of at 4 pm and need to empty their vehicles for domestic use first thing in the morning. There are always queues where I tip garden waste at Hempton. Early closure in Summer will increase pressure on the throughput of recycling resource and increase queuing.</p>

		<p>The summer months are when the majority of users make a trip to the tips.</p> <p>Even with the use of the home brown recycling bin, the need to use the local tips is necessary, especially for those who work.</p> <p>I strongly disagree because it affects waste traders and their financial circumstances as won't be able to fit work in after 3:30pm especially in the summer when the days are longer they can work longer days during the summer months.</p> <p>It is difficult to responsibly dispose of waste as it is. Don't give people any other excuse to fly tip. You may save some costs but destroy our countryside in the process.</p>
Comments about the respondent's working pattern in relation to proposed opening hours (not staff working patterns)	35	<p>This is a crazy proposal. Very often the busiest times of the day are the last hour/90mins. Working people would be penalised by being prevented from disposing of their rubbish towards the end of the existing opening hours.</p> <p>For those people working a 4pm close means that we could only access the recycling centre at weekends which is already the busiest times with the longest queues.</p> <p>When you are working evening availability is essential</p> <p>I have found it very difficult to find time to visit the recycling centre since the hours were reduced to within the working day. The old Mile Cross recycling centre used to open until 7pm which was much more practical for people working regular 9-5 jobs.</p> <p>Parents with children are on the school run 1500 to 1600 so closing at 1600 would mean they can not get to the recycle facility</p> <p>Generally working 7:30 - 16:00 out of the city, it's hard enough to have time at the weekend to visit a recycling centre; at least with the current setup it's possible to make a visit during the week when needed. This is a convenience and also a service to the community paid for by the taxpayer; it would be nice for councils to look at how to improve things for the taxpayer, rather than constantly cutting back to ensure higher-ups don't lose out on their salary increases.</p> <p>These hours mean many people cannot use the service because they work 9-5. Close whole days not reduce hours.</p> <p>I use the centre after work so would need it open after 4, or not open more fly tipping.</p>
Alternative ideas	30	<p>If most people visit the recycling centres in the last hour of opening, then why not open from 10.00am - 5.00pm April to October, and 11.00am - 4.00pm in the winter?</p> <p>You would be better off opening later during the Summer and closing later so people have access during early evenings</p> <p>Difficult to get to centre before 4pm. the 5pm opening is very beneficial.</p> <p>Maybe it could be maintained one day a week, or open an hour later one day to can stay open till 5 without additional cost</p> <p>why 9 -4pm when most people are at work, certainly keep hours the same everywhere, that is absolutely fine.</p> <p>Why not have more community friendly hours for everyone - like 11am - 6pm all year round.</p> <p>If a reduction of hours is absolutely necessary, consider shifting the opening hours so that they include the evening, e.g. 12-7 pm instead of</p>


		<p>only opening during hours when a large part of the population is bound to be in a workplace.</p> <p>The hours i prefer are 10 am to 6pm</p> <p>It would be better to close one day a week and extend opening hours in the evenings so people who own houses and work normally hours can actually take their rubbish to the dump.</p>
Comments about how the proposals will affect recycling centre staff	29	<p>I would be concerned with staff losing pay when energy prices are gone up hugely, and cost of living too. How are these staff going to manage their bills.</p> <p>Busier at the new times may put strain not only on staff who may become victims of driver's frustrations, and on the drivers bringing their rubbish/recycling.</p> <p>While I agree that, for the general public, it would far easier to have a consistant set of trading hours all year around, as a partner of a Recycling Advisor I am really concerned about the reduction in wages for the staff. The cost of living continues to increase and you're basically proposing to pay your staff less. That's not even taking in to consideration the fact they don't get paid enough to put up with the verbal abuse and general aggravation from people that try to dispose of their trade or DIY waste without paying the fees.</p> <p>Because the site staff are on basic salary as it is, take away the hour a day will have a huge impact on their lives and their family lives</p> <p>Recycling centres staff we face loss of hours or redundancy.</p> <p>This would reduce the hours of the workers (who apparently are only earning minimum wage - not even living wage). This would therefore reduce their income through no fault of their own.</p> <p>The workers on site will have reduced earnings and this will affect their families. Everything is going up in price so I'm sure the workers can't afford a pay cut .</p> <p>Because I work at one of the recycling centres and it would make an already poor wage even lower.</p> <p>Concerned at the pay implications on staff during current cost of living scenario. More work required in less time for reduced wage. How easy is it to retain staff anyway?</p>
Comments about how proposal is short sighted as it will lead to problems further down the line.	20	<p>I also feel that a reduction in service could signal to the local community that recycling is not a priority for our council.</p> <p>I use the trade service and find it very helpful to tip after 4pm. Has anyone considered how many new houses are being build in Norfolk, those home owners will need to tip there waste. This option however is better and just more sensible to closing on Wednesdays.</p> <p>This is a service which is essential for society. It is critical to ensure that households waste is properly managed and the service is easily available, making this difficult to access will lead to more fly tipping and increased costs to the council. Please do not go ahead with these cuts, and look for savings elsewhere!</p> <p>More rubbish will be dumped on farmer's land - leaving them to pay for the disposal charges which you charge them if they try and recycle it at a Centre. A job I expect our Authorities to do on our behalf from the Council charges we already pay. It is this type of service we expect from</p>

		<p>Local Government. It is bad enough you no longer dispose of old paint which inevitably goes into landfill.</p> <p>As a business who uses the Hartford Recycling centre regularly. I think cutting the summer hours would be a bad idea. With more hours of light customers want stuff picking up later in the day. When that happens as normal in the summer months we would be stranded with loads that we can't get off and can't make the time of closure. Encinitas will put people under pressure and increase fly tipping. I strongly disagree with the summer hours change. It will end up costing the council more in the long run.</p> <p>Opening less hours will make other times busier than they already are. For the user: reference to summer means that users will all rush during the reduced opening times to attend causing further delays that can already be long. May only be less than 10% use the facility during the final hours of opening but by not opening on Wednesdays the opportunity to use the facility is reduced and 100% of those that would have on a Wednesday will then try and squash into the schedule on the opening days causing further congestion. I suspect the congestion caused with both the measures suggested will increase waiting times in the summer months by an estimated 15%.</p>
Comments about impact on respondent or their family	14	<p>I like the option to use the recycling centre later in the day during the summer. Closing at 4.00 would take this choice away</p> <p>My Heacham site is really busy, would probably be too busy if hours were cut</p> <p>For working people finishing at 4 means the weekend will be a nightmare as it's the only time they can get there.</p> <p>Today, I had to queue for 10 minutes to get into my recycling center. A Wednesday.</p> <p>What will it be like on other days if this were implemented.</p> <p>I am a sole trader - your hours are already awkward for trade waste users since in the summer I am working far beyond 5pm - and you will not allow tradespeople to come at weekends for some stupid reason. You now only open at 9am, beyond the start of most traders' working day. If I need to offload, which I need one or twice a month I have to sacrifice work (and money) during the week to try to get there by. It's not harmonising, its cutting. Say what it is.</p> <p>I work a normal job 7-5 and recently when ever i want to take my rubbish to the dump, its shut.</p> <p>Reduces the work i can do in the garden by an hour on my chosen day, impacting family plans the following day</p>
Comments about the role and responsibilities of NCC.	10	<p>I believe that Norfolk County Council should be doing it's utmost to help the community to recycle and avoid fly tipping. I do not believe cutting the recycling hours will help the council tax payers who are paying for the service. In fact, I would like to see increased opening hours for my local centre which is only open 4 days a week. I consider that there are plenty of area where savings could be made and the centres made to be more efficient without cutting these particular services.</p> <p>This is a service which is essential for society. It is critical to ensure that households waste is properly managed and the service is easily available,</p>

		<p>making this difficult to access will lead to more fly tipping and increased costs to the council. Please do not go ahead with these cuts, and look for savings elsewhere!</p> <p>Loss of jobs, loss of available time to use them, is showing that apparently recycling is not important and can cut money from this area I pay into to probably just fund/line other people's pockets. I pay my council tax and I know for a fact I won't see a reductions in this. How about instead of reducing things people use, reduce the money of those who don't need a wage/all expenses/ general life paying for when us lowest minions do get that luxury</p>
--	--	--

Q. How often do you use your local recycling centre on a Wednesday?


316 people responded to this question, the majority (96) of whom said they used their local recycling centre every week.



Option	Total	Percent
Weekly	76	22.89%
Monthly	56	16.87%
A few times a year	96	28.92%
Hardly ever	54	16.27%
Never	34	10.24%
Not Answered	16	4.82%

Q. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to close all Norfolk recycling centres on Wednesdays?

323 people answered this question, with the majority (152) saying they '**strongly disagreed**' with the proposal.



Ninety-two people explained why they **agree or strongly agree** with the proposal. Only two reasons were cited over 10 times. These were the same that the proposal is acceptable or reasonable (14); and the proposal is seen as an effective way to save the council money (12).

Q. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to close all Norfolk recycling centres on Wednesdays?

Agree/Strongly Agree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about how the proposal is fair, acceptable, sensible or reasonable, can be 'resigned'	14	<p>Wednesday's are midweek and likely to be the least used day of the week</p> <p>This seems a sensible way to save money.</p> <p>this is probably one of the quieter days</p> <p>we have to save money somehow</p> <p>Closing on a Wednesday would be only a very slight inconvenience.</p> <p>balanced against the considerable projected savings this makes a lot of sense. I think people would soon adjust to a different opening regime.</p> <p>The ability to save £200,000 is very positive. It might mean some people turning up to a closed centre which would be very annoying. It would mean reduced pay for your workers which is a problem.</p>

		Closing one day a week for a big saving is worthwhile and people will know where they stand rather than reducing times for other days that the centre is open - causes confusion.
Positive comments about savings, including agreement because it will save money/we need to save money and this is an OK way of doing it	12	<p>It seems a good way to save a huge amount of money, but I can see there could be problems for trade waste disposal</p> <p>relatively painless way to make savings</p> <p>It will save us money.</p> <p>Good saving</p> <p>12% of visits on a Wednesday but times that by 7 days which gives 84%. Not too far off 100%. I don't have a problem with saving money but I do sympathize with the staff who will have their wages reduced just at a time when finances are difficult.</p> <p>If centres were closed on a common day, it wouldn't be a hardship to plan visits on another day. I would prefer this to happen (with the greater saving) instead of making the open hours shorter. Other industries have certain days where services are unavailable, so I see no issue with Wednesdays being a closure day as long as the open hours are extended in the Summer months.</p>

One hundred and ninety-nine people explained why they **disagree or strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reason for disagreement is the possible increase in flytipping that the proposal might create (78); the concern that the staff at centre may have their employment affected, during a cost of living crisis (38); and how the proposal is short sighted and could have knock on effects which would create more problems (37).

Q. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to close all Norfolk recycling centres on Wednesdays?
Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about the potential increased rise in fly-tipping	78	<p>Wednesday would become the day of the week when even more rubbish gets fly tipped in our Country lanes.</p> <p>Closing the centers will lead to an increase in fly tipping. This has been a problem in the past when NCC make significant changes. The cost of flytipping be borne by the district councils resulting in a zero cost saving to the taxpayer.</p> <p>As said previous, think this would encourage fly tipping if people turn up at a closed site as people wont remember that the sites are shut Wednesday's</p> <p>I'm concerned that having a whole day closed in all centres, particularly the busy norwich ones, will have an impact on fly-tipping. I used to live very near the Mile Cross centre & when the centre was closed people would dump things in the road, footpaths & on Andersons Meadow, which was not pleasant. If tips were closed on Wednesdays there would need to be a lot of promotion of this to raise awareness & extra resources would need to be used to target fly tipping. Surely these things would cost the council money anyway.</p> <p>Closing the recycling on a Wednesday would result in fly tipping and the countryside looking an untidy mess</p> <p>If you remove the Wednesday opening without actually consulting the people who come in on a Wednesday, you will never know why they chose Wednesday. It could be that they can only do it on a Wednesday, which would remove the possibility of the correct disposal of materials from themselves.</p> <p>Just because Suffolk do it doesn't mean you have to follow suit, you will have a bigger problem collecting the waste that has been fly tipped.</p> <p>If you make it increasingly difficult for people to stay within the law, then you push them towards fly-tipping as the only way they can dispose of their materials.</p> <p>Again, I feel this will encourage more fly tipping. It again reduces the amount of time people have to visit a recycling centre. If someone wants or needs to get rid of rubbish or unwanted items on a Wednesday, then people should be able to do so. What is good in one area of the country such as Suffolk, does not mean that Norfolk should be the same. I think it is a stupid idea.</p> <p>I believe this may increase fly tipping further. Would be best to reduce the opening hour to accommodate this.</p> <p>Reduced days of operating may increase flytipping, already a problem in forests round Thetford!</p>
Comments about how the proposals will affect recycling centre staff	38	<p>Reduced hours for staff resulting in reduced pay. How will they manage the huge increase in energy costs, and cost of living.</p> <p>As a relatively frequent user of a recycling centre these changes wouldn't affect me as I primarily use it at the weekend.</p>

		<p>It will however, impact my family as my partner is a Recycling Advisor and the reduction in working hours will seriously affect our household finances in a negative way and I am very worried.</p> <p>I have not seen anywhere in this proposal, the impact on the staff. Unless someone can describe what impact this will have in terms of how many staff will be made redundant or suffer from reduced working hours I'm not in favour of supporting a cut.</p> <p>As I said before, I currently work on one of the sites and I would have to strongly disagree about it being a quiet day, this has never been the case, some days have been as busy as a Saturday, I would say that this is due to Suffolk's sites being closed so the Norfolk ones inherit Suffolks users, this is evident as the vast majority of users have never been seen by the site staff or actually mention it. To close on a Wednesday would be an issue for the Trade users and some public, and every day you receive comments about fly tipping which I would say may well increase due the nature and general impatience of some people. I often wonder whether a postcode centred pass/permit would be a good idea, as well as a booking system for cars with trailers and vans like Suffolk use should be implemented too.</p> <p>How will this impact the wages of those who work there and have families to support?</p> <p>I am little concerned about staff losing pay by being forced to work extra hours. These are often low-paid workers and therefore the cost of living may have a devastating effect on them.</p> <p>The opening days should stay as they are now. Wednesday maybe the only day some people can visit. This would not be fair on the staff working at these recycling centres whose pay will be reduced.</p>
Comments about how proposal is short sighted as it will lead to problems further down the line	37	<p>Closing recycling centres on a Wednesday would confuse the general public and once again will communicate the message that the council does not prioritise recycling. Also, how does reducing opening hours and opening days of our recycling centres fit into your Greener more resilient future, priority?</p> <p>Takes at least £200k out of the local economy because you are reducing peoples pay and increases the councils commitments else where as the employee's may have to rely on the council to pay their rent or a portion of I'm concerned that having a whole day closed in all centres, particularly the busy norwich ones, will have an impact on fly-tipping. I used to live very near the Mile Cross centre & when the centre was closed people would dump things in the road, footpaths & on Andersons Meadow, which was not pleasant. If tips were closed on Wednesdays there would need to be a lot of promotion of this to raise awareness & extra resources would need to be used to target fly tipping. Surely these things would cost the council money anyway.</p> <p>Any reduction in opening days or times could increase fly tipping so is false economy when it is the council that have to deal with fly tipping. People would go to dump rubbish on Wednesdays, not realising it was closed. This would lead to fly tipping which would cos5 the council more to clear up the mess.</p> <p>More houses equals more people equals more waste.</p>

		<p>For the working man it is already difficult to use the recycling centres during the week which leads to long queues at the weekends. These hours have already been cut in the past. This is again sending out the wrong message about the importance of recycling. This will encourage fly tipping which will cost more money to clean up or are we expecting landowners to pay for this removal. This council needs to stand up and demand more money from Central Government instead of kowtowing to cut after cut to services.</p> <p>The centre is already busy and I have to queue. If it is open less hours then the open times will be even busier.</p> <p>More and more houses are being constructed which will therefore generate more waste, you cannot keep building more houses (more houses means more council tax) and not supply the infrastructure needed to support that decision.</p> <p>By closing recycling centres mid-week, including trade disposal centres it will discourage individuals from using the facilities. This will in-turn cause trade waste to be disposed of via private-sector supplies, affecting income received by NCC - and also will encourage private individuals to dispose of their waste either via bin collections (not recycling) or through fly-tipping / 3rd party, private sector waste contractors.</p>
Comments about impact on respondent or their family	22	<p>Norfolk should be acting for Norfolk residents, what goes on in Suffolk shouldn't be of concern. Some people (a family member living alone is one) have Wednesday as their only non-working day of the week. This proposal would rob them of sole opportunity to dispose of rubbish. It is one of the few days i am able to come</p> <p>Wednesday is my only half working day and I live in Hellesdon, Norwich. By all means close some of the smaller less busy RC's in Norfolk each Wednesday to save some money, but PLEASE DO NOT close the busy Norwich North RC on Wednesday. If you decide to do this I will submit a formal complaint to Broadland Council and my local MP Chloe Smith.</p> <p>Dependant on working schedules the knowledge that the recycling centres are open each day means that a visit can be accommodated easily-often with garden waste and clearance (domestic) a large volume needs to be cleared the same day. Personally my working schedule requires a Wednesday visit--travelling to South Norwich RC is neither economic nor environmentally sensible.</p> <p>I like to visit in a Wednesday</p> <p>Wednesday is one of my allocated rest days each week. I use the local recycling centre frequently, virtually every week. If it is closed on a Wednesday (and also closing at 4pm throughout the year) that will really impact the times I can visit. I am sure there are many other people in a similar position.</p> <p>Wednesday is my only day off so the only day I can use the recycling facility my other local recycling centre is only open weekends so wouldn't be able to dispose of any rubbish</p> <p>Taken our choices away to use the facility when and what days we want. Working part time and have Wednesdays off would make visits to the recycling centre impossible.</p>
Comments stating	17	As someone that uses the site every day I think it is a bad idea

disagreement with the proposals, but no reason cited		<p>You need to come out on a Wednesday at Norwich North and see how busy it is and also the money we take as well</p> <p>Don't believe in cutting public services, keep Wednesday afternoon 3to5 open</p> <p>If Wednesday is the only day I'm able to get to a recycling centre I won't be using one anymore.</p> <p>We need to keep this vital service open all week long. Recycling rates are high at my local centre and we need to encourage people to continue this, not to shut down the recycling centre.</p> <p>would be unwise</p> <p>I firmly believe that the recycling centres should be readily available to residents. I suggest that in order to reduce the demand on the budget consideration should be given to recycling more of what is taken to the recycling centres .</p>
Comment about the role of NCC, it's NCC's job or responsibility, or NCC should be doing this as part of their role	17	<p>As I said in my previous answer I see no evidence of the alleged savings involved in the closure on Wednesday and repeat that if RCs operated with greater flexibility and a spark of entrepreneurial innovation then they would cover a greater proportion of their costs than under the vice like grip of County Hall</p> <p>As per previous reasons , the saving maybe saved in management without affecting both the lower paid workers and public services.</p> <p>I would expect a reduction with my council tax as you are providing less service. If you do close for one day a week a Sunday would be better.</p> <p>If you want to make savings you should not have spent money on new lorries.</p> <p>Or employed another manager.</p> <p>As the people you have are capable to do this job.</p> <p>These proposals only save money for the county council while the problems it will cause must be covered by other councils. Win - win for county really</p> <p>Again, workers would loose a days work and consequently a days pay. This would probably mean they would have to claim working tax credit.</p> <p>The phrase "robbing peter to pay paul" comes to mind since this is all from the Council's pot of money.</p> <p>Staff will have a pay cut or lose their job, but never anyone at the council.</p> <p>Why did they not look at cutting staffing at the council too, as this would save money? What value for money is the taxpayer getting?</p>
Comments about how the respondent wants to maintain the current level of service, keep it as it is now with no changes	15	<p>Why not close the smaller tips on a Wednesday and keep the large centres open 7days a week. I use Norwich South on a daily basis and as a business this would effect my ability to work and support my customers.</p> <p>Norwich South generates hundreds of pounds per day from the shop & trade sales, so why spend millions on a new site to then reduce the operational hours of a new mega site. New homes are being built everywhere and people need to get rid of there waste, so these large tips are going to be needed more than ever moving forward. KEEP 7DAYS PLEASE!</p> <p>It's a service that's needed daily</p> <p>Excluding lots of people on a Wednesday again that cannot get there any other day</p>

		<p>Given a proposed reduction in opening hours for summer it will not be helpful to close all day on Wednesday</p> <p>The opening days should stay as they are now. Wednesday maybe the only day some people can visit. This would not be fair on the staff working at these recycling centres whose pay will be reduced.</p> <p>Centres are there to reduce fly tipping and all should be open every day. We should be keeping people in jobs, if people are visiting on a Wednesday there is a need to stay open</p>
Comments about issues for tradespeople or trade waste disposal	15	<p>Terrible idea. Tradespeople work Wednesdays, are they supposed to take the waste home with them at the end of the day? And then take time off work the next day catching up with waste disposal before they start their next job? It will increase flytipping, which will cost more in the long term. I believe that this is a community facility that should be open 7 days a week. It would also affect traders who are only allowed to dispose of their waste on weekdays</p> <p>I'm a trade user of the recycling centres, if sites were to close early all year (16.00) and a Wednesday effectively if I was not able to get to the recycling centre by 15.30 (which I'm told is my latest admittance) on a Tuesday I'm then unable to work Wednesday, if I am able to tip Tuesday I'm then limited to what work I can do on a Wednesday because of the proposed closures as I couldn't tip. How about leaving them open till 5 all year close on Wednesday and allowing trade to tip on a Saturday thus easing the potential loss.</p> <p>How will people remember this???</p> <p>If builders or the public need to go on a Wednesday, they will just dump it somewhere else.</p> <p>Again it's affecting waste traders they will be losing a days wage because they won't be able to book work in.</p> <p>if you close the tip on a wednesday, that means larger cues on a thursday, big van fulls of multiple traders trying to empty at the same time</p> <p>Changing the summer hours would be very difficult on us trade users. As the days get lighter people get busier and the summer months are very busy for waste Disposal. I own a house Clearance company and use Hartford as trade. It would put a lot more pressure on us to try and get jobs finished and get to the recycling centre in time. Which could leave us stranded with rubbish and not being able to get to our next customer the next day. I think it will increase the fly tipping rate, and cost the council more in the long run.</p> <p>This again restricts businesses as to when they can collect rubbish and if they do collect rubbish on a Tuesday late it ties up their van until Thursday morning which means they lose out on other business and this will then encourage fly tipping.</p> <p>You already make trade waste offloading awkward - why reduce the ability for trades people to offload to just four days per week. If we must lose a day at least make it so that the next nearest tip is open.</p> <p>My company use Hartford recycling centre on a weekly bases as trade. A closing on a Wednesday in the middle of the week would be bad for all of us trade users as if we have a load on to be disposed of in the right way and we can't get it off the content on the van that will cause problems not</p>

		<p>just for my business but for every other business who are paying the council for there brilliant service to dump there items. I think a closer on a wednesday will increase the fly tipping incidents rapidly as we already see so much of it that makes the rest of us look bad. I think on larger sites the council need to look at overheads and cut their costs in wages to save money. I strongly disagree with the closing on a Wednesday. I think in the long run the council will be loosing money on running around picking up the fly tipping problems. We also as trade can't dump on weekends! So it will leave a lot of us stranded.</p>
Alternative ideas	11	<p>Have different sites closed on different days to give people options to dispose of household waste</p> <p>Any reduction in hours of operation is a retrograde step. I would not support closing on Wednesday all year round. Is there a compromise by closing on Wednesday during the winter?</p> <p>I would expect a reduction with my council tax as you are providing less service. If you do close for one day a week a Sunday would be better. I believe this may increase fly tipping further. Would be best to reduce the opening hour to accommodate this.</p> <p>It is not easy to argue the case for or against any day of the week until you need the facilities on that day and they are not available. Personally I think the facilities should be available 7 days a week because society is moving towards a 7 x 24 environment (with some notable exclusions such as medical care etc. It is a step backwards.</p> <p>It's better to close earlier and still have a daily service</p>

Equality Impact Assessment Evidence

In total, there were **0** comments relevant to the EQIA.

Comments about the consultation process

There were **4** comments about the consultation process.

Comments about the consultation process
<p>Q To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to harmonise summer and winter opening hours, meaning recycling centres would open from 9am to 4pm all year round?</p> <p>...On a subsidiary point, what statistical evidence are you relying on in your decision-making regarding the relationship between flytipping and opening hours?</p> <p>Q How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to close all Norfolk recycling centres on Wednesdays?</p> <p>...You are totally detached in the methodology of carrying out this survey!</p>

Regular users of these Recycling facilities will not respond to this survey, as you well know, and you will base your decision on a very few responses.
You are wasting the NCC's finance on an unrealistic method of surveying!

...If you remove the Wednesday opening without actually consulting the people who come in on a Wednesday, you will never know why they chose Wednesday. It could be that they can only do it on a Wednesday, which would remove the possibility of the correct disposal of materials from themselves.

...I only heard of this survey by chance this week. It was not well publicised Perhaps consultations could be sent out by post, with the tax bills (I know that this would take a bit of forward planning). It would be good to be consulted more often. I'm sure a lot of us could let you know what we don't value, if you gave us a list.

8. Proposal 3: Your views on our proposal to save money by reducing the opening hours at the Norfolk Record Office

As part of the budget consultation, the Norfolk Record Office put forward savings proposals which would see the NRO close to the public on a Friday, but to extend the opening hours on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, by opening half an hour earlier.

The consultation was promoted via social media, the Norfolk Residents' Panel, through the NALC and press releases. There was specific engagement the Norfolk Record Society.

Of the responses received, all were submitted online via Norfolk County Council's consultation hub.

In total 69 responses were received to the Norfolk Record Office consultation page.

Option	Total	Percent
An individual/member of the public	63	91.30%
On behalf of a voluntary or community group	1	1.45%
On behalf of a statutory organisation	0	0.00%
On behalf of a business	2	2.90%
A Norfolk County Councillor	0	0.00%
A district or borough councillor	0	0.00%
A town or parish councillor	0	0.00%
A Norfolk County Council employee	2	2.90%
Not Answered	1	1.45%

Responses by groups, organisations and businesses:

Three online consultation respondents told us which group, organisation or business they were responding on behalf of. The organisations cited:

- The Norfolk Record Society

Respondent Profile:

The profile of 'individual' respondents (67 individuals) is as below:

Option	Total	Percent
Male	25	36.23%
Female	35	50.72%
Prefer not to say	4	5.80%
Prefer to self-describe (please specify below)	3	4.35%
Not Answered	2	2.90%

Responses by age (68 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	0	0.00%
25-34	6	8.70%
35-44	10	14.49%
45-54	9	13.04%
55-64	10	14.49%
65-74	18	26.09%
75-84	7	10.14%
85 or older	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	8	11.59%
Not Answered	1	1.45%

Responses by long-term illness, disability or limiting health problem (67 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	14	20.29%
No	49	71.01%
Prefer not to say	4	5.80%
Not Answered	2	2.90%

Responses by condition or disability (13 responses, some consultees may have ticked more than one box)

Option	Total	Percent
Blind or partially sighted	3	4.35%
D/deaf or hard of hearing	1	1.45%

Limiting health condition e.g. heart disease, asthma, strokes, osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia and myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME) etc.	4	5.80%
Learning Disabilities	1	1.45%
Neurodiversity e.g. autistic spectrum disorders, dyslexia, dyspraxia	0	0.00%
Mental health conditions – e.g. depression, schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorders, eating disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder	2	2.90%
Physical disability e.g. limb disorder, amputee, wheelchair user, cerebral palsy, motor neurone disease, muscular dystrophy	2	2.90%
Other	3	4.35%
Not Answered	56	81.16%
Blind or partially sighted	3	4.35%

Responses by ethnic group (59 individuals)

Option	Total
English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	52
Irish	1
Prefer not to say	6

Responses by language spoken (293 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Prefer not to say	6	8.70%
Not Answered	63	91.30%

Responses by district (67 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Breckland	8	11.59%
Broadland	8	11.59%
Great Yarmouth	4	5.80%
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	5	7.25%
North Norfolk	9	13.04%
Norwich	20	28.99%
South Norfolk	13	18.84%
Not Answered	2	2.90%
Breckland	8	11.59%

Responses from those with caring responsibilities (64 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
--------	-------	---------

Appendix 5: Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation report 2023-24

No	49	71.01%
Yes – for children with additional needs	3	4.35%
Yes – for older family members	6	8.70%
Yes - other	6	8.70%
Not Answered	5	7.25%


Responses from those outlining employment status (66 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Employed (full time)	21	30.43%
Employed (part time)	8	11.59%
Self employed	10	14.49%
Unemployed	0	0.00%
Student	0	0.00%
Looking after the family home	1	1.45%
Long-term sick	1	1.45%
Retired	25	36.23%
Not Answered	3	4.35%

Norfolk Record Office Proposal – Analysis

Q. How often do you use the Norfolk Record Office?

For this question, 69 answered. The majority, (46%) said they never use the Norfolk Record Office.



Option	Total	Percent
Daily	2	2.90%
Weekly	5	7.25%
Monthly	5	7.25%
A few times a year	13	18.84%
Hardly ever	12	17.39%
Never	32	46.38%
Not Answered	0	0.00%

Q. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office?

39 people indicated that they **agree** or **strongly agree** with the proposal. The main reasons for agreement were recognising the proposal as a way of making needed savings (7); regarding the proposal as fair and reasonable (5) and believing that the proposed changes would not have a significant impact on them or others that they know (4).

Q. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office? Please tell us more about why you chose that answer, using the box below:
Strongly Agree/Agree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about savings in general	7	<p>You need to save money in a painless way.</p> <p>Saving money is priority.</p> <p>we have to save money.</p> <p>Looking at times it would be good to reduce hours and save money.</p> <p>Cuts have to be made.</p>
Comments about the acceptability and fairness of the proposal	5	<p>It sounds sensible and will save money.</p> <p>Seems like an evidence-based, sensible approach.</p> <p>It seems a good way of reducing costs.</p> <p>this seems an appropriate way to compromise and consideration has been made as to how the service is used by those who actually use it.</p> <p>Looking at times it would be good to reduce hours and save money.</p>
Comments about the lack of impact on respondent or others	4	<p>Due to the amount of people visiting the records office, reducing the hours open will have little or no impact on those whom seek to use this facility.</p> <p>Those who really need information will organise so that they can be there at the right time.</p> <p>If you need the service, you set your visit according to the opening hours.</p> <p>I never use this service, would not miss it at all.</p>
Comments about the service not being vital, a key or major service	3	<p>For most cases it is non essential but is a good service.</p> <p>This appears to be a useful rather than a critical service and so I would have no issues with the cut in opening hours.</p> <p>Not a necessity. 2 days a week enough.</p>
Comments suggesting alternative opening times to those proposed.	3	<p>Why extend the hours on the days you still propose to open for such a low number of attendances? Just keep the same hours and reduce the day.</p> <p>I think that reducing the number of days it is open but increasing the hours on the days it is open is a much better option.</p>

		Looking at the times used it appears further saving could be made by cutting the hours further from 10am to 3pm.
Please note that themes with fewer than three associated comments have not been included in this table.		

21 people indicated that they **disagree** or **strongly disagree** with the proposal. The main reasons for disagreement are the belief that the NRO is a key and vital service (8); concern over the fact that the NRO has already experienced a reduction in opening hours (7) and others expressed concern over the restriction of public documents to the public (6).

Q. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office? Please tell us more about why you chose that answer, using the box below:

Strongly Disagree/Disagree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about the NRO being a key service.	8	<p>The NRO is something of an unsung hero within the council - their dedicated staff provide an excellent service and important work in maintaining and developing collections essential to the cultural life of the county</p> <p>The Norfolk Record Office is an important resource locally, nationally and internationally.</p> <p>It is part of our cultural heritage and access is very important.</p> <p>Norfolk has the finest Records outside London.</p> <p>The NRO holds one of the most important archive collections in England.</p>
Comments about further cuts to the NRO's operating hours.	7	<p>I feel the hours of the record office have already been severely cut back and the amount of saving is quite minimal.</p> <p>Opening hours have already been reduced.</p> <p>We have already lost Monday, which has excluded anyone whose day off from work this is, and I know people in this position.</p> <p>A further reduction in opening hours (following on from Monday closures) will simply confirm that the County Council has little concern for the treasures in its custody and has, at best, limited commitment to educational outreach.</p> <p>This is yet another damaging reduction in the opening hours for the NRO following, first, the abandonment of Saturday morning opening, then the loss of the compensatory Thursday evening session and finally (in 2018) the reduction to a four-day week (Tues-Fri).</p>

Comments about how the NRO should be accessible to all and the importance of public access	7	<p>Diminishing access to our community's records/past is wrong in principle. The Norfolk Record Society is itself the owner of a substantial holding of the material that is now housed in the Archive Centre and, like many other private owners, made its deposit on the assumption that the collection would always be readily available to the public and to members of the academic community. Public access was regularly stressed as one of the advantages of such deposit and the proposed further erosion of this service is a denial of that commitment. The society has also in the past helped to provide funding for record purchases on the assumption that the same conditions would be observed; they should be, unequivocally.</p> <p>I'm sure many enquiries are from people who do not visit in person however I think it is vital to give as much personal access to such an important collection as is possible.</p> <p>The number of people visiting is not so important as the fact that it is available, and the use they make of it.</p> <p>It would be tragic to reduce the days on which the public can access it.</p> <p>Because lots of people like to access it and it needs to be at a convenient time.</p>
Comments about the consequence of reduced hours on accessibility to NRO collections	6	<p>trimming away further hours (let's not forget that Mondays and evening visits have gone out of the window in previous years) only serves to undermine the work done there and reduces opportunities for people to visit.</p> <p>Those working on prolonged research will be greatly inconvenienced losing yet another day. This will inevitably discourage serious research, and diminish the number of users of the service.</p> <p>Further reductions in opening hour are discriminatory towards scholars, particularly visiting scholars, who might need continuous access to records for short bursts of activity - this might not show up in the overall figures quoted.</p> <p>I understand the need for budgetary savings nowadays, but to close on Fridays does curtail the availability of the documents in the Record Office.</p> <p>The NRO is a very valuable resource and reducing the opportunities to visit will make it difficult for visitors. If a visitor comes to Norfolk for the week, to carry out research, the available hours for research diminishes so much.</p>
Comments about Friday being an	4	<p>Friday is inconvenient for people who would like to visit for a long weekend to study.</p>

Appendix 5: Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation report 2023-24

inconvenient day to close		<p>Anyone wanting to have a long weekend and combine a day in NRO with a weekend break will no longer be able to do so.</p> <p>It is widely used by students and academics, many of whom travel to Norwich from far afield to work on research projects. They, and students nearer home at UEA, engaged on postgraduate degrees, will find Friday closure difficult, as they need sustained access to material which is only available for consultation in the search room.</p>
Comments about staff, their expertise or concern regarding redundancies	4	<p>their dedicated staff provide an excellent service and important work in maintaining and developing collections essential to the cultural life of the county.</p> <p>It is preferable to losing staff and expertise but does not represent value for money given the loss of opening hours.</p> <p>Will it result in redundancies among the record office staff?</p> <p>Presumably, staff can undertake a variety of tasks while on duty.</p>
Comments about negligible savings made by the proposal.	3	<p>I feel the hours of the record office have already been severely cut back and the amount of saving is quite minimal.</p> <p>Given the scale of savings needed to be made, saving £22k with these adjustments seems to outweigh any benefits.</p> <p>The saving proposed is not enough to close the service for another day.</p>
Comments suggesting alternative opening times to those proposed.	3	<p>I recognise the need to make savings but looking through your data wouldn't it be better to retain a 4 day service opening at 10.00 for example and closing at 3.30 or earlier?</p> <p>Surely it would make more sense to open the building 10am - 3pm Tuesday - Friday. That is 20 hours a week, so two hours less than your proposal - generating a bigger saving but also capturing the majority of your user base.</p> <p>Why not open half an hour later rather than earlier? People that work will not be able to use the service early but may use it at the end of the day once they finish work, foot fall may increase between 16.00 and 17.30.</p>
Please note that themes with fewer than three associated comments have not been included in this table.		

Equality Impact Assessment Evidence

In total, there were **0** comments relevant to the EQIA.

Comments about the consultation process

There were 2 comments about the consultation process.

Comments about the consultation process

Q. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office? Please tell us more about why you chose that answer, using the box below.

I welcome the opportunity to consult on the opening hours of the Record Office but I do not see how this is of much help towards meeting the budget deficit of £60m. The cost of putting together this report will eat into the £22,000 a year saving. I am pleased they have investigated popular visitor times and adjusted the hours in accordance with this. I do have a slight reservation about closing on a Friday because not all visitors to the Record Office will be local and by not opening on a Monday or Friday this may deter people from away who might make a weekend of their research and thus spend money in Norwich/Norfolk on accommodation, food etc.

The numbers don't add up there - you've pretty much got a 25% split over each of the 4 current days but with hardly anyone using the service after 3pm on each day. Surely it would make more sense to open the building 10am - 3pm Tuesday - Friday. That is 20 hours a week, so two hours less than your proposal - generating a bigger saving but also capturing the majority of your user base. It is a shame the service isn't open for a few hours on a Saturday to accommodate council tax payers who work Monday - Friday 9 - 5 and would like to use the service on their day off at the weekend!

9. Proposal 4: Your views on our proposal to save money by reducing weed spraying activities on the highway

As part of the budget consultation, Norfolk County Council proposed a savings proposal which would reduce weed killing from an activity completed twice a year, to once a year.

The consultation was promoted via social media, the Norfolk Residents' Panel, through the NALC and press releases.

Of the responses received, all were submitted online via Norfolk County Council's consultation hub.

In total 111 responses were received to the weed killing consultation page.

Option	Total	Percent
An individual/member of the public	102	91.89%
On behalf of a voluntary or community group	2	1.80%
On behalf of a statutory organisation	1	0.90%
On behalf of a business	0	0.00%
A Norfolk County Councillor	0	0.00%
A district or borough councillor	1	0.90%
A town or parish councillor	1	0.90%
A Norfolk County Council employee	3	2.70%
Not Answered	1	0.90%

Responses by groups, organisations and businesses:

Five online consultation respondents told us which group, organisation or business they were responding on behalf of. The organisations cited:

- Norfolk Residents' Panel
- Diocese of Norwich
- Broadland District Council
- Taverham Parish Council

We received one consultation response following the closure of the consultation (received on 19/10/2022 at 15:34) from Cley Parish Council. This detailed that Councillors agreed that NCC should reduce the number of times the grass verges are cut/sprayed each year. Due to the submission date, this has not been included in analysis, but has been captured for transparency here.

Respondent Profile:

The profile of 'individual' respondents (111 individuals) is as below:

Option	Total	Percent
Male	42	37.84%
Female	56	50.45%
Prefer not to say	10	9.01%
Prefer to self-describe (please specify below)	1	0.90%
Not Answered	2	1.80%

Responses by age (111 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-24	0	0.00%
25-34	8	7.21%
35-44	10	9.01%
45-54	22	19.82%
55-64	18	16.22%
65-74	37	33.33%
75-84	5	4.50%
85 or older	0	0.00%
Prefer not to say	9	8.11%
Not Answered	2	1.80%

Responses by long-term illness, disability or limiting health problem (111 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	20	18.02%
No	75	67.57%
Prefer not to say	12	10.81%
Not Answered	4	3.60%

Responses by condition or disability (111 responses, some consultees may have ticked more than one box)

Option	Total	Percent
Blind or partially sighted	3	2.70%
D/deaf or hard of hearing	0	0.00%
Limiting health condition e.g. heart disease, asthma, strokes, osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, fibromyalgia and myalgic encephalomyelitis (ME) etc.	12	10.81%
Learning Disabilities	0	0.00%
Neurodiversity e.g. autistic spectrum disorders, dyslexia, dyspraxia	2	1.80%
Mental health conditions – e.g. depression, schizophrenia, bipolar affective disorders, eating disorders, obsessive compulsive disorder	1	0.90%

Appendix 5: Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation report 2023-24

Physical disability e.g. limb disorder, amputee, wheelchair user, cerebral palsy, motor neurone disease, muscular dystrophy	1	0.90%
Other	5	4.50%
Not Answered	92	82.88%

Responses by ethnic group (101 individuals)

Option	Total
English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	83
Irish	1
Prefer not to say	17

Responses by language spoken (101 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
English	103	92.79%
Not Answered	8	7.21%

Responses by district (111 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Breckland	9	8.11%
Broadland	18	16.22%
Great Yarmouth	6	5.41%
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	15	13.51%
North Norfolk	15	13.51%
Norwich	20	18.02%
South Norfolk	24	21.62%
Not Answered	4	3.60%

Responses from those with caring responsibilities (114 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
No	86	77.48%
Yes – for children with additional needs	3	2.70%
Yes – for older family members	12	10.81%
Yes - other	4	3.60%
Not Answered	6	5.41%


Responses from those outlining employment status (111 individuals)

Option	Total	Percent
Employed (full time)	42	37.84%
Employed (part time)	13	11.71%
Self employed	15	13.51%
Unemployed	0	0.00%
Student	0	0.00%
Looking after the family home	2	1.80%
Long-term sick	1	0.90%
Retired	35	31.53%
Not Answered	3	2.70%

Your views on our proposal to save money by reducing weed spraying activities on the highway – analysis

Q. How far do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the frequency of weed spraying activities?

All 111 respondents answered this question, with a total of **63 people sharing that they strongly agree or agree** (56.75%) with the proposals to reduce weed spraying, and **9 people shared that they neither agree or disagree** (8.11%). The main reasons given for agreement include that reducing weed spraying is better for the environment (30) and the understanding that NCC must prioritise and make savings (11). Another popular answer is agreement as long it does not compromise safety (10).



Option	Total	Percent
Not answered	0	00.00%
Don't know	1	0.90%
Strongly disagree	28	25.23%
Disagree	10	9.01%
Nether agree or disagree	9	8.11%
Agree	25	22.52%
Strongly agree	38	34.23%

Q. How far do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the frequency of weed spraying activities? Please tell us more about why you chose that answer, using the box below.

Strongly agree/agree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about the impact of spraying on the environment (eg. pollinators, food for birds, habitat), reference to nature or biodiversity.	30	<p>Better for environment.</p> <p>Destroying ecosystems should be avoided. Spraying at a time of year which avoids massive disruption to insect populations would be good, too.</p> <p>Weeds are just plants like any other</p> <p>I imagine this will be better for the natural environment</p> <p>Would increase the number of wild flowers and have a positive impact on related wildlife.</p> <p>Would like to know what environmentally friendly weed killer is being used. Many "weeds" are pollinators that should be allowed to thrive. The less use of weed killers the better for overall biodiversity.</p>
Agree or disagree but with a proviso ('only if/ 'as long as ...')	12	<p>Does not look like you do this in any case where I live. Agree could therefore save the money but if it is going to cause more repairs later, these will clearly cost more in the long run so not the point of the exercise.</p> <p>I agree you might get away with 1 spray but the weeds will be bigger and stronger so you will have to use a higher dose of spray to kill the big weeds.</p> <p>I agree, as long as it can be proven that the surrounding road surfaces will not be adversely affected, because if they are, then the savings against only spraying once a year will be greatly outweighed against the cost of road repairs and the disruption to road users.</p> <p>As long as safety is not compromised I am happy with the proposal. Norfolk is a rural county and a few weeds don't matter.</p>

Acknowledgement that NCC has to prioritise, make hard decisions, comment shows understanding of need to balance books and budget	11	<p>It's about priorities and although I would prefer you continue some hard decisions have to be made</p> <p>Not only will it save money but 'weeds' like all plants are carbon sinks and will help with pollution too.</p> <p>its a good way to save money without having to reduce more important services.</p> <p>My only concern that it would cost more in the long run, if the weeds have caused damage that has then to be repaired. Have you done a cost benefit analysis on whether the savings now will outweigh the cost of future repairs?</p> <p>As far as I can see this is a "win, win" proposal. It affords Norfolk County council the opportunity to save money and reduces the use of harmful chemicals in our immediate environment.</p> <p>Reducing use of pesticide, however environmentally friendly it is deemed to be, seems to be a good proposal and if it saves money so much the better.</p> <p>Cost savings. These duties can be carried out by those who are receiving benefits for more than 6 months.</p>
--	----	---

In total, **38 people disagreed or strongly disagreed** (34.24%) The main reasons for disagreement is the impact on safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers (18), comments about how the proposal is short sighted and will therefore lead to problems further down the line (13) and the negative visual impact on appearance (12).

Q. How far do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the frequency of weed spraying activities? Please tell us more about why you chose that answer, using the box below.

Strongly Disagree/Disagree

Theme	No	Comments
Comments about the impact of spraying on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists or drivers.	18	<p>The weeds will not only erode the roads and paths resulting in costs to repair or insurance claims as people are injured through tripping.</p> <p>Views at junctions will be impaired by particularly tall weeds. Narrow paths will be reduced to one way only and force people into the road. Damage to pavements will be costly to repair and will result in more trip injuries.</p> <p>The visually impaired will struggle particularly to avoid damage and are more likely to have a fall. Small children will be unable to access footpaths if they will be required to brush past brambles and nettles.</p>

		<p>For the motorist this is a safety hazard, as said some weeds grow quite vigorously. The reduction in hedge cutting along with this is step to much.</p> <p>There are many safety, warning, and traffic management signs currently obscured.</p> <p>In addition, the taller weeds next to junction sight lines and on top of round-a-bouts, make it unsafe to use those junctions.</p>
Comments about how proposal is short sighted as it will lead to problems further down the line.	13	<p>I believe this is short sighted. It may reduce costs initially but weeds take hold and create more costly problems to solve. Weeds break up hard surfaces, block drainage channels etc. The cost of repairing these will far outweigh the cost of weed killing.</p> <p>Aside from the unpleasant impact on the local environment, leaving weeds could in the longer-term cause damage to pathways which could cost more to replace. This proposal seems like a short-term measure.</p> <p>As mentioned on previous page, weeds will make roads look messy. However, more seriously the spread of weeds may cause more damage to roads in the long run.</p> <p>My only concern that it would cost more in the long run, if the weeds have caused damage that has then to be repaired. Have you done a cost benefit analysis on whether the savings now will outweigh the cost of future repairs?</p>
Comments about the impact of spraying on the appearance of places.	12	<p>The highways are a complete mess, with too many overgrown weeds etc.</p> <p>The spray programme should be increased. The roads of Norfolk are very tatty.</p> <p>I will not like living in a area that looks like a scruffy and overgrown in the Summer. It reflects badly on Norfolk and will only encourage others to litter and generally take less care of their local environment. The amount saved is not worth it.</p> <p>This is not good because not only to do with roads etc. not looking nice but it is also not good for pedestrians having to use pavements where things are over grown.</p> <p>It will be unsightly and potentially dangerous for road and path users.</p> <p>Results in more work untidy streets ,trip hazards and damage to surfaces.</p>
Comments about impact of spraying on weeds or about the weeds	10	<p>False economy as will lead to even more weeds</p> <p>Weeds not destroyed also results in weed seeds being dispersed into gardens making harder work for housholders in keeping gardens presentable.</p>

themselves (including comments about ragwort, hogweed or other dangerous weeds).		<p>the amount of harmful weeds such as ragwort (which i believe we have a responsibility to keep under control) is on the increase. I much prefer the mowing as on the riverbanks</p> <p>Ive known an elderly person down our road have quite a fight with a 50cm high bunch of weeds on our roadside.</p> <p>Weeds left to grow during the summer become well established if they are not reduced/removed.</p>
Please note that themes with fewer than three associated comments have not been included in this table.		

Q. How, if at all, do you think our proposal might affect you? Please share your answer with us, using the box below:

In total, 85 people answered this question. The most common answer was that reducing weed spraying will not have an impact on them (26), that it will have negative impact on them (15), that it will have a negative impact on others (11) and that it will cause risks to their personal safety (10) and others safety (10).

Q. How, if at all, do you think our proposal might affect you? Please share your answer with us, using the box below:		
Theme	No	Comments
No or minimal impact	26	<p>Did not know that you did this so guess not</p> <p>Where I live we do not have a big weed problem on our roads or pavements.</p> <p>Not at all</p> <p>Minimally</p>
Negative impact on the individual	15	<p>In my road I have only seen the weeds chopped down twice in 20 odd years and it is a nightmare trying to keep on top of the weeds that spread into the gardens.</p> <p>My road, Paxton Place, is currently badly weed-strewn as we've had few visits from any weed-sprayers over the last few years. I did ask someone in Allens Lane recently to do our road (Paxton Place) too and he seemed surprised by my request but then did spray it. The cobbled surface is potentially damaged. As a cyclist I'm very aware of all the life-threatening detritus at the edge of the road, weeds included.</p> <p>We can't see around corners of verges and it will affect our standard of living.</p>

		<p>It won't be nice walking or travelling around if the weeds are on paths</p> <p>As indicated previously this could impact me a lot as I am a pedestrian, and am blind, so if areas are not cut or treated then it results in things being over grown making it difficult to walk on pavements.</p>
Negative impact on others/everyone /community and issues with safety as a collective group	11	<p>Safety on rural roads, pets at risk of injury dispersal of weed seeds.</p> <p>Increased costs of repairs where infrastructure is damaged by uncontrolled/ineffectively controlled weed growth. Our main roads are gateways to our area and towns/villages and excessive weed growth looks terrible to visitors in tourist areas, etc.</p> <p>Degradation of the look and feel of the neighbourhood.</p>
Risks to personal safety as a pedestrian, horse rider, cyclist or road user	10	<p>I regularly walk along roads and frequently there are no footpaths or verges, reducing the amount of maintenance will make some areas inaccessible without compromising my safety</p> <p>As a cyclist I'm very aware of all the life-threatening detritus at the edge of the road, weeds included.</p> <p>Damage to pavements will cause more trip injuries.</p> <p>My mother has already tripped on a damaged pavement this year and injured herself. She is visually impaired and did not see the damage until she was lying on the ground next to it.</p> <p>I will have to walk in the road so that my young son can use the pavement if the pavement is narrowed.</p>
Please note that themes with fewer than three associated comments have not been included in this table.		

Equality Impact Assessment Evidence

In total, there were 3 comments relevant to the EQIA.

EQIA Evidence	
Question	Comment
Q2 - How far do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the frequency of weed spraying activities?	Views at junctions will be impaired by particularly tall weeds. Accessibility for wheelchair users and parents with children in pushchairs will be affected by encroachments on to pavements and footpaths.
	Narrow paths will be reduced to one way only and force people into the road. Damage to pavements will be costly to repair and will result in more trip injuries. The visually

Appendix 5: Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation report 2023-24

	impaired will struggle particularly to avoid damage and are more likely to have a fall.
Q3 - How, if at all, do you think our proposal might affect you?	As indicated previously this could impact me a lot as I am a pedestrian, and am blind, so if areas are not cut or treated then it results in things being over grown making it defficult to walk on pavements.



Norfolk County Council

Proposed budget for 2023/24

Equality impact assessment report

For further information about this report please contact:

Telephone: 01603 973232

Email: equalities@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 Claire Charwood on 01603 989946 or 18001 0344 800 8020 (Text relay).

Contents

1. Introduction
2. The legal context
3. Summary of findings for 2023/2024
4. Contextual issues to consider
5. Human rights implications
6. Conclusions
7. Mitigating Actions
8. Other evidence used to inform the assessments
9. Annex A – Proposal to increase council tax

Introduction

1. This report summarises the findings of equality impact assessments of Norfolk County Council's proposed budget for 2023/2024.
2. Equality assessments enable elected members to consider the potential impact of decisions on people and communities prior to decisions being taken. This enables mitigating actions to be developed if detrimental impact is identified.

The legal context

3. Public authorities have a duty under the Equality Act 2010 to pay due regard to:
 - Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act ⁱ
 - Advancing equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristicⁱⁱ and people who do not share itⁱⁱⁱ
 - Fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.^{iv}
4. The full Act is available [here](#).
5. The new Armed Forces Covenant Duty came into force on 22 November 2022 and budget proposals have been considered in line with this new duty.

Summary of findings for 2023/2024

6. In total, 93 equality impact assessments have been carried out on all budget proposals for 2023/2024. This includes the proposal to increase council tax and the Adult Social Care precept.
7. Based on the evidence available, it is possible to conclude that most proposals will likely have no significant adverse impact on people with protected characteristics.
8. Broadly speaking, this is because:
 - Most proposals are designed to promote greater independence, choice and dignity for service users, giving them more flexibility and control over their lives. These are priorities routinely highlighted as vital by the public in consultation.
 - Eligibility thresholds for services remain unchanged, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs.
 - People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.
 - Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive.
 - There will not be new or increased costs for service users.
 - The proposals will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other requirements. These means that reasonable adjustments for disabled people will always be made where appropriate.
9. Where there is a potential for adverse impact on people with protected characteristics, this is always clearly described in the assessment.

10. If a proposal relates to transformation, it may not yet be possible at this stage to predict the final outcome of the transformation - because this level of detail is not yet known. It should be noted that transformation may lead to changes to how some services will be provided in future. These changes could impact differently on people with protected characteristics – including on older and disabled people who make up a substantial proportion of Norfolk residents.
11. In view of this, individual assessments have reflected where there may be risks and how these may be mitigated through further in-depth equality impact assessments, robust monitoring, quality assurance and tailored implementation plans. People who share protected characteristics may also be over or under-represented as service users in some services and therefore, as proposals are implemented, the Council will continue to take steps to meet statutory obligations and respond to the needs of these residents.
12. In addition, the individual assessment always states that if new evidence emerges during transformation of the potential for determinantal impact on people with protected characteristics, that this will be reported to the Cabinet before the transformation progresses, to enable decision-makers to give due regard to the public sector equality duty.

Contextual issues to take into account

13. When considering the impact of the budget proposals on people with protected characteristics, the Council is required to take into account the cumulative impact of all the proposals, together with other relevant social factors, such as:
 - The economy, the rising cost of living; deprivation and poverty
 - The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Norfolk
 - The increased use of digital, web-based and virtual technology to deliver services
 - Population changes and trends
 - Health and wellbeing
 - Crime and disorder
 - Rurality
 - Past changes to services such as a need for service users to start paying for some services or towards the cost of their care.
 - The Council's new duty of due regard to the principles of the Armed Forces Covenant where this applies.
14. The Cabinet routinely keeps these issues under review. Reports are published on the Council's website www.Norfolk.gov.uk
15. In addition, the findings of the equality assessments should be considered alongside the following information:
 - Public consultation on the budget proposals for 2023-2024, set out elsewhere on the agenda.
 - The Council's [Digital Inclusion Strategy](#) and the common barriers that disabled people and people with other protected characteristics face when getting online and accessing digital information and virtual environments.
 - Norfolk's population data, set out in [Norfolk's Story 2021 published - Norfolk Insight](#)
 - Past reports to Full Council on equality impacts of budget proposals, specifically those that at the time identified a potential for detrimental impact. The Council does not wish to

underplay the significance of any of the difficult decisions it has had to make in the past in order to balance the budget and protect as many essential services as possible.

- The findings of the [new Norfolk equalities evidence base](#).

Other information

16. It is important to note that the assessments set out in Appendices 1-5 only consider the impact of the Council's budget proposals for this year.
17. For obvious reasons, they do not detail the various positive impacts of the Council's day-to-day services on people with protected characteristics, such as: growing the economy; the proposed programme of capital investment for 2023-2024; 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.

Human rights implications

18. Public authorities in the UK are required to act compatibly with the Human Rights Act 1998. There is no evidence to indicate that there are any human rights issues arising from the proposals.

Conclusion

19. The impacts set out in this report should be considered when deciding whether or not the proposals should go ahead, in addition to the mitigating actions below.
20. Some of the mitigating actions will address the detrimental impacts identified in this report, but it is not possible to address all the detrimental impacts.
21. In consequence, therefore, the task for the Cabinet and Full Council is to consider the impacts set out in this report, alongside the other factors to be taken into account to achieve a balanced budget that focuses the Council's resources where they are most needed.
22. The findings of the assessments are set out in **Appendices 1-5**.
 - Appendix 1 – Adult Social Services Proposals
 - Appendix 2 – Childrens Services Proposals
 - Appendix 3 – Community & Environmental Services Proposals
 - Appendix 4 Strategy & Transformation, Governance and Financial Services Proposals (including Finance gross new saving proposals)
 - Appendix 5 – Strategic Review Proposals (all Services)

Mitigating actions

23. The following mitigating actions are proposed, to address the impacts set out in this report:

Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment report 2023-24

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	<p>Executive Directors to ensure that the proposals are implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements.</p> <p>This means that where appropriate, reasonable adjustments would be put in place for people who experience disadvantage or barriers to the built and virtual environments; services; information; ICT and communication, due to a protected characteristic, in accordance with the Equality Act 2010.</p>	All Executive Directors	From 1 April 2023
2.	<p>Executive Directors to monitor the development of implementation plans for each budget proposal, in accordance with the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>If, during implementation, it emerges that a proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting these assessments, this to be reported to Cabinet, to enable Cabinet to give due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty in accordance with the Equality Act 2010, to agree next steps before proceeding further.</p>	All Executive Directors	From 1 April 2023
3.	<p>HR to provide equalities data to departmental management teams via the HR dashboard for monitoring purposes. This will include whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures. If any disproportionality arises, this is to be reported to Cabinet.</p>	Director of People	From 1 April 2023

Other evidence used to inform these assessments

- Norfolk budget proposals 2017-2018 to 2020-2023 – consultation documents, consultation findings and background papers, as previously reported to Full Council each February
- The equality impact assessment of the Digital Inclusion Strategy
- The equality impact assessments of the Adult Social Care Connecting Communities Programme and Recovery Plan
- The equality impact assessment of the re-design of the mobile library service
- The equality impact assessments of the Strategic Review and Organisational Change Reviews
- Norfolk County Council's Digital Inclusion Strategy 2018 and Digital Inclusion EqIA 2021
- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Armed Forces Covenant Duty

i 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.

ii The protected characteristics are:

Age – 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, nationality (including citizenship), and ethnic or national origins.

Religion and belief – 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.

iii 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

For the assessment see Appendix 4 - Finance General gross new saving proposals - Council Tax and Adult Social Care Precept

Table: The number of dwellings on the council tax valuation list, and percentages of council tax exemptions, by Norfolk district (October 2022)

	Total chargeable dwellings on valuation list	Number dwellings paying full Council Tax	% Dwellings paying full Council Tax	% Dwellings subject to some reduction in Council Tax
Breckland	62,182	42,038	67.60%	32.40%
Broadland	59,428	40,382	67.95%	32.05%
Great Yarmouth	48,361	29,172	60.32%	39.68%
Kings Lynn & West Norfolk	72,271	48,033	66.46%	33.54%
North Norfolk	54,777	35,516	64.84%	35.16%
Norwich	65,670	36,661	55.83%	44.17%
South Norfolk	64,021	42,209	65.93%	34.07%
Total Norfolk	426,710	274,011	64.21%	35.79%

EQIA APPENDIX 1 - Adult Social Services – Budget savings proposals 2023-24

Budget Challenge 1-3

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Connecting Communities: Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving ASC018 and 2223ASS030</p>	<p>A comprehensive equality impact assessment of the Connecting Communities programme has been undertaken to inform service planning and delivery. This assessment is supported by the findings from the Council's public consultation with seldom-heard communities on equality, diversity, and inclusion (open now). This assessment includes an action plan which identifies how the experiences and needs of people with protected characteristics should be monitored and considered in decision making. This assessment will be regularly reviewed by strategic and operational leads for the duration of the programme.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that people with protected characteristics may experience different barriers when seeking to access services, may experience services differently, and may require practitioners to work differently on a case-by-case basis to identify and meet individuals' ongoing care and support needs. This assessment recognises the need to examine data about services users with protected characteristics and use this intelligence to ensure that new service plans are responsive to service users' diverse needs. Currently, there is limited evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria (as per the Care Act 2014), so people should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service should continue to do so, where they are assessed as continuing to meet eligibility criteria. • The proposal should not lead to increased direct costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national legislation and guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate whether staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics because of this proposal. The equality impact assessment recognises there may be more staff with protected characteristics working in Adult Social Services than elsewhere in the Council. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions because of this proposal will be implemented in accordance with relevant HR policies, procedures and guidance which are impact assessed separately. In addition the Programme will take account of other work taking place including the Workforce Race Equality Standard action plan. <p>This proposal will require officers to undertake additional equality impact assessments when developing detailed service design proposals and implementation plans. This has been identified as a requirement for the Programme by the overarching assessment. If, during monitoring and quality assurance of the Programme's activities, it emerges that an aspect of the work may have a detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	assessment this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.
<p>Double up care reviews. Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving 2223ASS038</p>	<p>This proposal builds on work already being undertaken under the Adult Social Services Recovery Plan which was subject to a comprehensive equality impact assessment in March 2021. This assessment recognised that some proposals may potentially impact differently on service users with protected characteristics.</p> <p>It is understood that service users who have more than one carer at a time supporting them are more likely to have long-term complex health needs or disabilities. Ensuring service users can remain independent at home with the appropriate and safe level of care and support is an ongoing priority for Adult Social Services.</p> <p>This proposal recognises that care plan reviews conducted by qualified occupational therapists may identify changes in service users' personal circumstances and / or identify opportunities for improved access to assistive technology and equipment. As a result, in some instances it may be possible introduce changes to existing care plans to safely reduce the number of carers required by individuals, without compromising the quality of care currently being provided. All care plan reviews are undertaken by qualified experienced professionals and Adult Social Services are legally required to ensure that care plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remain up-to-date, and relevant to the person's needs • remain relevant to the person's aspirations; and • Mitigate the risk of people entering a crisis or safeguarding situation. <p>This assessment recognises that there is some evidence that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal may have a disproportionate impact on some older and disabled people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian,

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal may have a greater impact on some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However, the proposal should not have a detrimental impact on service users with protected characteristics because care plan reviews will continue to be conducted in accordance with statutory obligations and best practice, and service users will continue to receive care and support in accordance with their assessed needs. This assessment recognises that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some service users may experience a reduction in the amount of support they currently receive. Service users should not experience a reduction in the quality, standards of support because of this proposal. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. The proposal should not lead to new or increased direct costs for service users. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal will require robust monitoring and care reviews should continue to be subject to quality assurance. If, because of monitoring it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
<p>Expansion of Self-Directed Support. Recognising additional benefits from our existing savings programme. Linked to our existing saving 2223ASS034</p>	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it should promote greater independence, choice, and dignity for disabled and older people, giving them greater flexibility and control to decide how their care and support needs are met. This is a core aim for Adult Social Services. This proposal will continue to enable service users in receipt of self-directed support to liaise directly with the providers of their choice to arrange their own care and support, rather than being referred to commissioned services.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that disabled and older people report maintaining their independence is a critical factor to their well-being. This assessment recognises that there may be potential for adverse impact if service users with protected characteristics experience barriers when seeking to access commissioned services or because available commissioned services have insufficient capacity or resources or experiences to meet their needs.</p> <p>There is a recognised risk that some disabled people may struggle to effectively identify or articulate their care and support needs due to barriers to communications and/or understanding and some service users may find it more difficult to access services due to geographical, physical and or financial barriers. This risk should be mitigated as service users in receipt of direct payments, and their support networks will continue to be able to access specialist advice and support through the Direct Payment Support Service.</p> <p>There is some evidence to indicate that:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal may have a disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal may indirectly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria, so people will continue to receive financial support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased direct costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal will require officers to take account of the findings of the related equality impact assessments for the Connecting Communities Programme and Adult Social Services Recovery Plan. The anticipated increased take-up of self-directed support should be robustly monitored to ensure the impacts on service users with protected characteristics are understood and any potential for adverse impact is recognised and mitigated where possible. If it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
One-off usage of ASC reserves	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will mean releasing funds from Adult Social Care reserves to alleviate budget pressures as a one-off. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive because of this proposal. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>One-off usage of ASC reserves: additional one-off usage of ASC reserves (reprioritisation)</p>	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will mean releasing funds from the reserves to alleviate budget pressures as a one-off. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Reduction in staff travel costs: post pandemic, staff travel has not returned to the level seen in previous years. This proposal reflects the changing pattern of spend.</p>	<p>This proposal recognises the need to adjust the budget because staff travel costs across Adult Social Services have reduced. This is because of changes in ways of working introduced over the past few years which have enabled more staff to choose to work flexibly from home to undertake administrative work or attend meetings virtually, resulting in an associated reduction in travel claims.</p> <p>This proposal recognises that Adult Social Services staff will continue to meet service users face to face where necessary and travel to attend important meetings in person as required. This proposal recognises the benefits of hybrid working to the environment and to staff wellbeing, as well as achieving a cost saving. Staff will continue to be able to claim for essential travel costs in accordance with Council policies and mileage and costs will continue to be paid in accordance with contractually agreed rates. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Review of budget assumptions: removal of cost pressures previously assumed in the Adult Social Care budget which are no longer expected to be required.</p>	<p>This proposal involves adjusting the overall Adult Social Care budget to remove assumed cost pressures which are believed to no longer be required, based on the latest information. There will be no impact on front line services or on the workforce. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; People from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of budget assumptions: reprioritised Better Care Fund (BCF) and Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) investment</p>	<p>This proposal involves adjusting the Reprioritised Better Care Fund (BCF) and Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF) investment to revise budget assumptions which are believed to no longer be required based on the latest information available.</p> <p>The Better Care Fund (BCF) programme is a joint fund for NHS and local authorities to support local systems to successfully deliver the integration of health and social care in a way that supports person-centred care, sustainability and better outcomes for people and carers. The pooled budget is made up of clinical commissioning group funding as well as local government grants, of which one is the NHS Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF).</p> <p>There should be no impact on front line services or on the workforce because of this proposal. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of service levels and demand post pandemic: targeted interventions relating to the Adult and Older Care Budgets – getting it right first time</p>	<p>If accepted, this proposal recognises that there may be opportunities to target more interventions to keep more older people healthy, safe, and well at home for longer and potentially limit the need for longer term interventions by Adult Social Services.</p> <p>This proposal will involve undertaking in-depth reviews of the causes of older people requiring long-term care and support and using this intelligence to adjust service levels and identify ways to take more effective preventative action or provide care and support in different ways, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving early support to reduce self-neglect and hoarding • providing advice and assessments to reduce falls at home or in care.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal should also reduce demands on Adult Social Services through the re-direction of resources. There are parallels with the work being undertaken through the Connecting Communities Programme and this proposal should draw on the learning from the comprehensive equality impact assessment undertaken of this Programme.</p> <p>This proposal recognises that the eligibility criteria for services will remain unchanged (as per the3 Care Act 2014) so service users should still receive care & support in accordance with their assessed needs. This proposal recognises there may be ways to make changes to the way services are provided to individuals and as a result some existing care packages may be reduced because of tailored interventions.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that there may be some evidence to show that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals may have a disproportionate impact on some older people with protected characteristics (such as men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal may have a greater impact on some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This assessment notes that the proposal should not have a detrimental impact on service users with protected characteristics as care plan reviews will continue be conducted in accordance with statutory obligations and best practice. Service users should continue to receive care and support in accordance with their assessed needs, albeit this may be delivered in different ways in future.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some service users may experience a reduction in the level of support they currently receive. They should not experience a reduction in the quality or standards of support they receive because of this proposal. • No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria, so people should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased direct costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal will require robust monitoring, and care reviews will continue to be subject to quality assurance. If, because of monitoring it emerges that an aspect of a proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
Working with partners to fully recover the costs of integrated services	This proposal relates to ongoing work with health partners to ensure contracts in place for the provision of the Norfolk Swift Response service (formerly Night Owls) are adjusted to take account of rising costs for the provision of this service on behalf of the NHS. Norfolk Swift Response is a free 24-hour service for residents to call if they have an urgent, unplanned need at home but don't need the emergency services. A core aim of this service

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>is to reduce pressures on acute health services by providing immediate support in the event of a sudden emergency – for example, where someone has a fall, but is not seriously injured. NCC: Norfolk Swift Response Team</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of budget assumptions: utilising alternative funding sources to maintain housing related ASC Prevention Services</p>	<p>This proposal involves revising budget assumptions which are believed to no longer be required, based on the latest information. This is because alternative funding sources have been identified to maintain existing housing related Adult Social Services prevention services which are vital to supporting Norfolk residents to remain healthy, safe, and well and live independently at home. There should be no impact on front line services or on the workforce because of this proposal. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Transformation of Physical Disabilities Services: delivering improved choice and independent outcomes for people with a physical disability	<p>This proposal involves undertaking a review of how services and support are currently offered to people with physical disabilities by Adult Social Services. Currently, there is not a specialist team supporting people with physical disabilities although there are specialist teams supporting people with learning disabilities, mental health needs and sensory impairments.</p> <p>This proposal recognises that there may be significant benefits in providing a specialist physical disability service as this will enable more targeted interventions to be identified through care plan reviews and through engagement with service users with physical disabilities and their families and support networks.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that taking a holistic approach to understanding and removing the barriers experienced by people with physical disabilities, using the social model of disability, should improve outcomes and enable more people to live independently at home with greater choice and control over their care and support. This assessment recognises that this proposal will directly impact on service users with a protected characteristic (disability), and there may also be some impact on staff because of reorganisation. There is insufficient evidence at present to state whether:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality of standards of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased direct costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There may be some organisational changes to staffing structures. Any changes will be implemented in accordance with their terms or conditions and relevant HR policies and procedures which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal requires officers to undertake a further equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of this proposal. This assessment will also need to be informed by the views and experiences of service users with physical disabilities to ensure that their needs are taken account of in the service re-design. This proposal will require robust monitoring, and care reviews will continue to be subject to quality assurance. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised and mitigated where possible, through this assessment. If it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>

Budget Challenge 4

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Additional capitalisation to release further one-off reserves	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will mean releasing funds from the Adult Social Care budget. The Flexible Use of Capital Receipts direction allows authorities to use the proceeds from asset sales to fund the revenue costs of projects that will reduce costs, increase revenue or support a more efficient provision of services.</p> <p>This proposal recognises that the substantial investment by the Service in the transformation partnership with Newton Europe for the Connecting Communities Programme falls into this category. The partnership has an agreed fee which has historically been funded from reserves, funding it instead from capital receipts means that reserves can be redirected for investment elsewhere. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Mental Health Transformation	<p>This proposal recognises that there may be further opportunities to streamline how support is provided to service users with mental health needs through care plan reviews and direct engagement with service users and their families and support networks. The reviews will be conducted by the established accommodation review team who are qualified mental health professionals within the existing Adult Mental Health team. Care plan reviews will also consider whether support can be offered in different ways through commissioned providers to achieve savings and improvements.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal does not reflect a change in policy with respect eligibility so existing service users will continue to receive support in accordance with their assessed needs, albeit the way this is provided may be adjusted in accordance with individual care reviews. This assessment recognises that there will be a direct impact on some service users with a protected characteristic (disability – mental health). There is insufficient evidence at present to state whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality of standards of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased direct costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance the Council's Promoting Independence Strategy, corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.

Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment report 2023-24

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There may be some organisational changes to staffing structures as an outcome of the review, but these will be implemented in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal will require robust monitoring, and care plan reviews will continue to be subject to quality assurance. Any potential for adverse impact on people with protected characteristics should be identified through monitoring and mitigated where possible. Monitoring and quality assurance should also take account of the views and experiences of service users with mental health needs to inform service improvements. If it emerges, that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
Strategic Review	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal

EQIA APPENDIX 2 - Children's Services – Budget savings proposals 2023-24

Budget Challenge 1-3

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Changes in ways of working post pandemic: reduction in the Early Years training budget because of the move towards a digital training offer</p>	<p>If accepted this proposal will involve reducing the allocated budget for delivering Early Years training due to increased demand for online training and more hybrid working which enables training to be delivered virtually and increases staff capacity.</p> <p>There will be no impact on frontline services because of this proposal. People who wish to attend training will still be able to access this, albeit it will be delivered in different ways moving forward. The accessibility of training (including digital accessibility) will be considered as a priority through the work of Learning & Development as the Council recognises that people with different disabilities require online training to be provided in accessible formats, taking account of the barriers they experience. The Council is undertaking a considerable amount of work to ensure its online provision meets accessibility standards in 2023 and this proposal will pay due regard to the Council's NCC Digital Inclusion Strategy.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, because it is responsive to staff and service user demand, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. Staff, schools, and early years providers will continue to be able to access high quality training through Children's Services according to their needs. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Expansion of CHS002: Alternatives to care (New Roads)	<p>New Roads is a dedicated service for young people aged 12-25, who are being supported by Children's Services. It gives young people access to a dedicated support team that helps them to achieve and succeed. The aims of the service are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the time young people spend in residential settings, like children's homes. • Support children and young people to live in family-based care, such as foster care, when they cannot live with their own families • Reduce the number of children and young people in care • Support children and young people to live closer to their family, friends, and their community, wherever possible

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to prevent young people from going missing, getting arrested or going into hospital. <p>The New Roads hubs are supported with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated supported accommodation trainer flats for 16 to 18-year-olds • High needs supported lodgings hosts. The hosts will be able to provide a room within their home and be a stepping-stone for young people moving towards living independently. • Hub community families, supported and supervised by our fostering team who can call on any of the specialist hub support at any time. <p>Young people residing at one of the placement options will continue to be supported by the New Roads service and the professional specialist support through this proposal.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that some young people within this cohort share one or more protected characteristics and as a result may experience worst outcomes due to a lack of tailored support and provision. Evidence from the Commission on Young Lives shows young black men are more likely to become looked after and more looked after young people and care leavers are identified as having special educational needs/long-term mental health conditions. These cohorts of young people are more likely to spend time in residential settings and national research indicates they are at greater risk of criminal exploitation and/or entering the youth justice system.</p> <p>The continued expansion of New Roads is aimed at improving outcomes for all young people in this cohort, including young people with protected characteristics and the Service will continue to prioritise work to identify and addressing systemic inequalities impacting children who are looked after and care leavers as part of anti-racist practice work and the Council's corporate Service & Communities Equality, Diversity & Inclusion plan 2023-26.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it should have a positive impact on young people with protected characteristics where support continues to be tailored to respond to the needs of diverse young people. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so young people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. Young people who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to young people who are looked after, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Expansion of CHS007: Inclusion (Home to School Transport) – extension of existing activity focussed on providing education more locally, supporting inclusion, supporting independent travel where that is right for the child, and commissioning transport most efficiently</p>	<p>The Council provides free school transport, as required by the Education Act 1996, if a child is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of compulsory school age (5 to 16 years old) on 1 September or they will be 5 before 1 September when applying for school... and • they attend the nearest catchment school or the nearest appropriate school with a place as designated by Children’s Services and • live more than 2 miles, measured by the nearest walking route to school, when under the age of 8 • live more than 3 miles walking distance from school, when aged 8 or over. <p>The Council also provides transport for children who are unable to walk to school due to limited mobility or a severe medical condition in some circumstances. Free school transport may also be available for families receiving certain other benefits, dependent on how far from the school a child lives, and eligibility is assessed based on evidence of need.</p> <p>This proposal builds on work undertaken in previous years, and if accepted, Children’s Services working with school transport services, will continue to work to ensure that children and young people’s transport needs are being met in the most appropriate way, with a continued focus on ensuring that children and young people are in the right local setting, their diverse needs are being met and they are being supported to develop their ability to travel independently in preparation for adulthood. This work will involve reviewing personal budgets and individual travel plans to ensure these are appropriately child centred and exploring ways to improve the commissioning and procurement of home to school transport to achieve savings.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it should have a positive impact on children and young people with protected characteristics (and their families) where support continues to be tailored to respond to their diverse needs. There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible children and young people should not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so children and young people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs in accordance with the Council's legal obligations. There should be no increased direct costs for parents and carers whose children and young people are eligible for support with transportation. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>Eligibility for home to school transport requires continued robust monitoring to ensure that policies are applied fairly and there is no unintended adverse impact. Responsible officers should take account of monitoring and use this to quality assure services. If, because of monitoring, there appears to be any disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics that it was not possible to identify at the time of this assessment, this will be reported formally so appropriate mitigating actions can be implemented.</p>
<p>Review of budget assumptions: Additional Supporting Families base funding offsetting the need for NCC funding for Family Support teams</p>	<p>This proposal involves adjusting the budget for Family Support Teams to remove assumed costs which are believed to no longer be required on receipt of additional central funding received from Supporting Families Programme 2022-25. There is no impact on front line services or on the workforce. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of budget assumptions: Additional Supporting Families income due to ongoing successful outcomes resulting in maximum performance by results income</p>	<p>This proposal involves adjusting the budget to remove assumed costs which are believed to no longer be required, because of additional funding received from Supporting Families Programme 2022-25. This is because Children's Services has demonstrated successful outcomes and maximised its performance by results income. There is no impact on front line services or on the workforce. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example,

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.</p> <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of legal costs: ensuring the right level of external legal expertise is utilised</p>	<p>This proposal recognises that Children's Services must be appropriately represented in court and at hearings involving children, young people, and families, and case work must be robust, however there may be opportunities to make savings and use contracted legal services more efficiently in future. The review will check to ensure that practitioners and managers are drawing on the correct level of expertise for case work and hearings and can upskill in legal case work. The review will also consider levels of demand and need for barristers in court to ensure they are bought in when required.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would now have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal now would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. Children's Services will continue to have legal representation as required. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of service levels and demand post pandemic: right sizing of the Early Years Sustainability Fund to reflect the level of demand seen in recent years</p>	<p>This proposal represents an adjustment to the Early Years Sustainability Fund because funding is no longer required for provision which ceased in 2021 and there is now an associated decreased demand on the fund. If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would now have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. The proposal now would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The related provision has already ceased, and alternative provision has been identified to meet local demand/need. Children and families will not experience any further reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics will now be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no further organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Withdrawing from the PDC Building: revenue implications</p>	<p>Due to decreased demand face-to-face training and events from organisations who have used the Professional Development Centre historically (including schools and education providers) and because of the Council's move to more flexible and hybrid working, this building is currently being under-utilised. Following a review in 2022, it has been identified that there is now an opportunity to withdraw from and make savings within the Service with minimal impact. The service will continue to provide training on-line or at other Council facilities as required, so service users' needs will continue to be met. This assessment recognises that there are other Council facilities which are more accessible to diverse service users because of long-term investments.</p> <p>If the proposal to withdraw from the Professional Development Centre is accepted, this will enable an adjustment to the overall Children's Services budget because of the change in expected revenue generated because of savings from capital recovery. Any revenue generated will be reinvested for the benefit of Norfolk children, young people, and families.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would now have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal now would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics because of this part of the proposal. There may be some minor organisational changes and changes to working arrangements for the small number of staff who currently use the Professional Development Centre as their centre of operations. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>A full equality impact assessment of organisational change reviews and restructures has been undertaken by HR. This identifies where there may be the potential for adverse impact on staff with protected characteristics because of workforce reorganisations and restructures and how these will be monitored and mitigated through the application of the correct HR processes which are also equality impact assessed separately.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Revision to nplaw model: alternative arrangement expected to deliver savings for Children's Services</p>	<p>This proposal recognises that Children's Services must be appropriately represented in court and at hearings involving children, young people, and families, and case work must be robust, however there are opportunities to make savings and use nplaw services more efficiently in future through changes to the way services are provided. The alternative arrangements are expected to deliver savings, as well as upskilling staff in the service and in nplaw.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would now have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal now would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. Children's Services will continue to have legal representation from nplaw as required. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Contract efficiencies: efficiency savings through reducing management roles and one-off inflationary savings</p>	<p>This proposal relates to a re-negotiation of a contract with an external provider to support children and families living with a range of issues and provide community-based early years support. As a result of contract negotiations, management efficiencies have been identified with no impact on front line services, although there may be some redistribution of workloads for management and the contracted provider as a result.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>A full equality impact assessment of organisational change reviews and restructures has been undertaken by HR. This identifies where there may be the potential for adverse impact on staff with protected characteristics because of workforce reorganisations and restructures and how these will be monitored and mitigated through the application of the correct HR processes which are also equality impact assessed separately.</p>
Review of service levels and demand post-pandemic: not restarting activities where there is no longer demand nor economic viability	This proposal relates to an adjustment in the Children's Services budget to remove costs which are no longer required as there has been no demand for provision post-pandemic. This includes removing the budget allocated for the coordination of the Children's University (a traded service which schools and education providers can still access independently), and removing budget allocated for coordination of international exchanges (also a traded services which schools can continue to facilitate as they wish). There is no requirement to consult with staff about the changes due to re-distribution of workloads internally to balance

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>the loss of functions. If this proposal goes ahead, taking account there has been no demand for these services, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and young people will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. Schools and education providers will continue to be able to access these services independently from Children's Services based on whether they wish to continue to participate in these schemes. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children and young people, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions because of this proposal. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact

Budget Challenge 4

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
One-off funding of transformation spends from capital receipts	<p>This proposal recognises the opportunity to utilise capital receipts as a one-off to support wider transformation work being undertaken within Children's Service. The Flexible Use of Capital Receipts direction allows authorities to use the proceeds from asset sales to fund the revenue costs of projects that will reduce costs, increase revenue or support a more efficient provision of services. There is therefore an opportunity to fund transformation costs from capital receipts where there is an associated saving and no impact on frontline services. If this proposal goes ahead, this should support planned service improvements and there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would now have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal now would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children and young people, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics because of this [art of the proposal. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Additional capitalisation of Senior Leaders in relation to asset development	<p>This proposal recognises that there are likely further opportunities to recover costs through the capitalisation of work undertaken by senior managers in Children's Services through asset development because of their ongoing involvement in provision of advice and consultancy on national and regional projects. Any income generated would be reinvested for the benefit of Norfolk children, young people, and families. If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would now have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal now would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children and young people, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics because of this part of the proposal. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Post-16 transport: remove option to pay a daily fare (currently only available on local buses which charge fares)</p>	<p>The Council provides free school transport, as required by the Education Act 1996, if a child is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • of compulsory school age (5 to 16 years old) on 1 September or they will be 5 before 1 September when applying for school... and • they attend the nearest catchment school or the nearest appropriate school with a place as designated by Children's Services and • live more than 2 miles, measured by the nearest walking route to school, when under the age of 8 • live more than 3 miles walking distance from school, when aged 8 or over. <p>The Council also provides transport for children who are unable to walk to school due to limited mobility or a severe medical condition in some circumstances. Free school transport</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>may also be available for families receiving certain other benefits, dependent on how far from the school a child lives, and eligibility is assessed based on evidence of need.</p> <p>Although young people must now remain in education or training until they are 18, the government has not increased the age range of free transport available to eligible young people. For students aged 16-19 years (or 16-25 years for those with an education, health, and care plan (EHCP) that names a post-16 learning establishment) the Council operates a subsidised scheme on existing local bus or train services, on education transport contract vehicles, or on any specialist transport that is deemed necessary to meet a student's needs. NCC: Post-16 Travel Scheme</p> <p>To ensure equity across the systems this proposal would mean daily payments for travel would no longer be permitted. A review has already been undertaken to inform this proposal, which has identified that the Council currently offers some families the option of paying daily for some types of transport provision. Whilst ceasing daily payments would bring efficiencies, it would also bring equality to the system ensuring all eligible young people have the same payment option regardless of type of transport.</p> <p>The removal of the option of the daily payment would also enable Children's Services to manage the post-16 travel budget robustly and allow for more effective monitoring of demand. While this would be a change for a small number of affected young people and their parents and carers initially, the change will be communicated in advance, and those affected be signposted to advice and guidance to ensure the young people can continue to travel to school or college with no disruption.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that in the short term, whilst changes are implemented the proposal to remove daily payments could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate detrimental impact on a small number of people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligible young people should not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria, so young people should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs in accordance with the Council's legal obligations. There should be no increased direct costs for parents and carers whose children and young people are eligible for support with transportation. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>As the removal of daily payments would constitute a change in the way a small proportion of young people pay for post 16 transport and receive their subsidised support, it will require a further equality impact assessment to be undertaken prior to implementation to ensure that any potential for short term adverse impact is fully understood and mitigated. The small</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	cohort of affected young people will be communicated with so they understand and can adapt to the changes with advice and support in place.
Strategic review of internal post-16 teams: ensuring integrated delivery of these functions across the council and the wider system	<p>The review of specialist post-16 teams ensuring integrated delivery of these functions across the council and the wider system should not impact on how eligible young people access services.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, overall, this proposal should have a positive impact on young people as support will continue to be provided in accordance with assessed needs, but the service will be delivered more efficiently.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so young people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. Young people who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities to children, young people and families, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance.

Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment report 2023-24

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Strategic Review: Opportunities A and B	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal

EQIA APPENDIX 3 – Community & Environmental Services – Budget savings proposals 2023-24

Budget Challenge 1-3

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Budget reduction: reduction of Arts Projects Grants and reduction in the Strategic Fund</p>	<p>The Arts Strategic Fund supports strategic arts activities in the county. This Fund is a recognised invaluable means of enabling partners across the cultural sector to access a wide range of external investment, including public funding such as the National Lottery, Arts Council England (ACE), trusts and foundations. This match-funding is used to support in-year funding applications by cultural partners to funding bodies including Arts Council England. It also enables the wider strategic development and capacity building of the sector and supports collaborative development work across Norfolk and Suffolk with, and on behalf of, the Norfolk and Suffolk Culture Board. Funding supports creative enterprise, cultural leadership development activity, skills programmes, and cultural tourism development.</p> <p>The NCC Arts Project Fund prioritises support to projects and activities that demonstrate significant community impact and benefit, and which most closely fulfil the Council's strategic aims and Arts Policy objectives. The Council has previously made awards of up to £500 to around 70 projects per year. Funding is awarded based on eligibility criteria for projects – for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects which demonstrate the wider value and impact of the arts on individuals and communities eg, health and wellbeing, social inclusion, learning & skills, and community cohesion. • Arts projects which benefit arts practitioners, and which are accessible to people of all ages and backgrounds. • Projects which encourage exploration and awareness of cultural diversity and develop new audiences for the arts. <p>If accepted, this proposal will reduce the budget available for these two arts funds. The main potential for adverse impact is that the proposal may reduce the capacity of smaller arts</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>organisations in Norfolk to deliver targeted initiatives to groups with protected characteristics, including those with complex needs, and outreach work. This has been identified in equality impact assessments undertaken in previous years. Evidence suggests that vulnerable people with protected characteristics, and those with complex needs are at greater risk of social exclusion and isolation, and less likely to participate in the arts than other people.</p> <p>Any associated reduction in outreach work could impact on people in rural areas. Any increase in ticket prices will impact on people on low incomes. Disabled and older people and people from Black, Asian, and other diverse ethnicity minority backgrounds are often in the lowest income groups. Arts organisations in Norfolk have historically played a significant role in delivering outward facing programmes to promote equality, foster positive relationships between different communities in Norfolk and provide educative opportunities.</p> <p>Any potential for disadvantage will be minimised where possible by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring the criteria for awards remains focused on meeting the Council’s wider strategic priorities • ensuring that activities supporting or benefiting vulnerable and excluded people are prioritised. <p>The Service will continue to mitigate any potential detrimental impact by continuing to identify other ways to promote, celebrate and support diverse and seldom heard communities – through well-established programmes for Black History Month and Norfolk Pride and LGBTQ+ History Month as examples. The service has also successfully attracted increased Arts Council England funding for the next 3 years. Arts Council funding will be focused on supporting and maintaining outreach and engagement with diverse communities, including targeted outreach and support to enable people who are at greater risk of social exclusion and isolation to access the Arts. A good example of this work is the regional Festival of East Anglia & Punjab.</p> <p>The Service undertakes an annual review of supported organisations and has robust data with respect to the diversity of the programmes it supports through funding – this information</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>is reviewed annually to help inform diverse project and programme development and delivery. This assessment recognised that there may be some limited evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal may have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal may more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The service will continue to maintain its strong track record with respect to promoting and supporting equality, diversity, and inclusion. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Business Rates Pool – forecast income over £2m	<p>This proposal, relating to the pooled business rates, which are in the Council’s control, has no direct impact on front line services or on the workforce, as this is a source of income. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive because of this proposal. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions.

Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment report 2023-24

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Business Support review	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
Civil Parking Enforcement – future back-office efficiencies	<p>If accepted, this proposal, will involve the transfer and combining of back-office services in civil parking enforcement from Norwich City Council to Kings Lynn & West Borough District Council and will achieve savings through delivering efficiencies in the management and administration of enforcement processes. The transfer will commence in October 2023. A small number of City Council employees will be impacted by this change but will be protected through TUPE processes.</p> <p>The change will be clearly communicated to members of the public through the Council's website and through information provided at the time of enforcement.</p> <p>Service users should only experience minor changes with regards who to contact for advice and information relating to civil parking enforcement matters (including appeals processes) in affected areas. There will be robust interim arrangements in place for the duration of the change period (until April 2024) to support the smooth transition of back-office services.</p> <p>A full equality impact assessment of organisational change reviews and restructures has been undertaken. This identifies where there may be the potential for adverse impact on staff with protected characteristics because of workforce reorganisations and restructures and how these will be monitored and mitigated through the application of the correct HR processes (which are also equality impact assessed separately).</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. Information about the changes will be communicated clearly to affected members of the public and to staff. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s statutory responsibilities, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics – only a small number of City Council employees will be affected by these changes. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be conducted in accordance with TUPE/HR processes Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Closed landfill: capitalise borehole installations	<p>A closed landfill is a site where solid waste is no longer deposited for disposal but is still monitored to ensure its environmental safety and that site risks around landfill gas and leachate are being managed effectively. In the proposal some borehole installations (to undertake monitoring and management of risks) will be recognised as assets rather than expenses, due to the County Council’s investment into the development of these. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; People from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Flood Prevention Funding – capitalise relevant activity previously funded from revenue budgets</p>	<p>This proposal will generate a saving through recognising flood prevention activities as assets rather than expenses, due to the Council’s longer-term work and investment into the development of these.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Norfolk Record Office – reduction in opening hours and income generation</p>	<p>The Norfolk Record Office provides a range of services to the public who are seeking documentation (including copies of birth, deaths, and marriage certificates) as well as offering advice, guidance and support for people undertaking research and archival work in Norfolk.</p> <p>The Norfolk Record Office has always sought to keep its fees and charges at a reasonable rate. This proposal recognises that there is now a need to increase some fees and charges, taking account of rising costs and the need to generate sufficient revenue to maintain a high-quality and accessible service to all Norfolk residents. This proposal also recognises that other savings can be made by reducing opening hours at times when there is low demand.</p> <p>This proposal is subject to public consultation. This will enable diverse service users to express their views and feedback will be taken account of in the implementation of this proposal, to ensure that the services on offer continue to be accessible to those who wish to use these.</p> <p>There is minimal evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence,

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.</p> <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of service they currently receive. People who currently pay for services will continue to do so (albeit that some fees and charges to the public who use the service will increase), and the service may be open at different times, based on overall demand. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is limited evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. This proposal may impact on some staff. Any organisational changes will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>A full equality impact assessment of organisational change reviews and restructures has been undertaken. This identifies where there may be the potential for adverse impact on staff with protected characteristics because of workforce reorganisations and restructures and how these will be monitored and mitigated through the application of the correct HR processes (which are also equality impact assessed separately).</p>
One-off usage of CES reserves	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will mean releasing funds from the reserves to alleviate budget pressures as a one-off. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; People from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Recycling centres: contract efficiencies	<p>This proposal relates to further optimisation of the contract arrangement with NEWS and Norse who provide recycling services and the updating of service level agreements to achieve better value for money. There will be no changes to services to the public because of this proposal. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of service they currently receive. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased direct or indirect costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Some contracted staff of the commissioned provider may be impacted because of the renegotiation of contracts which will be the responsibility of their employer to manage. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Recycling centres: harmonise summer opening hours at recycling centres</p>	<p>This proposal will involve modifying summer opening hours, so these are standardised across Norfolk recycling centres all year round. This proposal may involve some minor adjustments to staff working arrangements to ensure that the centres are appropriately staffed during opening hours. The proposal is intended to positively benefit service users because it will mean that opening hours will be consistent across Norfolk all year round. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any changes to staff working hours will be implemented in accordance with their terms or conditions and relevant HR policies and procedures which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Recycling centres: Wednesday closures</p> <p><i>Note: Proposal removed from budget planning</i></p>	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will mean closing full-time recycling centres that are currently open seven days a week, on Wednesdays but would not affect part-time recycling centres that only open Friday to Monday. The proposal recognises that at full-time recycling centres there is lower demand by the public for using the recycling centres on some weekdays, although it is recognised that older retired people and other people who do not work may make more use of the recycling centres mid-week as they wish to avoid going to the centres at peak times. This impact is mitigated because recycling centres will remain open on other weekdays.</p> <p>Two new recycling centres in the greater Norwich area have been designed to be as inclusive and accessible as possible and include large reuse shops, parking for cars and bikes and bins at lower levels and this approach is being factored into other new site designs.</p> <p>This proposal is subject to public consultation. This will enable diverse service users to express their views and their feedback will be taken account of in the implementation of this proposal, to ensure that the services offered are accessible to those who wish to use these. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards of the service they currently receive. People who currently access this service will continue to do so, albeit there will be a reduction in the service. The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. There is insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any changes to staff working hours will be implemented in accordance with their terms or conditions and relevant HR policies and procedures which are impact assessed separately. Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Reduce funding to the Norfolk Windmills trust	<p>The Norfolk Windmills Trust cares for 21 buildings across Norfolk. Thirteen are owned or leased by Norfolk County Council. These are open to the public on certain days throughout the year when admission is charged. This proposal seeks to reduce Council funding by a range of means – for example, increasing the frequency of open days and generating more revenue from admissions. This will enable the Trust to continue to pay for restoration and maintenance of the windmills.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>The proposal may lead to new or increased costs for members of the public (visitors and residents) who visit Norfolk windmills. It is recognised that the Norfolk windmills are an important part of Norfolk's heritage, but due to their age, structure, and their locations across Norfolk they may not be fully accessible to all Norfolk residents, particularly residents with physical disabilities.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norfolk residents should still be able to visit the Norfolk windmills, albeit there may be increased costs to do so and not all the sites are fully accessible. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Reducing weedkilling on highway network to a single treatment</p>	<p>This proposal will seek to reduce costs for the highways networks through reducing the frequency of weedkilling treatments. This proposal will have no direct impact on service users but may have a limited impact on the workforce/contracted staff due to the change in workloads. There are associated benefits to the environment, and Highways will continue to ensure that grass verges are cut as required for safety reasons.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive because of this proposal. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Review charges for events on the Highway	<p>This proposal recognises there may be a need to increase some charges, to take account of the increasing costs to provide services and budget pressures. Non-community events on the public highway are charged per event, for arranging and processing Traffic Regulation Orders etc.</p> <p>Currently, community events are heavily subsidised and consequently parish councils and other interested parties are only currently charged a nominal fee of £41. This fee has been further reduced for certain events such as royal weddings and jubilees etc. Typically, each year there are around 100 community events where this reduced charge is applied. The proposal is to charge the full amount to ensure the Council's costs are covered.</p> <p>The Highways service has always sought to keep its fees and charges set at an affordable rate and all fees and charges are reviewed annually. This is to ensure these generate sufficient revenue to ensure the Council can continue to provide a high-quality service to all Norfolk residents and maintain Norfolk's highways to a good safe level.</p> <p>Other fees and charges are applied in accordance with the published schedule.</p> <p>It is recognised that this would be seen as a substantial increase in fees, and this assessment identifies that this may impact negatively on community groups who wish to hold events, raise funds, or celebrate with their community. The smaller the community group,</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>the less available income they may be able to generate to pay these fees. In addition, it should be recognised that charitable contributions and small grant funding for community activities has reduced significantly overall due to the wider financial climate. Smaller community and voluntary organisations representing special interest groups (including those supporting groups of people with protected characteristics) may find it particularly difficult to raise funds to pay for significantly increased fees and therefore may have to make choices to limit or refocus their community activities as a result.</p> <p>The Council will seek to mitigate this impact by continuing to identify other ways to promote, celebrate and support diverse seldom heard communities – through well-established programmes for Black History Month and Norfolk Pride and LGBTQ+ History Month as examples.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that there may be some evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal may have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on some people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal may more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This assessment recognises that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norfolk residents should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of service they currently receive, albeit that some charges will increase to bring these in line with other fees

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of budget assumptions: Removal of growth and cost pressures previously assumed in the Community and Environmental Services budget which are no longer expected to be required.</p>	<p>This proposal involves adjusting the overall Community and Environmental Services budget to remove assumed growth and cost pressures which are believed to no longer be required, based on the latest information. There is no impact on front line services or on the workforce. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Review of Norfolk's Mobile Library Service and Vehicle replacement fund	<p>This equality impact assessment considers a proposal to deliver a redesigned mobile library service, based on the following key principles: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular mobile stops to be designed no closer than 1.5 miles of a branch library, except where there are significant geographical barriers or another significant factor to be considered • Any stops that have been unused for six months/the last six visits will cease • Encourage use of the Home Library Service (HLS) where people are unable or less able to reach either a mobile library stop or a branch library • Utilise greener vehicle options as the business case and affordable technologies allow (<i>note that an Electric Vehicle Mini-Mobile is being purchased using funds from a secured external grant</i>) • Continue to provide non-scheduled targeted activity for those socially furthest from the service, supporting one-off campaigns and programmes e.g., at care homes,

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Travellers' sites and with schools or nurseries (<i>note the Electric Vehicle Mini-Mobile will be used for this purpose</i>)</p> <p>The people affected</p> <p>In total, 5224 people used the mobile library service in Norfolk between January 2022 and December 2022.</p> <p>It is estimated that 278 current mobile library service users would be affected by the proposal. This includes people with a range of protected characteristics, set out below.</p> <p>The proposal would impact on employees of the service, as it would lead to a reduction of 1 full time equivalent (FTE) post. However, there is currently a 1 FTE post vacant within the service. Employees will be consulted on the changes and implications in accordance with agreed HR policies, and in line with the equality impact assessment of Organisational Change, Restructure and Review. This ensures that employees with protected characteristics (which includes being from the armed forces community) have access to appropriate support.</p> <p>The demographic profile of the people affected</p> <p>It is well documented that people who use mobile library services in Norfolk (and England as a whole), tend to be older people.</p> <p>Of the current profile of 278 current Norfolk mobile library service users, 60% are over the age of 65.</p> <p>Detailed demographic information on the other protected characteristics of these service users is not known.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>However, there is good information about the protected characteristics of the 5224 people who used the mobile library service in Norfolk between January 2022 and December 2022. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The highest proportion of users were aged 75 to 95+ (1,768). <p>The next groups, in terms of size were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People 25 years and under (1,424) • People aged 65 to 74 years (939) • People aged 25 to 64 years (964). <p>In terms of sex/gender, the majority of service users are women (64 per cent women vs 27.4 per cent men).</p> <p>In term of disability, around 6% of users self-identified as being disabled, homebound or being a hospital member.</p> <p>There were low levels of reporting on ethnicity.</p> <p>Public consultation on the proposal</p> <p>Another source of data is the public consultation findings on the proposal, which was carried out from 22nd July to 21st September 2022. In summary, there was a good participation rate, with 1,397 responses received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% of respondents to the public consultation were over the age of 65 and 36% were over the age of 75 (due to this age profile, there is a strong likelihood that more women than men will be impacted by the changes, as the number of women in

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>proportion to men in the county increases with age, for example, in Norfolk, people aged 85+ are more likely to be women who live alone).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1% of respondents to the consultation were under the age of 24. • 30% of respondents declared a disability which included sight loss, physical, mobility and wheelchair use, heart conditions and mental health issues. • 33% of respondents had no transport or means to get to other library services. <p>Respondents reported this is a key service, often describing it as a ‘vital lifeline’ to people in rural communities at increased risk of social isolation. Respondents reiterated the importance of the role of the library service in alleviating loneliness and reducing social isolation, particularly among older and/or less mobile people.</p> <p>There were many positive comments about the service and the staff – particularly - were praised. The contribution of the mobile library service in improving literacy and facilitating people’s love of reading was also noted.</p> <p>There was limited desire for people to change to digital services, existing users of these services often noted barriers to access or caveats around the take-up of digital services. Those less likely to use digital and online services gave their reasons as a preference for books and face to face contact, or technical skills/barriers.</p> <p>When asked about other activities or services that could be provided alongside the mobile library service, over half of respondents (725 or 51.90%) picked the ‘basic health checks’ option of listed potential activities. The Healthy Libraries initiative, an established partnership with Public Health and now the NHS (National Health Service), will continue to seek ways to enhance this offer within the redesign and continuation of the mobile library service.</p> <p>Other suggestions for the service to explore were charities, organisations for children or older people, The Post Office, councils, financial organisations, and food suppliers. These would require further partnership development and feasibility work.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>The Home Library Service (HLS) is volunteer delivered via agreement with the Royal Voluntary Service (RVS). The aim of the HLS is “to provide a library and information service to people referred to as Home Library Service customers who because of restricted mobility, are vulnerable, housebound or in residential care, or have considerable difficulty getting to a local library or mobile library.”</p> <p>68.6% of respondents to the public consultation were not aware of the Home Library Service and 16%, or 223 people, said that they would be interested in using the HLS now that they know about it. This provides an opportunity to enhance the use of the HLS when redesigning the routes, to ensure residents still receive an adequate level of service. A further 35%, or 493 people, said that they may be interested in using the HLS.</p> <p>There is some capacity within current provision of the HLS to serve more customers and the RVS is keen to recruit additional volunteers.</p> <p>The Electric Vehicle (EV) Mini Mobile is being funded by a grant from the Arts Council Libraries Improvement Fund. It will enable an environmentally responsible means of bringing the library service to deprived areas, fitting-out an EV with books and a suite of laptops or tablets to visit schools and targeted areas such as hospitals and other care settings.</p> <p>Respondents told us visits should be long enough to carry out activities which promote wellbeing and/or social cohesion or to allow library users to do activities such as chat and choose from a wide selection of books.</p> <p>Respondents also told us that they wanted mobile library services to be provided in rural areas; places where clusters of residents have specific needs and, conversely, where there is any need. The main reason people are unlikely to travel to a branch is lack of transport, though the cost of travel and barriers to accessing branch libraries were also mentioned.</p> <p>The main feedback given to prioritise routes and stops were usage and the availability of other services in the area.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>It was evident that many respondents considered themselves to be rurally or socially isolated. Responses came in from every part of Norfolk, with slightly lower responses from Great Yarmouth and Norwich.</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead</p> <p>278 current mobile library service users would be affected by the change.</p> <p>The proposal sets out principles for the continuation of the service, identifying new routes that will cause minimal disruption for service users.</p> <p>The Library Service would contact all users affected by the change and guide them to alternative services that include use of a branch library or registering for the Home Library Service to mitigate disruption for users.</p> <p>The Library Service would include work with the Digital Inclusion Strategy team to help people to make the transition to digital options where this provides a wider range of reading materials such as Large Print or eAudio listening books.</p> <p>There would be opportunities for targeted activity that is not part of the scheduled mobile library stops and routes.</p> <p>The proposal also includes use of an Electric Vehicle (EV), grant funded, for targeted activity to also mitigate the impact of change for customers.</p> <p>Potential impact of the proposal</p> <p>Based on the evidence available, if the proposal goes ahead, there may be a limited detrimental impact on some older and disabled people over the shorter term. This is because</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>some users may not be able to access the mobile library service in the same way they did previously.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that this detrimental impact is not considered to be substantial, because existing service users may continue to be able to access reading and audio materials from the home library service. This means that Norfolk will be able to maintain a 'comprehensive and efficient library service' for all residents.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the current mobile library service is not accessible to all older and disabled people – specifically older and disabled people who are unable to leave home or travel independently to a mobile library vehicle (it should be noted that some service users benefit from the mobile library stop being parked outside their home or very close by).</p> <p>In view of this therefore, there is potentially a positive impact for older and disabled people over the longer term, as the proposed expansion, development and marketing of the home library service means that people who are currently unable to use the mobile library service due to their age or disability will be signposted to use the HLS.</p> <p>In addition, current users of the service, who were finding it challenging to use the service due to increasing age or disability, may still be able to access reading and audio materials.</p> <p>In the short term there is a risk that the HLS may not have capacity in some specific areas where there is demand, but every effort would be made to develop business resilience over the longer term.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence to show whether people from some ethnic minority groups and people of diverse religions and beliefs will be negatively impacted by the proposal. Whilst Norfolk is home to a growing ethnically diverse population, Office of National Statistics data suggests that the county's ethnic minority population is primarily concentrated in urban communities. Norfolk Library user data shows a high proportion of branch library users from ethnic minorities.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>The Mobile Library Service does not currently serve Traveller sites in the county, except for the Roundwell site in Norwich. Provision to Roundwell site is not affected by this proposal. There is evidence of low levels of literacy skills on local authority-owned Traveller sites in Norfolk. In view of this the service is exploring options undertake outreach to these sites, working with relevant teams such as Traveller Education to enable more Gypsy and Traveller young people and families to access reading and audio materials.</p> <p>As indicated earlier in this assessment, there is a strong likelihood that more women than men will be impacted by the proposal. It may also be the case that women of younger age groups may be more impacted, as they are more likely to be primary caregivers to young children and be economically inactive living in rural areas, hence more likely to utilise a local mobile library service.</p> <p>Branch library services already provide resources targeted parenting, pregnancy, women into work and reading groups and the proposal has already sought to prioritise securing routes where the mobile service has higher numbers of older women or families with young children or routes which are further away from static libraries and poorer public transport. The Service will continue to prioritise targeting activities which will complement other community provision for families with children.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or non-binary people (LGBT+) would be negatively impacted by the proposal. Norfolk Library Service is well regarded for the diverse resources it provides to LGBT+ service users, and the availability of this resource will remain unchanged.</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead, the Mobile Library Service will continue to ensure that the mobile library service takes account of the needs of people with protected characteristics (whether in terms of ethnicity, disability, sex, gender, sexual orientation and religion and belief) by providing access to relevant reading and audio resources.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>It is relevant to note that a primary issue raised by participants in the consultation was 'increased social isolation' if the mobile library service was removed.</p> <p>Whilst this is a significant impact (greatly valued by service users) it should be noted that the general duty of the library service (as set out in the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964) does not include tackling social isolation.</p> <p>Having noted this, recent strategies for the library service published by the Department for Digital, Culture Media, have identified cultural enrichment, happier lives and social cohesion as important aspects of the library service.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the demographic profile of mobile library users is likely to undergo a significant shift over future years. This is because as the digitally confident population ages, the number of people who prefer to access digital services is likely to increase.</p> <p>In terms of the impact on employees, this is addressed as set out earlier in this assessment.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>There is no legal impediment to going ahead with the proposal. The proposal will be compliant with the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 to provide a 'comprehensive and efficient library service to all persons'. The Norfolk Library and Information Service will continue to meet the needs of the most vulnerable people in Norfolk, including older, disabled, socially isolated and rurally disadvantaged residents.</p> <p>It is possible to conclude that the proposal may have a detrimental impact on some people, for the reasons set out in this assessment. It may also have positive impacts, set out in the assessment.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Over the longer term, the process of developing and expanding the home library service could have far-reaching benefits for older and disabled people across Norfolk for decades to come.</p> <p>Decision-makers are advised to take the impacts set out in this assessment into account when deciding whether the proposal should go ahead, in addition to the mitigating actions recommended at the end of this document.⁶⁵</p> <p>Some of the mitigating actions will address the detrimental impacts identified in this assessment, but it is not possible to address all the potential impacts. Ultimately, the task for decision-makers is to balance these impacts alongside the need to manage reduced resources and continue to provide a library service to the people of Norfolk.</p>
Roll out of on street parking charges ⁶⁶	<p>This proposal is to roll out new a suite of new parking schemes to solve historical parking issues across different locations in Norfolk, with tailored options to meet the needs of each community.</p> <p>The purpose is to provide an effective on-street parking service in these locations and manage the Council's assets in a cost-effective way, while still ensuring that local people's parking needs are met. This assessment recognises that car parking charges can influence residents and visitors home, school, work, and travel choices and also promote sustainable transport choices. We are aware, from feedback received to date that some residents will be strongly supportive of the proposal on the basis that this approach should discourage non-residential (tourist or business parking in residential areas enabling more people to park closer to their homes).</p> <p>It is understood that any increased or new parking charges would potentially have a more significant impact on lower income households and particularly on those who rely on using</p>

⁶⁵ Mitigating actions agreed because of this assessment can be found at page 66 of this Appendix

⁶⁶ Consultation will be undertaken with specific areas impacted prior to any implementation

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>their own vehicles for work (including delivery drivers and tradespeople who may be on zero-hour contracts). There is some evidence nationally to suggest that there are likely to be a disproportionate number of people from diverse ethnic backgrounds in this type of work. There may also be a greater impact on disabled people on lower incomes who rely on a Motability vehicle to travel independently, however it should be considered that this group will also be in receipt of the higher rate PIP mobility payment which may offset some impact.</p> <p>It is recognised that all Blue Badge holders will continue to be able to park free of charge at some Pay and Display sites and in some marked residential and business areas (with statutory limitations) and that disabled and older people (and some eligible carers) will continue to be able to access free off-peak bus transportation across Norfolk. Nothing in this proposal will impede the concessions they are entitled to currently and therefore this would mitigate the impact of any changes on disabled and older people. Full time students aged 5-19 (including those studying at City College Norwich) can also access discounted fares for unlimited travel on First Buses.</p> <p>There is limited evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. <p>It should also be considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For these proposals to take effect an existing Traffic Regulation Order will need to be amended and this proposal will follow a formal inclusive consultation process, as a result, which will ensure that people with diverse protected characteristics can give feedback. • The Council will communicate with those residents likely to be affected as early as possible because the proposal may lead to increased costs for some Norfolk residents, thus enabling them to prepare in advance and give their views.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal will require a further equality impact assessment to be undertaken to assess feedback from people with protected characteristics and inform the detailed implementation plans. If it emerges that an aspect of the restructure may have a detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
Waste reduction initiatives: reduced funding	<p>If accepted, this proposal will reduce the available funding for the Council to spend on campaigns, initiatives and awareness raising activities to reduce waste. The Council will identify ways to use alternative lower cost methods including working effectively with the Norfolk Waste Partnership on shared goals and objectives and continue to promote important messages and programmes to increase the benefits of waste reduction through recycling and re-use.</p> <p>Norfolk Recycles is the public-facing brand of the Norfolk Waste Partnership (NWP); a partnership of Norfolk's County, District, Borough, and City councils working together to improve waste and recycling services for Norfolk's residents and visitors and campaign against fly-tipping. Norfolk Recycles has developed a fully accessible website as a central repository of information and advice and will continue to be used to promote shared and increasingly targeted campaigns through established networks, including on social media and in the community.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>It is recognised that some people with protected characteristics, particularly some older, disabled, and ethnic minority people may experience barriers when engaging with campaigns where information is only provided online or in one format. The County Council and NWP should take account of this in the development of all future campaigns and consider how it can monitor and assess whether information is reaching a diverse audience.</p> <p>Information on Norfolk Recycles is already provided to every household in Norfolk through different mechanisms the “Your Norfolk” newsletters, e-bulletins and through District, Borough, and City Council magazines. The County Council and NWP support a range of community initiatives although some of this activity may be limited because of the reduction in funding.</p> <p>There is currently limited evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to services because of this proposal. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Winter maintenance – operational delivery efficiencies	<p>This proposal relates to a change in the ICT system being used to manage the winter maintenance programme of work. This will achieve a cost saving through the procurement of a new system which is expected to also deliver efficiencies. The priority for winter maintenance will continue to be to carry out precautionary salting on priority established routes when ice is likely to form – this includes on A, B and some C class roads, commuter and major bus routes and, as far as is possible, one route into all villages and some pedestrian areas in central King's Lynn, central Great Yarmouth and central Norwich.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of service they currently receive. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is limited evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. This proposal may impact on some contracted Norse staff. Full training on the system will be provided There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of fees and charges: review of fees and charges across Highways and Waste budgets to ensure charging is at the right level and introduce new charges in line with other local authorities where appropriate</p>	<p>The ongoing review of fees and charges has identified that some Highways, Transport and Waste services fees are set at substantially lower rates in Norfolk in comparison to neighbouring authorities, and some fees require adjusting on an annual basis to take account of inflationary increases (RPI) and other effects on costs.</p> <p>This proposal also recognises that there may also be opportunities for the Council to generate revenue for reinvestment by introducing some new fees – particularly to businesses and developers where they wish to use the highways for their purposes – for example displaying banners on highways or for permits for skips and scaffolding. Where necessary, the public will be consulted on increased fees, in accordance with the Council's legal obligations.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal, if accepted would enable the Council to generate more income, primarily from businesses and developers, for re-investment in the service, to maintain services and cover enforcement costs. The proposal will ensure that where the Council can lawfully make charges, these fees are set at competitive levels and deliver value for money. There may be some impact on individual service users, but frontline services would be unaffected by this proposal. Fees and charges would apply based on agreed set criteria with statutory exemptions. Rates will be tested for affordability, and all fees and charges will be published and reviewed annually in accordance with the schedules.</p> <p>There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive, albeit there may be some increases in some fees and new charges • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal may require officers to undertake further equality impact assessments to understand whether there is a likelihood of any adverse impact on people with protected characteristics, taking account of feedback from consultations undertaken and statutory guidance with respect making fees and charges. If it emerges that an aspect of the restructure may have a detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
<p>Review of Highways and Waste budgets: reviewing service levels, budget requirements and demand, contract efficiencies, capitalisation, and deletion of vacant posts</p>	<p>If accepted, this proposal will bring together several different activities to deliver efficiencies, ensure contracts are delivering value for money and proactively identify improvements to highways and waste services.</p> <p>Increasing the frequency of proactive highway street-works inspections and close monitoring of contractors work and compliance with permit schemes would benefit residents. Extension of contracts which are performing well would create savings from procurement processes, as would the capitalisation of assets which have benefited from service investments and the deletion of posts and re-distribution of work, and the recognition of further opportunities to recover costs from re-charging of for advice and consultancy on national projects. Whilst for some Waste services that are demand led, changing budgets to reflect the most recent levels of demand will generate a cost reduction, driven mainly by a reduction in the amount of residual waste collected by Norfolk's councils.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any changes to staff working hours will be implemented in accordance with their terms or conditions and relevant HR policies and procedures which are impact assessed separately. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Restructure of the Museums Service⁶⁷</p>	<p>Since 2021, the Museums Service has been looking at how funding can be accessed or used in different ways to maintain service levels and deliver efficiencies. The Service has successfully attracted significant national funding to maintain and enhance provision at all its 10 museums and in the delivery of services across Norfolk.</p> <p>If accepted, this proposal will seek to deliver efficiencies within the Service with minimal impact on Norfolk residents and visitors who wish to visit the various museum or engage with education programmes. Savings will be achieved through restructuring the service and reviewing staffing levels. The planned restructure will take account of analysis of demand for/use of locations at different times by members of the public and groups and consider visitor feedback in tailoring the offer. There may be some adjustments to opening times and/or entry fees as a result, and there may also be some changes behind the scenes in terms of managing exhibitions and supporting ongoing preservation and education work.</p> <p>In 2021-22 the Museums Service undertook in-depth accessibility audits at key locations to understand how to make its physical locations as accessible and inclusive as possible. This work has included a detailed equality impact assessment of the refurbishment of Norwich Castle and a full access audit of Gressenhall Farm and Workhouse (currently underway and linked to the work being undertaken through the Monuments Project). The Museums Service is also providing Changing Places toilets in some locations. The evidence from these assessments and audits will be considered as part of the restructure to enable the Service to consider how people with one or more protected characteristic can use the Service, and whether there are still opportunities to generate more income through increased footfall.</p> <p>The Service has a strong track record of meeting the needs of diverse communities and will continue to support community led initiatives both physically and online – including, but not limited to LGBTQ+ History Month, Holocaust Memorial Day and Black History Month, and through the Kick the Dust programme for young people and Slaves of Fashion exhibition.</p>

⁶⁷ Proposal to deliver efficiencies within the service, this does not relate to changes in the level or type of services provided.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is currently limited evidence to indicate that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any significant reductions in the quality or standards of the service they currently receive. People who currently access this service will continue to do so, albeit there may be some limited changes to how they access this service. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is insufficient evidence available currently to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies and procedures which are impact assessed separately and all affected staff will be consulted with in accordance with the Council's legal responsibilities as an employer. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Budget Challenge 4

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Capitalisation in EDI service	<p>This proposal represents a change in accounting recognising the commercial consultancy and advice services provided by officers within the EDI service and associate income generation for reinvestment can be considered a capital asset. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>One-off saving from Trading Standards staffing budget</p>	<p>This proposal recognises that as trainee Trading Standards Officers progress through their qualification journey their salary will increase. Previously, the budget was set above the current Officer's existing salary level. Taking account of the time it would take current staff to reach the required level of qualifications, the assumed budget can be reduced in this financial year (as a one-off saving). There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Armed forces covenant funding – reduce funding contribution for one year</p>	<p>The Norfolk Armed Forces Covenant Board is a highly-regarded, established independent Board. It facilitates partnership work and supports organisations across Norfolk to improve outcomes for members of Norfolk's armed forces in line with the Armed Forces Act 2021, which more recently includes the new statutory duty of due regard to the Covenant.</p> <p>This proposal recognises that the small events and partnership activities budget provided by the Council to the Armed Forces Covenant Board has been under-utilised in the past.</p> <p>For one year only, it is proposed to reduce the funding allocation we provide to the Norfolk Armed Forces Covenant Board budget for 2023/2024 from £20,000 to £10,000.</p> <p>This means that in 2023/2024, the Board would receive funding of £10,000. Thereafter, from 2024/2025, the funding allocation to the Board would return to £20,000 per annum.</p> <p>It is not proposed to make any reductions to any other aspect of the significant level of resource we dedicate to the Board.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>The Norfolk Armed Forces Commissioner and the Norfolk Armed Forces Covenant Board members have been asked for their views about the proposal, to ensure that we fully understand the potential before making a decision. The findings of this equality assessment will be updated when this information is available.</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead, the Board will still retain a budget in 2023/24 to support projects to improve outcomes for Norfolk's armed forces community. This should not impact on the Board's ability to continue to be able to maintain strong relationships with Armed Forces Charities and local services supporting the Armed Forces community in Norfolk to ensure that the needs of serving families and veterans living in Norfolk are being met.</p> <p>There is no evidence at the present time to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's duty of due regard for the Covenant, the Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. <p>If the proposal goes ahead, the size of the budget available to the Board will be reduced in 2023/2024, and the impact of this on armed forces initiatives will be assessed in detail following receipt of the views of the Norfolk Armed Forces Commissioner and the Board.</p>
Remove Learning & Development budget	<p>The Director of Communities, Information & Learning had a historic budget allocated for additional learning and development which is no longer required. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Staff will continue to access required learning and professional development via their management • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Joined up approach to Prevention and Protection/Trading Standards activities</p>	<p>If accepted, this proposal relates to the realignment of the CES Trading Standards team with Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service's Prevention and Protection team. The proposal recognises there would be opportunities to achieve efficiencies through closer working of these teams because of similarities in their functions and ways of working. The implementation of this proposal will be informed by a review and no changes to organisational structures are expected in the financial year. Staff will be consulted on this proposal via their management and their views and experiences will be considered in the re-design.</p> <p>An equality impact assessment of organisational change reviews and restructures has been undertaken. This identifies where there may be the potential for adverse impact on staff with protected characteristics because of workforce reorganisations and restructures and how these will be monitored and mitigated through the application of the correct HR processes (which are also equality impact assessed separately).</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. Information about any changes to how services will be delivered in future will be communicated clearly to members of the public and to staff when these are agreed upon • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be conducted in accordance with HR processes which are impact assessed separately, and staff will be consulted with before any organisational changes are made, in accordance with the Council's contractual obligations.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal will require a further equality impact assessment to be undertaken to assess whether there is the potential for any adverse impact on staff or service users with protected characteristics and inform the detailed implementation plans. If it emerges that an aspect of the reorganisation may have a detrimental or disproportionate impact on service users or staff with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
Fire and Rescue Service efficiencies	<p>This proposal represents a one-off release of budget through a review of Fire & Rescue service underspends and short-term opportunities to minimise costs within the year. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. People will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Norfolk Record Office efficiencies	<p>As a result of ongoing reviews, the Norfolk Record Office has identified some efficiencies which can be made in the back office, which will achieve a reduction in spend on staff training, conservation materials, transport costs and office supplies. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of service they currently receive. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Staff will continue to access required learning and professional development via their management (albeit this may be online training or in-house training which can be provided at lower cost) • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding surplus	<p>The Transport Act 2020 requires NCC to publish a local transport plan which describes the council's strategy and policy framework for transport and is used as a guide for investment priorities as well as being considered by other agencies when determining their planning or delivery decisions.</p> <p>The current Local Transport Plan (LTP) covers the period 2021-2036 and was adopted at the full County Council meeting of 19 July 2022 following extensive consultation. However, as part of the work towards achieving a County Deal for Norfolk, the LTP will need to be reviewed in line with expected new national guidance which will be subject to specific funding meaning that NCC will not be required to fund this change as would normally be the case.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal may require officers to undertake further equality impact assessments when reviewing the LTP and implementing it. If, during consideration of these, it emerges that an aspect of a proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to the Cabinet, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
Changes to the process for determining planning decisions	The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 enable local planning authorities to determine their own development proposals on land in which they have an interest. This

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
where the County Council is the applicant	<p>proposal would see the Council taking opportunities arising from amendments to these regulations to achieve efficiencies in future. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. • No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Residual waste: waste growth review – additional saving over	Residual waste volumes increased sharply over two years from 2019 by around 9%, driven by the Covid-19 effects on consumer behaviours and increases in working from home. From late 2021 waste volumes started to reduce, and that effect has continued as a reflection of

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
and above associated proposals above	<p>changing consumer practices and confidence. This means that savings can be achieved because money set aside will no longer be needed to cope with the disposal of high levels of waste.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. • No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Recycling centres: relocation of operations from Mayton Wood Recycling Centre to the new Norwich North Recycling Centre</p>	<p>The proposal is to relocate operations from the existing recycling centre at Mayton Wood near Coltishall, around six miles or a 15-minute car journey, to the new Norwich North Recycling Centre meaning that the Mayton Wood Recycling Centre would be able to close. The new Norwich North Recycling Centre opened in autumn 2021 and provides an improved service which is easily accessible by customers due to its location. The new site is operated without interruptions for bin movements and does not require use of steps by customers to dispose of their waste and has an improved layout for traffic flows and parking as well as a large reuse shop.</p> <p>There is some evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users may experience some reductions in the standard of support they currently receive due to an increased travel time or distance to the new recycling centre. However, it should be noted that the new site is more accessible for disabled and older people. • No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so however the relocation of the site may act as a barrier for some people, especially if they are less able to travel.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will potentially lead to new or increased indirect costs for service users if they need to travel further to access the site. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is some evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics if they are required to travel to the new recycling centre, an alternative recycling centre or if their employment ceases. • There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions, however contractors' employees may be impacted by the changes. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal will require a further equality impact assessment to be undertaken to assess feedback from people with protected characteristics and inform the detailed implementation plans. If it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
Increased recycling centre charges	<p>Whilst household waste items such as garden waste, electrical items and furniture are accepted free of charge to householders at recycling centres, charges have been in place at recycling centres for DIY type waste for over 20 years. The charges in place were last updated in 2018, with charges in place such as £3 for an item or 80 litre bag equivalent of rubble or timber, £5 for flat glass or non-recyclable DIY waste, £9 for plasterboard and £4 per tyre.</p> <p>Increases to charges in place for these specific DIY type materials from householders and for charges to business customers are required to ensure that they cover the costs of</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>dealing with these materials due to changes in processing costs and the effects of inflation. The approach would be to ensure that from 01 April 2023 any changes to charges are rounded-up to the nearest 50 pence to keep the charges simple for all when calculating costs and for when customers are comparing alternative options for dealing with such materials.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. • No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so however they will potentially be required to pay more for some of the service they receive. • The proposal will lead to increased costs for all service users, regardless of protected characteristics. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal may require further equality impact assessments to be undertaken when developing detailed service design proposals and implementation plans. If, during consideration of these, it emerges that an aspect of a proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to the Cabinet, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p>
<p>External funding contribution to deliver the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP)</p>	<p>The Council is required to contribute towards the National Bus Strategy (part of the Bus Services Act 2017) to improve bus services through greater local leadership, to reverse the recent shift in journeys away from public transport and encourage passengers back to bus. New funding made available from the Department for Transport will enable NCC to deliver actions to meet the Strategy without having to fund it directly.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. • No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so and may see some improvements in the level of service provided. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Streetlighting – further dim all lights with an existing CMS (Central Management System) which are usually the main road streetlights – lights would come on at 75%, dim to 50% from 8pm</p>	<p>Currently streetlights on main roads (not residential areas) are switched on at 100% illumination and dimmed to 75% at 8pm and to 50% at 10pm. This proposal would seek to start lighting at 75% and then dim to 50% at 8pm for the remaining overnight period to achieve savings. This would mean that streetlights would be less bright from earlier in the evening and overnight all year round. This proposal will not be fully implemented until 2024-25.</p> <p>There is limited evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service users may experience some reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>As previously reported to elected members, the main impact of dimming the lights is that some people with sight loss, who rely on bright light to see, may find it harder to navigate. Some people who are older or disabled or who are worried about crime may be worried that reduced lighting increases risk of crime.</p> <p>However, similar proposals to reduce street lighting in Norfolk have been implemented in the past, and this has not triggered these issues.</p> <p>This proposal may require officers to undertake further equality impact assessments when developing detailed service design proposals and implementation plans. If, during consideration of these, it emerges that an aspect of a proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	be reported formally to the Cabinet, to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.
Application of Business Rates Pool funds to support Norfolk Investment Framework (NIF) expenditure	<p>If accepted, this proposal will involve releasing funds from pooled business rates, which are in the Council's control, as a one-off to fund economic development activities. This investment is expected benefit Norfolk's economy by allowing Norfolk to self-determine long-term investment priorities and ensure the collective benefits of those investments are shared by all residents. Both the evidence base and the Norfolk Investment Framework were consulted on widely, involving public, private, and voluntary sector bodies and community groups. The Framework and its supporting evidence document were endorsed by the County Council's Cabinet on 6 June 2022.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or levels of service they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
One-off application of CES reserves to support core budget	<p>This proposal, relating to the use of CES reserves, has no direct impact on front line services or on the workforce, as this is an alternative source of funding enabling current activity levels to be maintained. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive because of this proposal. No changes are proposed to

Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment report 2023-24

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Strategic Review	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal

Mitigating actions agreed to support the implementation of the Mobile Library proposal if agreed

No.	Action	Lead
1.	<p>If the proposal goes ahead, the Library Service to contact all users affected by the change and to guide them to alternative services that include use of a branch library or registering for the Home Library Service to mitigate disruption for users.</p> <p>This will include work with the Digital Inclusion Strategy team to help people to make the transition to digital options where this provides a wider range of reading materials such as Large Print or e-Audio listening books.</p>	Head of Norfolk Library and Information Service
2.	<p>If, during implementation of this proposal, a detrimental impact emerges for people with protected characteristics or who are from the armed forces that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this to be reported to decision makers, to enable them to give due regard to equality before proceeding further.</p>	Head of Norfolk Library and Information Service
3.	<p>HR to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures. If any disproportionality arises, this is to be reported to CES senior leadership to determine next steps</p>	Director of People

EQIA APPENDIX 4 - Strategy & Transformation – Governance - Finance and Commercial Services/Finance and Governance – Budget savings proposals 2023-24

Also - Finance General gross new saving proposals 2023-24 to 2024-25 (Council Tax and Adult Social Care Precept)

Budget Challenge 1-3 – Strategy & Transformation

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Expansion of professional leads: centralise and control spend on communications. This would include paid staff and/or non-pay procurement across the organisation	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
Expansion of professional leads: work with other departments to agree the Council's desired level of activity and overall number of analysts required	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
One-off usage of S&T reserves	<p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will mean releasing funds from the Strategy & Transformation budget reserves to alleviate pressures as a one-off. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.</p> <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Budget Challenge 4 – Strategy & Transformation

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
HR remodelling	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
Transformation capitalisation saving	<p>This proposal is linked to the Strategic Review and if accepted would see the Council’s investment in service transformation and associated revenue generation funded from capital receipts for two years. The Flexible Use of Capital Receipts direction allows authorities to use the proceeds from asset sales to fund the revenue costs of projects that will reduce costs, increase revenue or support a more efficient provision of services. There is therefore an opportunity to fund transformation costs from capital receipts where there is an associated saving and no impact on frontline services. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics by this aspect of the Strategic Review. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>

Budget Challenge 1-3 – Governance

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Increase in registrars' income	<p>This proposal recognises there has been increased demand for registrar services post-pandemic (copy certificates, venue licencing, marriages, and civil partnerships) and therefore there will be an associated increase in income for reinvestment into Council services as a result.</p> <p>Costs for providing ceremonies are reviewed annually to ensure that these take account of inflation and the rising costs associated with the provision of venues and registrars for ceremonies. The service will continue to work to ensure that there is sufficient choice for service users and ensure that ceremonies (including Council owned venues) are inclusive and accessible to all and there are affordable/lower cost options available.</p> <p>While there may be some associated increases in fees relating to this proposal, because of increasing costs to the Council for provision of services, fees will be applied equitably based on the ceremony option the individual service user chooses. Therefore, there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.</p> <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of service they currently receive. Service users will still be able to access registrar services as required, and the service will offer a range of options which are accessible, inclusive and affordable. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Budget Challenge 1-3 – Finance and Commercial Services/Finance General

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Review of budget assumptions: Additional dividend income expected from ESPO.</p>	<p>This proposal recognises the additional income for the Council because of the additional dividend income expected from investments. If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or levels of service they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of budget assumptions: additional Norse rebate income expected</p>	<p>This proposal recognises the additional income for the Council because of the predicted increase in the expected refund from Norse. If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or levels of service they currently receive. No changes

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Review of budget assumptions: review of pension pressures previously assumed in the budget which are no longer expected to be required</p>	<p>This proposal recognises the adjustment to the budget because of the latest information with respect previously anticipated pension pressures. If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or levels of service they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Review of budget assumptions: review of Treasury Management budgets to reflect higher interest rates achieved on investment and treasury management activity</p>	<p>This proposal recognises the additional income for the Council because of higher interest rates payable on investments. If this proposal goes ahead, there is no evidence to indicate that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or levels of service they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
<p>Repton Property Developments Ltd dividend: recognise an income budget from Repton Property Developments Ltd following successful commercial activity. Following the launch of the company and a period of development and growth, Repton is now expected to be able to deliver a dividend to the County Council of around £1m in 2023-24 and on an ongoing basis annually.</p>	<p>The Council set up Repton Property Developments Ltd with the aim of building up to 600 much-needed homes over a five-year period and generating an income. This proposal reflects the expected return on this investment which will be reinvested for the benefit of all Norfolk residents. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions.

Budget Challenge 4 – Finance and Commercial Services/Finance General

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Further income from commercialisation of property assets including County Hall	Due to changes in ways of working across the Council in recent years and a move towards more flexible/hybrid working this proposal will ensure best use of Council owned office space through the letting of a part of the building which was previously under-utilised for use by partner organisations.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>This proposal will deliver value for money through the effective use of vacant office space, ensure there is recovery of costs to the Council for reinvestment and offer further opportunities for closer working between partner organisations and Council staff through direct face-to-face engagement in the workplace.</p> <p>In 2022 County Hall was recognised globally as the most “Inclusive Building/Organisation” and winner of the 2022 Leonard Cheshire Blue Badge Award.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • More significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or levels of service they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.
Strategic Review – Opportunity A – Finance and Property	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
Strategic Review – Opportunity A – IMT/Digital	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
Strategic Review – Opportunity A – Procurement	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
Release pay provision held in Finance General following Strategic Review	See APPENDIX 5 – All Strategic Review Proposals – Budget Equality Impact Assessment 2023-24 for details of the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal
One-off application of Finance General reserves to support core budget	This proposal, relating to the use of Finance General reserves, has no direct impact on front line services or on the workforce, as this is an

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>alternative source of funding enabling current activity levels to be maintained. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive because of this proposal. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity and inclusion requirements.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK.

Finance General gross new saving proposals 2023-24 to 2024-25

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
Proposed increase in council tax and adult social care precept	<p>The Council has consulted on a proposed total increase of 2.99 per cent to Council tax - 1.99 per cent for general council tax and one per cent for the adult social care precept. This is in line with current budget planning and the expected level of funding set by Government. The Council has also asked people for views on a rise of 4.10 per cent, as has been set in previous years, and 10.1 per cent - in line with inflation - which would require a referendum. If the increase was set at 5% this would add an estimated £51 and £152 to council taxpayers' bills in 2023/24.</p> <p>Each organisation that provides services in the area sets their own proportion of the council tax bill. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norfolk County Council • The District / Borough council • The Parish council (if there is one) • Norfolk Police

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<p>Most of the money that people pay as part of the Council's share of the council tax helps fund the costs of all the services provided by the Council and is not linked to specific services.</p> <p>The adult social care precept</p> <p>In 2015, the Government permitted Councils to raise council tax to help pay for adult social care services – this is the adult social care precept. The money raised from the precept is ringfenced which means that the Council can only spend it on adult social care services.</p> <p>Government now expects the Council to raise sufficient funds to cover Norfolk's adult social care costs via the precept. This funding must enable the Council to meet the needs of the increasing numbers of adult social care users, many of whom are older, disabled and extremely vulnerable. Meeting this high level of demand is a priority as any reduction in social care support has the potential to have a substantial detrimental impact on people with one or more protected characteristics, as well as a detrimental impact on other local services.</p> <p>Adult Social Care supports older people, disabled people, and people with mental health problems to stay safe in their own homes and live independently. Where this is not possible, they will support people in residential care, with the expectation that people pay what they can in accordance with national criteria. In 2023-24 the Council's gross budget for Adult Social Care is £495m.</p> <p>Who is affected by the proposed increase in council tax and adult social care precept</p> <p>The proposed increase in council tax will impact on all residents eligible to pay council tax, including people with protected characteristics and in rural areas.</p> <p>Concessions for people eligible for support, reductions, or exemption</p>

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<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 A presents the proportion of people subject to some 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. • 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 23,281, and for older people was 18,643.</p> <p>District councils also have powers to reduce the amount of council tax payable for certain classes of dwelling including empty properties and properties undergoing major structural work, with legislation prescribing the level of discount the district council can offer. An</p>

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<p>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>In October 2022 there were 426,710 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>In considering an increase in council tax, it is important to take other social factors into account, such as the rising cost of living and new benefits that have been introduced by the Government to mitigate hardship.</p> <p>Social factors to consider</p> <p>Any decisions with respect to increasing Council Tax should take into consideration that:</p> <p>As of October 2022, the Consumer Prices Index (CPI) rose by 9.3% in the 12 months to November 2022. The largest upward contributions to the annual inflation rate came from housing and household services (principally from electricity, gas, and other fuels), and food.</p> <p>The State Pension rise will be 10.1% from April 2023. The current basic rate State Pension is £141.85 per week (£7,376 per annum); and the highest rate for the new State Pension (for those retiring from April 2016) will be £185.15 a week (£9,627 per annum).</p> <p>The National Living Wage will increase in April 2023 to £10.42 for over 23-year-olds and £7.49 for 18–20-year-olds. This is now only marginally lower than the “real” living wage in the UK.</p>

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<p>In November 2022, the Prime Minister announced the energy price cap would increase from £2500 (average bill for a typical household) to £3000 in April 2023. This increase may be considered to have been offset through government investment with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All households automatically receiving a one-off £400 discount on their fuel bills from October 2022 • Eight million low-income households who receive certain benefits or tax credits receiving £650 • Pensioner households receiving £300 and some disabled people getting £150. <p>In January 2023, the DWP announced that Universal Credit claimants will receive an additional £900 cost of living support payment over next 12 months. As of November 2022, around 70,300 people in Norfolk were in receipt of Universal Credit with around 45% of these being in employment.</p> <p>The Government's assessment published in the Spring Statement 2022, showed that in the financial year 2024 to 2025, the poorest 60% of households will receive more in public spending than they contribute. On average, households in the lowest income decile will receive over £4 in public spending for every £1 they pay in tax.</p> <p>The Government's latest analysis of the impact of the cost-of-living increases has identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proportion of all adults finding it difficult to afford their energy bills, rent or mortgage payments has increased through the year • 55% of disabled adults reported finding it difficult to afford their energy bills, and around a third (36%) found it difficult to afford their rent or mortgage payments compared with 40% and 27% of non-disabled people. • 4 in 10 (44%) White adults reported finding it difficult to afford their energy bills, compared with around two-thirds (69%) for Black or Black British adults and 6 in 10 (59%) Asian or Asian British adults

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the period September-October 2022, adults who paid their gas or electricity by prepayment (72%) more frequently reported difficulty affording energy than those who pay for gas and electricity using either direct debit or one-off payments (42%) • Poorer households are currently experiencing higher inflation, on average, than better-off households. This may be compounded because the price of lowest-cost food items on which these households rely have increased further or the cheapest products have been unavailable <p>In the East of England, the Trussel Trust, the largest distributor of emergency food parcels recorded 140,000 food parcels were distributed across the East of England (an increase of 50% compared to the same period in 2019).</p> <p>Around 20% of Norfolk's population has a long-term limiting health condition. This figure increases to around 45% of people aged 65+ years. In 2020 the Joseph Rowntree Foundation identified around half of households living in poverty in the UK include a disabled person, and that working-age disabled people were most likely to be at risk of living in poverty.</p> <p>This assessment recognises that cost-of-living increases combined with the long-term impact of the pandemic has created a significant challenge for the voluntary and community sector (VCSE). This is at a time when individual charitable contributions and volunteer numbers continue to fall.</p> <p>The general cost-of-living increase and the long-term outcomes of the pandemic have been recognised to have exacerbated mental health problems for some people as they experience more social isolation and/or future uncertainty. This assessment recognises that this impact may be greater where people live in rural areas with few community facilities, less access to services and limited transport links.</p> <p>Another issue to consider 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</p>

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<p>bands. However, people in rural areas report 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>Mitigations</p> <p>In addition to the mitigations provided by Government (as set out above) at a local level Norfolk County Council has been working closely with district, borough and parish councils, housing providers, VCSE partners and utilities providers to support local people in need of emergency assistance since 2021. Most of the funding for this work has come directly from Government through the Household Support Fund (HSF). NCC: Norfolk Cost of Living Support Scheme Launched 2022</p> <p>Further funding from Government was released in November 2022 to enable this work to continue until March 2023. The package of support on offer has been subject to a comprehensive equality impact assessment to ensure planned activities meet the needs of diverse local people who share protected characteristics where they are facing acute hardship.</p> <p>Further information about support available to people in hardship in Norfolk can be found at Help with living costs - Norfolk County Council</p> <p>The Norfolk Social Infrastructure Fund (set up in 2020) has made capital grants of up to £250,000 available for groups who are involved in community projects and initiatives that benefit the residents of Norfolk, as part of the Council's commitment to voluntary and community organisations.</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</p>

Appendix 6: Equality Impact Assessment report 2023-24

Reference and title of proposal:	Potential impact
	<p>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 likely to earn less than their non-disabled counterparts, even when they share the same qualifications and other relevant characteristics^v.</p> <p>On balance, the greatest factor to consider is that an increase in council tax and adult social care precept would primarily benefit Norfolk's most vulnerable families and disabled and older people and their carers. This is because it will enable the Council to continue to protect essential children's and adult social care services, as well as fund other vital services that benefit every person within the county – such as libraries, fire and rescue services, the environment, public health, culture and heritage, trading standards and highways.</p>

^v The same is also true for women, and some ethnic minority groups.

EQIA APPENDIX 5 – ALL Strategic Review Budget savings proposals 2023-24

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
Adult Social Care - Strategic Review Proposal Children's Services - Strategic Review Proposal - Opportunities A and B Community & Environmental Services - Strategic Review Proposal Finance & Commercial Services / Finance General - Strategic Review Proposal: Opportunity A – Finance and Property Finance & Commercial Services / Finance General - Strategic Review Proposal: Opportunity A – IMT/Digital Finance & Commercial Services / Finance General - Strategic Review Proposal - Opportunity A – Procurement	<p>The Strategic Review has been designed as a whole organisation exercise to enable the Council to meet the financial and organisational challenges it is facing and will continue to face in the coming years. It aims to enable the Council to become a leaner organisational structure, which in turn should aid engagement and communication, internally and externally taking account of the ongoing challenges in an evolving public sector environment.</p> <p>Cabinet Papers 3 October - Strategic Review</p> <p>Work to date has involved a whole Council review to consider new models, ways of working and associated structural changes which may be required. This approach will enable the right capacity and capability across the organisation moving forward. The initial focus areas are those that facilitate and support the delivery of core services to our communities. The review also applies a consistent set of principles which will lead to a refresh of current structures and give greater clarity on accountabilities, faster decision making, improved management of risk and empowerment of staff with clarity on career progression and development opportunities.</p> <p>Future activity will see the Council adopt career families, which will support professional leadership development and talent management – aiding staff retention. This will partly be delivered by implementing standardised job role profiles, which will help to maintain a good structure in the future and mitigate equal pay risk.</p> <p>The review will also design a pay and reward strategy, which will assist recruitment by ensuring the Council is competitive in the job market. The review is ongoing and should lead to the Council to become an organisation which is able to recognise, analyse and respond to change in a positive manner – for the benefit of staff, the wider organisation, and the communities it serves.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Due to the scale of the Strategic Review, an equality impact assessment is being maintained to assess whether proposals will have a direct or indirect impact on people with protected characteristics. The Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Community & Environmental Services, Finance & Commercial Services / Finance and Governance elements of this work will be considered as part of this wider assessment (options A & B) to fully understand whether there will be any potential for adverse impact on employees with protected characteristics which will require mitigation through implementation.</p> <p>Currently there is insufficient evidence available to state whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However, as mitigation, it should be considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of service they currently receive because of this proposal. People should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with statutory, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate whether staff with protected characteristics may be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. All Children's Services, Adult Social Care, Community & Environmental Services, IMT/Digital and Procurement staff will continue to be consulted with in accordance with the Council's legal and contractual obligations, and staff will continue to be kept apprised of developments which may directly or indirectly impact on them by senior managers. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal requires an equality impact assessment to be maintained to inform development and implementation. Any potential for adverse impact will be identified through this process and mitigated where possible. If it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to Cabinet enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p> <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>
<p>Community & Environmental Services Strategic Review Proposal - Business Support review</p>	<p>This proposal recognises that in light of a review of Business Support functions, linked to the Strategic Review there is an opportunity to delete or reduce some posts on the basis that these are no longer required due to changes in ways of working.</p> <p>A full equality impact assessment of organisational change reviews and restructures has been undertaken by HR. This identifies where there may be the potential for adverse impact</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>on staff with protected characteristics because of workforce reorganisations and restructures and how these will be monitored and mitigated through the application of the correct HR processes (which are also equality impact assessed separately).</p> <p>There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is limited evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. This

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>proposal may impact on some staff. Most of the changes relate to the deletion of posts which are already vacant as a result they are no longer required. Any organisational changes or changes to staff terms and conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. Staff will continue to be consulted with in accordance with the Council's legal and contractual obligations, and staff will continue to be kept apprised of developments which may directly or indirectly impact on them by senior managers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>
<p>Strategy & Transformation – Strategic Review Proposal - Expansion of professional leads: centralise and control spend on communications. This would include paid staff and/or non-pay procurement across the organisation</p>	<p>This proposal will be informed by the Strategic Review. If accepted, it will involve centralising all spend on communications across the Council to ensure that there are robust controls on expenditure and all organisational communications meet agreed corporate standards, including accessibility standards. This proposal will also ensure all staff can continue to access support from communications experts when they want to share messages with the public.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the Strategic Review, an equality impact assessment is being undertaken to assess whether proposals will have a direct or indirect impact on people with protected characteristics. The “expansion of professional leads” element of this work will be considered as part of this wider assessment.</p> <p>Currently there is insufficient evidence available to state whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However, as mitigation, it should be considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of service they currently receive because of this proposal. People should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with statutory, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council’s Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate whether staff with protected characteristics may be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. All staff will continue to be consulted with in accordance with the Council’s legal and contractual obligations, and staff will continue to be kept apprised of developments which may directly or indirectly impact on them by senior managers. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal requires an equality impact assessment to be maintained to inform the development and implementation of this proposal. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible. If it emerges that</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p> <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>
<p>Strategy & Transformation – Strategic Review Proposal - Expansion of professional leads: work with other departments to agree the Council's desired level of activity and overall number of analysts required</p>	<p>This proposal will be informed by the Strategic Review, and if accepted will ensure that across the organisation there are sufficient analysts to undertake necessary monitoring and quality assurance of services and support service re-design and development through use of intelligence, with and expectation that efficiencies can also be achieved through some changes to ways of working.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the Strategic Review, an equality impact assessment is being undertaken to assess whether proposals will have a direct or indirect impact on people with protected characteristics. The “expansion of professional leads” element of this work will be considered as part of this wider assessment.</p> <p>Currently there is insufficient evidence available to state whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence,

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence.</p> <p>However, as mitigation, it should be considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of service they currently receive because of this proposal. People should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with statutory, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate whether staff with protected characteristics may be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. All staff will continue to be consulted with in accordance with the Council's legal and contractual obligations, and staff will continue to be kept apprised of developments which may directly or indirectly impact on them by senior managers. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal requires an equality impact assessment to be maintained to inform the development and implementation of this proposal. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible. If it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p> <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>
<p>Strategy & Transformation – Strategic Review Proposal - HR remodelling</p>	<p>The remodelling of Human Resources services during the year will be informed by the Strategic Review. If accepted, this proposal will ensure the HR service will continue to meet the needs of staff across the organisation, with the expectation that efficiencies can also be achieved.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the Strategic Review, an equality impact assessment is being undertaken to assess whether proposals will have a direct or indirect impact on people with protected characteristics. The Human Resources element of this work will be considered as part of this wider assessment.</p> <p>Currently there is insufficient evidence available to state whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • The proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>However, as mitigation, it should be considered that:</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users should not experience any reductions in the quality or standards of service they currently receive because of this proposal. People should continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. • The proposal should not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with statutory, corporate, and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is currently insufficient evidence to indicate whether staff with protected characteristics may be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics. Any organisational changes to staffing structures or changes to staff terms or conditions will be undertaken in accordance with HR policies which are impact assessed separately. All affected staff will continue to be consulted with in accordance with the Council's legal and contractual obligations, and staff will continue to be kept apprised of developments which may directly or indirectly impact on them by senior managers. • Similar proposals have been successfully implemented elsewhere in the UK. <p>This proposal requires an equality impact assessment to be maintained to inform the development and implementation of this proposal. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible. If it emerges that an aspect of the proposal may have a significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas that it was not possible to predict at the time of conducting this assessment, this will be reported formally to enable next steps to be agreed before proceeding further.</p> <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
<p>Strategy & Transformation - Strategic Review Proposal - Transformation capitalisation saving</p>	<p>This proposal is linked to the Strategic Review and if accepted would see the Council's investment in service transformation and associated revenue generation funded from capital receipts for two years. The Flexible Use of Capital Receipts direction allows authorities to use the proceeds from asset sales to fund the revenue costs of projects that will reduce costs, increase revenue or support a more efficient provision of services. There is therefore an opportunity to fund transformation costs from capital receipts where there is an associated saving and no impact on frontline services. There is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. • This proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so. • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<p>Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics by this aspect of the Strategic Review. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>
<p>Finance & Commercial Services / Finance and Governance Strategic Review Proposal - Release pay provision held in Finance General following Strategic Review</p>	<p>This proposal recognises that the general budget can be adjusted as a one-off and a saving achieved because of initial outcomes from the Strategic Review and savings generated to-date. As a stand-alone budget adjustment there is no evidence to indicate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposal would have a disproportionate or detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics (such as older and younger people; men, women and people who are intersex or non-binary; disabled people; people from different ethnic minority groups; people with different religions and beliefs; people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender) compared to people who do not share these characteristics. This proposal would more significantly disadvantage some people with a protected characteristic, compared to others who share that characteristic – for example, disabled people who experience complex and substantial barriers to independence, compared to disabled people who face less complex and substantial barriers to independence. <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service users will not experience any reductions in the quality, standards, or level of support they currently receive. No changes are proposed to eligibility criteria for services, so people will continue to receive support relevant to their assessed needs. People who currently receive a service will continue to do so.

Reference and title of proposal	Potential impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will not lead to new or increased costs for service users. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with corporate and departmental policies and procedures and national guidance. • The proposal will be implemented in accordance with the Council's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policy; the Public Sector Equality Duty; the Equality Act 2010; the Accessible Information Standard and all other relevant equality, diversity, and inclusion requirements. • There is no evidence to indicate that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately affected compared to staff without these characteristics by this adjustment to accounting. There will be no organisational changes to staffing structures and no changes to staff terms or conditions. <p>The Strategic Review is subject to an equality impact assessment to inform the development and implementation of related proposals. Any potential for adverse impact will be recognised through this assessment process and mitigated where possible.</p>

Review of Mobile Library Service

The mobile library service operates across Norfolk and is primarily intended for those people who either cannot or find it difficult to access one of the 47 the branch library buildings. The current service has just over 1,300 stops at a variety of places within local communities, ranging from playgroups, schools, care homes, as well as locations where there is high footfall such as parish halls, and supermarkets.

In July 2022, Members considered a proposal to review the mobile library service. At the time, the work to review the service had not been carried out and an indicative saving of £200k was allocated, against a total current budget of £405k. Since that time, a public consultation asking for views to help shape how the reduced funding could be used for the future delivery of the service has been carried out. There was a good response rate, with 1,397 responses received from Residents and key stakeholders. A copy of the full report setting out the findings of the consultation is included at [Annex 7.1](#).

In the consultation, people told us this is a key service, often describing this as a vital lifeline to people in rural communities at increased risk of social isolation. Respondents reiterated the importance of its role in alleviating loneliness and reducing social isolation, particularly among older and/or less mobile people.

There were many positive comments about the service and the staff – particularly - were praised. The contribution of the mobile library service in improving literacy and facilitating people's love of reading was also noted.

Taking account of the findings of the consultation, the focus has been on a review that ensures statutory compliance contained in 'The Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964', meets the needs of the most vulnerable, elderly, disabled, socially isolated, and rurally disadvantaged residents and incorporates the views of the respondents to the public consultation, while addressing the budget challenge.

The public consultation has informed the proposal to deliver a redesigned mobile library service, operating within a set of key principles to guide planning and provision into the future. The proposal is to continue to deliver a mobile library service based on the following key principles: -

1. Regular mobile stops to be designed no closer than 1.5 miles of a branch library, except where there are significant geographical barriers or another significant factor to be considered
2. Any stops that have been unused for six months/the last six visits will cease
3. Encourage use of the Home Library Service where people are unable or less able to reach either a mobile library stop or a branch library
4. Utilise greener vehicle options as the business case and affordable technologies allow (*note that an Electric Vehicle Mini-Mobile is being purchased using funds from a secured external grant*)
5. Continue to provide non-scheduled targeted activity for those socially furthest from the service, supporting one-off campaigns and programmes e.g., at care

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service

homes, travellers' sites and with schools or nurseries (*note the Electric Vehicle Mini-Mobile will be used for this purpose*)

These principles will be reviewed on a regular basis (at least annually) and adjustments made to the routes and stops in line with these.

The existing service has been reviewed against these principles and identified 144 stops that have been unused in the last six visits. In addition, there are 98 active stops that fall within 1.5 miles of a branch library. There are a small number of stops within 1.5 miles which will remain as there is a clear justification for doing so, for example the Queen's Hill School stop in Norwich will remain as although it is within 1.5 miles of a branch library, it has 50 users and a complex journey for children to attend the local library.

The number of stops will reduce by 242 stops for 2023/24, which will deliver an ongoing saving of £107,000. A full list of the stops that will cease, along with information on the number of service users accessing them, is included at [Annex 7.2](#). The total number of service users affected is 278.

We will support service users to make use of the home delivery service, or direct to branch libraries, to help mitigate any impact. The Home Library Service (HLS) is volunteer delivered via agreement with the Royal Voluntary Service (RVS). The aim of the HLS is "to provide a library and information service to people referred to as Home Library Service customers who because of restricted mobility, are vulnerable, housebound or in residential care, or have considerable difficulty getting to a local library or mobile library." There is some capacity within current provision of the HLS to serve more customers and the RVS is keen to recruit additional volunteers.

In addition, we have reviewed our approach to funding new mobile library vehicles to operate the service. This has identified the ongoing saving of £107,000 and a one-off saving of £300k by removing the mobile library replacement fund. Instead, we will progress alternative ways to secure appropriate vehicles for the service, as needed.

Further information about the service context and the potential impact of these proposals is set out in detail in the mobile library service Equality Impact Assessment within [EQIA Appendix 3](#).

The Future of Norfolk's Mobile Library Service Consultation Findings Report – 4 October 2022

Background

Norfolk County Council (NCC) continues to face higher costs and demand for services and have set a target to save £60 million from the council budget by next year.

On 4th July 2022, initial proposals to save £13 million as part of the £60 million target were considered by councillors. One of those savings proposals is to reduce the budget for the mobile library service by £200,000 - this is nearly half of the 2022-23 budget of £422,000.

Norfolk County Council ran a consultation and encouraged residents and stakeholders to consider the proposed saving and to think about how the mobile library service could be run in a different way.

This document outlines the findings of the consultation which ran from 22nd July to 21st September 2022 and received **1397 responses**. Please note: the original end date of the consultation was due to be Wednesday 14th September. However, given the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II it was decided to extend the time the consultation was open to reflect the national period of mourning.

Methodology

A consultation was developed and ran for nine weeks and was hosted on the County Council's Citizen Space online platform. Easy Read and large print versions were available to download from the online portal, and paper copies and large print versions were also available through the library service and on request by email and phone. The mobile library teams distributed and collated paper copies of the consultation which were returned to County Hall where the consultation team added responses to our online platform.

Promotion

The consultation was promoted to make sure that both the members of the public and local stakeholders were informed and invited to contribute. We promoted the consultation through a variety of methods, these are detailed in the table below.


Activity	Description	Completed
Mobile library staff briefed	Mobile library staff briefed by management on the budget saving proposal and the forthcoming consultation	04/07 and 11/07
Consultation launched	Consultation went live on Citizen Space, linked to from the libraries and mobile libraries web page	22/07
Social media posts ⁶⁸	Link to the consultation posted on NCC's social media channels, posts also went out 4 weeks into the consultation and 1 week before the closing date.	22/07
Press release issued	Press release about the consultation sent to local media	25/07
Eastern Daily Press Article	Article published about the launch of the consultation Hundreds have say on cuts to Norfolk mobile libraries Eastern Daily Press (edp24.co.uk)	26/07
Members briefing	Member update (via Dem Services)	22/07
Staff briefing	An article published in the <i>Friday Takeaway</i>	29/07

⁶⁸ Some posts that were scheduled to go out one week before the original closing date were suspended due to the period of mourning as a result of the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II
C:\Program Files (x86)\neevia.com\docConverterPro\temp\NVDC\ID25F071A-9BAA-4B03-9074-CE3E9613098F\b328a90e-2790-4d28-8ded-6e0cc031e971.docx

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Activity	Description	Completed
	informing staff about the consultation	
Poster for branch and mobile libraries	A poster was designed to promote the consultation in library buildings	25/07
Parish Council briefing	Briefing and link to the consultation sent to the Norfolk Association of Local Councils (NALC) A second reminder was sent to the NALC	27/07 02/08
Norfolk Residents' Panel	An email was sent to the Norfolk Residents' Panel (over 1000 people) informing them of the consultation	29/07
Eastern Daily Press article	An article to mark the halfway point of the consultation, commenting that over 750 responses had been received and featuring comments from councillors. Hundreds have say on cuts to Norfolk mobile libraries Eastern Daily Press (edp24.co.uk)	22/08
Paid for social media ads	Performance £100.00 spent over 10 days: Link Clicks 843 Post engagement 1043 Post reactions 67 Post shares 48	22/07

How respondents heard about the consultation



Option	Total	Percent
Social media	279	19.97%
Visiting my mobile library	637	45.60%
Local media (newspaper/radio etc)	54	3.87%
Through my town/parish council	39	2.79%
Through the Norfolk Residents' Panel	47	3.36%
Through an email I received	109	7.80%
The Norfolk County Council website	23	1.65%
A poster I saw at my local library	7	0.50%
From a friend	93	6.66%
Not answered	109	7.80%

Analysis and reporting

Every response has been read in detail and analysed to establish the range of people's opinions, identify any repeated or consistently expressed views, and evaluate the anticipated impact of proposals on people's lives.

Where percentages are used, totals may not necessarily add up to 100% because of rounding or multiple responses. The bases for each question vary owing to respondent selection of questions they wished to answer.

When summarising the feedback to the open questions, we have selected quotations to help illustrate the spectrum of key themes emerging from the consultation feedback but these should not be taken to reflect the entirety of opinion. These quotes faithfully reflect an individual's articulation of that theme, and as such all quotations are given verbatim, with respective spelling/punctuation.

Overview and summary of key themes in the responses

The Communications team worked in collaboration with the Mobile Library team to ensure we reached out to service users, residents and other key stakeholders and

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

invite them to feedback to the consultation. There were good response rates and most respondents were elderly with around 60% of people over 65 years of age, and around 36% being of respondents being over the age of 75.

Key findings:

People told us this is a key service, often describing this as vital lifeline to people in rural communities at increased risk of social isolation. Respondents reiterated the importance ('lifeline') of the mobile library service to rural communities and its role in alleviating loneliness and reducing social isolation, particularly among older and/or less mobile people.

There were many positive comments about the service and the staff – particularly - were praised. The contribution of the mobile library service in improving literacy and facilitating people's love of reading was also noted.

Respondents told us visits should be long enough to carry out activities which promote wellbeing and/or community cohesion or to allow library users to do particular activities such as chat and choose from a wide selection of books.

Respondents also told us that mobile library services should be provided in rural areas; places where clusters of residents have specific needs and, conversely, where there is any need. People likely to travel to a branch said they could do so because they have transport and would want to continue their love of reading, even if going to a branch wasn't their preferred option. The main reason people are unlikely to travel to a branch is lack of transport, though the cost of travel and barriers to accessing branch libraries were also mentioned.

When asked about potential reduced routes and route priorities, there were many comments about reasons why routes should not be reduced or questions about the rationale for proposing a reduction. The main feedback given to prioritise routes and stops were usage and the availability of other services in the area.

People who are likely to use digital and online services generally identified as existing users of these services, but they also often noted barriers to access or caveats around the take-up of digital services. Those less likely to use digital and online services gave their reasons as a preference for books and face to face contact, or technical skills/barriers.

When asked about other activities or services that could be provided alongside the mobile library service many respondents questioned the practicalities of hosting additional activities or expressed a preference for keeping the mobile library service to its core library service activities. Over half of respondents (725 or 51.90%) picked the 'basic health checks' option of listed potential activities but only seven people referred to health related activities in their comments. Similarly, the organisations Norfolk County Council could work with most frequently cited by respondents were: health services, charities, organisations for children or older people. The Post Office, councils, financial organisations and food suppliers were also mentioned.

Respondent numbers

We received **1397** responses to our consultation.

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

We received **449** paper submissions and **935** submissions to the online survey, **13** responses were received via the haveyoursay@norfolk.gov.uk email address.

Of these, over 90% or 1265 people described themselves as ‘members of the public’.


Option	Total	Percent
A member of the public	1265	90.55%
On behalf of a voluntary or community group	23	1.65%
On behalf of a statutory organisation	5	0.36%
On behalf of a business	8	0.57%
A Norfolk County Councillor	4	0.29%
A district or borough Councillor	3	0.21%
A town or parish Councillor	19	1.36%
A Norfolk County Council employee	4	0.29%
Prefer not to say	11	0.79%
Not answered	55	3.94%

A list of organisations that responded can be found in [Appendix 5](#) located on page **487** of this document.

Respondent profile

Gender:

The majority of respondents (73.87%) identified as female.




Option	Total	Percent
Male	261	18.68%
Female	1032	73.87%
Prefer to self-describe (please specify below)	7	0.50%
Prefer not to say	19	1.36%
Not answered	78	5.58%

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Responses by age:

Most respondents were elderly. Around 60% of people were over 65 years of age, with around 36% being of respondents being over the age of 75.




Option	Total	Percent
Under 18	3	0.21%
18-24	10	0.72%
25-34	48	3.44%
35-44	101	7.23%
45-54	104	7.44%
55-64	170	12.17%
65-74	361	25.84%
75-84	364	26.06%
85 or older	145	10.38%
Prefer not to say	29	2.08%
Not answered	62	4.44%

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Responses by ethnic group:

The majority of respondents identified as White British.




Option	Total	Percent
White British	1218	87.19%
White Irish	7	0.50%
White other	15	1.07%
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	5	0.36%
Asian or Asian British	3	0.21%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	1	0.07%
Prefer not to say	55	3.94%
Not Answered	93	6.66%

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Disability


Around 30% of respondents said that they have a “long-term illness, disability or health problem that limits your daily activities or the work you can do”. Around 10% of respondents said they prefer not to answer the question.



Option	Total	Percent
Yes	427	30.57%
No	729	52.18%
Prefer not to say	135	9.66%
Not answered	106	7.59%

Location

Respondents were asked ‘Which district/borough/city do you live in?’ The responses were reasonably evenly spread with Great Yarmouth and Norwich having the lowest response rate.



Option	Total	Percent
Breckland	297	21.26%
Broadland	199	14.24%
Great Yarmouth	52	3.72%
Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	239	17.11%
North Norfolk	176	12.60%
Norwich	64	4.58%
South Norfolk	268	19.18%
Not answered	102	7.30%

Questions and answers

The consultation was structured into two sections, this is also how we will also report the findings.

Part 1 – How you use the mobile library service


Part 2 – Questions about the future of the mobile library service'

Below are the results and a detailed analysis of the responses given to our questions. Please note the question numbers are as they appeared in the online survey. Question 1 was related to consenting to taking the survey and reading NCC's data privacy agreement.

Part 1 How you use the mobile library service

Q2. How often do you use your local mobile library service?


The vast majority of respondents (68.58%) said they used the service every month.



Option	Total	Percent
Every month (normally every 28 days)	958	68.58%
Every other visit (normally every 56 days)	58	4.15%
Occasionally	177	12.67%
Not sure	18	1.29%
Never	151	10.81%
Not answered	35	2.51%

Q3. What is it that you like about our mobile library service? Please tick (✓) all that apply.

1,214 people answered this question, people could tick more than one option. Just over three-quarters of respondents [1,082] said they like the convenience of the mobile library service. Around a third of respondents [465] highlighted the social aspects of the mobile library service and a similar number of people [449] said they have no transport to visit a library.



Option	Total	Percent
It is convenient	1082	77.45%
I have no transport to visit a library	449	32.14%
It's a good way to get out and meet people	465	33.29%
Not answered	183	13.10%

Additional Comments for Q3


430 additional comments were received for question 3. In this and in each subsequent question the number in brackets shows the number of comments.

Respondents were positive about the mobile library service [88], describing it as an important service to people, a 'lifeline' [63], especially for older people and children [67], to rural communities [38], and for people who are unable to travel to branch libraries [50]. Mobile library staff were praised for their knowledge and personal qualities [64]. In addition, the role of the mobile library service in promoting reading [42] and enhancing the wellbeing of individuals and communities by providing an opportunity for social interaction was noted [59].

See [Table 1, Appendix 1](#) located on page 467 of this document for examples of comments.

Q4. What services do you use on the mobile library? Please tick (✓) all that apply:

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1




Option	Total	Percent
Borrowing books, (including large print and children's)	1198	85.76%
Borrowing audio books – cassettes or CDs	177	12.67%
Borrowing DVDs	88	6.30%
Help to access online magazines, newspapers, eBooks and eAudio	54	3.87%
Collect reservations of books and items from the wider library service	493	35.29%
Ask for information, help and advice	330	23.62%
Return items borrowed from other libraries in Norfolk	370	26.49%
Not answered	165	11.81%

Q5. If the mobile library was not available how likely would you be to travel to a branch library for these services? Please tick (✓) one answer only:

1,308 people answered this question, people could pick one option only. [846] respondents said they are 'very or somewhat *unlikely*' to travel to a branch library if the mobile library was not available; [384] are 'very or somewhat *likely*' to travel, and [78] are unsure.

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1



Option	Total	Percent
Very likely	160	11.45%
Somewhat likely	224	16.03%
Somewhat unlikely	253	18.11%
Very unlikely	593	42.45%
Not sure	78	5.58%
Not answered	89	6.37%

Please explain why you said this:

992 additional comments were received for question 5.

There were 668 comments from people who said they are **‘very or somewhat unlikely’ to travel to a branch library**: the main reason given was lack of transport – both public and private - making it difficult to reach a branch library [357]. Other reasons included health issues (including difficulties in carrying large numbers of books home) [82], barriers to accessing branch libraries [81] and the cost of travelling to a branch library [68]. See [Table 2, Appendix 1](#) located on page 469 of this document for examples of comments.

There were 258 comments from respondents who said they are **‘very or somewhat likely’ to travel to a branch library**: the main reason given was ability to travel using public or private transport [63]. However, some respondents who said they could travel to a branch library qualified their statement [56] or referred to difficulties in accessing a branch library [34]. The importance of the mobile library service in promoting reading was also mentioned [34].

See [Table 3, Appendix 1](#) on page 470 of this document for examples of comments.

There were 59 comments from respondents who said they are **‘not sure’** if they would travel to a branch library; the main reason cited was lack of transport [20]. Some respondents did not pick one of the options but provided a further 7 comments making a total of 992 comments.

Q6. Where is your nearest mobile library stop?


Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

There were 1260 responses to this part of the question. **These answers can be found in [Appendix 6](#) on page 490 of this document.**

Q7. If you know it, please give the postcode of your local mobile library stop? Details can be found online at www.norfolk.gov.uk/mobilelibraries

Some of the answers we received to this question were incomplete e.g. 'NR10', as such these were not able to be included in the map below. As a result, only about 81% of responses to this question were able to be mapped. Note that the rate per 10,000 is the number of responses we would expect in that area in a group of 10,000 people.

Rate per 10,000 population of response rate to the consultation on the future of mobile libraries




Part 2 Questions about the future of the mobile library service

Q8. What do you think are the most important factors when deciding where library services should be provided? Please tick (✓) one answer only:

1,313 people answered this question, people could tick more than one option. The majority of respondents said the most important factor when deciding where library services should be provided is the rural nature of locations where transport [703] and other local services [447] are limited.

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1



Option	Total	Percent
In a rural location in Norfolk without transport	703	50.32%
In a rural location without other services locally	447	32.00%
Near busy places such as supermarkets,	18	1.29%
community centres, parks / play areas	40	2.86%
In a location with easy access via car, public transport, cycling or walking	105	7.52%
Not answered	84	6.01%

Other – e.g. specific needs of local communities to consider?

226 other comments were received for question 8.

Respondents told us the most important factor when considering where library services should be provided is the rural nature of an area [62].


Locations where specific populations of people live [47], where older people or children and younger people live [34], or at specific community sites such as schools or care homes [23], should also be considered. Conversely, some respondents said that services should be provided *anywhere* there is a need [20]. The significance of the mobile library service to people (a 'vital' service) [22] and its role in promoting community and individual wellbeing [23] was also noted.

See [Table 4, Appendix 1](#) on page 471 of this document for examples of comments.

Q9. What do you think are the most important factors to consider when deciding how long a mobile library visit should be? Please tick (✓) all that apply:

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

1,344 people answered this question, people could tick more than one option. Respondents told us that time to choose books was the most important factor to consider when deciding the duration of a mobile library visit [1,247]. Time to collect book reservations and to talk to staff were also important considerations [840].



Option	Total	Percent
Time to choose books	1247	89.26%
Time to collect book reservations and time to talk to other people and staff	840	60.13%
Time to research something online or complete an online transaction	300	21.47%
Time to read with children in dedicated space for families	190	13.60%
Not answered	53	3.79%

Other comments, please write here


107 other comments were received for question 9.

Respondents said the most important factor to consider when deciding on the duration of a mobile library visit is the time it takes to complete certain activities such as finding a book [19]. Some respondents suggested specific periods of time for a stop, or ways of calculating the duration of a stop [22]. The role of the mobile library service in promoting community and individual wellbeing [16] was also noted. Eleven people queried the underlying assumption or premise of the question.

See [Table 5, Appendix 1](#) on page 472 of this document for examples of comments.

Q10. Would you, or members of your household, friends and neighbours like to try accessing more information online via one of the following? Please tick (✓) one answer only:


A vast majority of respondents (71.08%) did not answer this question. One of themes that emerged in other answers is that a lot of service users are not comfortable or are unable to use digital technology, which may explain why the response rate to this question was very low.



Option	Total	Percent
Borrowing a tablet or other device for reading	159	11.38%
Borrowing a laptop or tablet to help get you online at home	115	8.23%
Assistance and support to help you access online services	210	15.03%
Assistance with using your mobile phone or digital device	182	13.03%
Not answered	993	71.08%


Q11. If we were to reduce the number of routes, how far would you travel to visit a mobile library? Please tick (✓) one answer only:

The majority of respondents to this question stated they would choose (or many stated on their paper copies that they would be unable) to visit any library if they had to travel any further.



Option	Total	Percent
I would travel 1-2 miles	328	23.48%
I would travel 2-3 miles	68	4.87%
I would travel 3-4 miles	28	2.00%
I would travel 4-5 miles	19	1.36%
I would travel over 5 miles	29	2.08%
No, I would choose to stop visiting any library if I had to travel further	793	56.76%
Not answered	132	9.45%


Q12. If your current local mobile library stop was unavailable, would you travel to your nearest local branch library? Please tick (✓) one answer only:



Option	Total	Percent
Yes	219	15.68%
Maybe	328	23.48%
No	567	40.59%
Not sure	194	13.89%
Not answered	89	6.37%

Q13. If we were to reduce routes, in your opinion how should we prioritise which routes and stops to keep? Please tick (✓) one answer only:

1,138 people answered this question, people could tick more than one option. Almost half of respondents [684] selected the option 'reduce routes in the areas that have closer proximity to other services (ie, urban/rural areas)' and [393] of respondents selected the option 'reduce routes based on usage' (ie. routes which are used the least).



Option	Total	Percent
--------	-------	---------

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Reduce routes based on usage (i.e look at which routes are used the least)	393	28.13%
Reduce routes in the areas that have closer proximity to other services (i.e urban/town areas)	684	48.96%
Reduce routes that have good broadband and internet connection (i.e so that people can use our online services)	61	4.37%
Not answered	259	18.54%


Other, please write here:

239 other comments were received for question 13.

43 respondents told us that routes and stops should *not* be reduced. Comments were also received about the need to prioritise routes/stops based on current usage [29], and in rural areas where other services may be limited [37]. Respondents questioned the rationale of the proposal [30]. Some respondents suggested reducing the frequency of stops instead of reducing the number of routes [23].

See [Table 6, Appendix 1](#) on page 473 of this document for examples of comments.

Q14. Would you consider visiting a stop further away from you if the length of time at the stop was a minimum of 30 minutes? Please tick (✓) one answer only:




Option	Total	Percent
Yes	155	11.10%
Maybe	380	27.20%
No	599	42.88%
Not sure	166	11.88%
Not answered	97	6.94%

Q15. How likely are you to use our digital and online services if we were to reduce the mobile service? Please tick (✓) one answer only:

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

1,293 people answered this question, people could pick one option only. [918] respondents said they are 'very or somewhat *unlikely*' to use our digital and online services if the mobile library service is reduced, [236] are 'very or somewhat *likely*', and [139] are not sure.



Option	Total	Percent
Very likely	91	6.51%
Somewhat likely	145	10.38%
Somewhat unlikely	182	13.03%
Very unlikely	736	52.68%
Not sure	139	9.95%
Not answered	104	7.44%

Please explain why you said this

858 additional comments were received for question 15.

There were 607 comments from respondents who said they are '**very or somewhat *unlikely***' to use digital and online services if the mobile library service was reduced: the main reason given was a preference for paper books [181]. Lack of skills or interest in using technology [152] was also given as a reason, as was lack of computer equipment and broadband access [138]. Preference for face-to-face contact with other people at the mobile library van instead of using digital services was also mentioned [57]. Although some respondents already have access to the internet at home the difference between using IT for functional, necessary activities and reading for pleasure was noted [53] as was a preference for reading typeface on a page instead of looking at a screen [43].

See [Table 7, Appendix 1](#) on page 474 of this document for examples of comments.

There were 145 comments from respondents who said they are '**very or somewhat *likely***' to use digital and online services if the mobile service was reduced: respondents who picked this option tended to identify as being existing users of digital services [68] although

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1


some qualified their response with a proviso about choice or stock [30]. Preference for books as physical artifacts as opposed to a virtual version was also noted [20].

See [Table 8, Appendix 1](#) on page 476 of this document for examples of comments.

There were 82 comments from respondents who said they are '**not sure**' if they would use digital or online services; the main reasons were a preference for reading paper (not virtual) books [21], lack of IT equipment or access to broadband [14], and lack of technological ability or interest [14]. Some respondents did not pick one of the options but provided a further 24 comments making a total of 858 comments.

Q16. Which, if any, of the following activities would interest you *if* services could be provided alongside the mobile library service? Please tick (✓) all that apply:

965 people answered this question, people could pick more than one option. The option selected most frequently was 'basic health checks' [725], followed by social activities [480].



Option	Total	Percent
Basic health checks such as blood pressure or hearing aid checks	725	51.90%
Information about managing your money or other life advice	238	17.04%
Healthy eating and lifestyle choices	270	19.33%
Shared Reading and / or other reading activity	270	19.33%
Baby weigh facilities and early years support	175	12.53%
Share a cuppa and a chat with other customers	480	34.36%
Support with digital skills and online transactions	286	20.47%
Not answered	432	30.92%

Other please write here:

177 other comments were received for question 16.

Although many respondents selected numerous options from the list of suggested activities (see above) with health and social activities being the most popular options, the free text comments provided an alternative view. Respondents expressed a lack of interest in, or need for, additional activities and/or told us that the mobile library van should stick to core library activities, often defined in comments as lending books and encouraging reading activities [54]. The rationale of adding services was also questioned [38].


See [Table 9, Appendix 1](#) on page 476 of this document for examples of comments.

Q17. Which other organisations could we consider working with to deliver services to rural locations?

591 people answered this (free text) question. Some respondents suggested organisations which could operate within the mobile library van, while others suggested locations the mobile library van could be based at to undertake joint working in the community (for example at churches, schools or village halls).

The main organisations which respondents said the library service could consider working with to deliver services to rural areas were:

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1




22 respondents questioned the rationale of working with other organisations, how it would work in practice, and how existing library services might be affected. Although there was enthusiasm about the prospect of the mobile library service working alongside other organisations, [20] respondents said we should not consider working with any other organisations but should focus instead on core services.

The importance of the mobile library service to the wellbeing of people and communities [15] and for rural communities [14] was reiterated.

Q18. Are you aware of the Home Library Service that delivers books to your door for those who are less able to get to a library? See www.norfolk.gov.uk/libraries-local-history-and-archives/libraries/library-services/home-library


Most respondents (68.58%) who answered this question were not aware of the Home Library Service.



Option	Total	Percent
Yes	381	27.27%
No	958	68.58%
Not answered	58	4.15%

Q19. Now that you know about the Home Library services, would you use it?

However, despite the majority not knowing about the service, the response to possibly using the service in future was lukewarm, with just over 15% saying they would use it.



Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Option	Total	Percent
Yes	223	15.96%
Maybe	493	35.29%
No	414	29.63%
Not sure	204	14.60%
Not answered	63	4.51%

Q20. Is there anything else you want to tell us about the mobile library services that you think might be useful?

798 people answered this (free text) question. Most of the comments for question 20 reflected points made in previous responses. Respondents stressed the importance of the mobile library service, describing it as 'vital' or a 'key service' [250], its role in promoting wellbeing [206], particularly in rural areas where other services may be limited [149] and for older and younger people [139]. Library staff were praised for their expertise and personal qualities [131] and there were also very many general positive comments about the service [162]. The importance of the mobile library service in promoting reading was noted [97]. Some respondents queried the rationale behind the proposal [103] or asked for the service not to be cut [92] (see table below).

Theme	No.	Comments
Comments about the service being vital, a 'lifeline', invaluable, and something people rely on	250	<p>This service is important to those of us who can not travel far, it gives us access to things we do not normally have and we rely on it.</p> <p>This is a life line for many esp in rural areas.</p> <p>Please keep the library service, it is an important aspect of village life and a lifeline for many.</p> <p>Living in a rural area with no public transport as we are both pensioners this service is vital to us.</p> <p>This service is the lifeline to a proportion of our community. It is wrong therefore to reduce or remove this treasured and valued amenity that some of our society treat as their lifeline.</p> <p>The mobile library is a life line to isolated and lonely people such as myself.</p> <p>At a time of shrinking budgets this is an essential lifeline for pensioners who are in danger of becoming even more isolated.</p> <p>To older readers the library is essential. If disabled or inform or a non driver, the mobile is a lifeline. Please don't take it away.</p> <p>This is such an undeservedly depressing form. A library and easy access to one should be a human right since it is so fundamentally important.</p> <p>The mobile library is a very important event in a lot of people's lives.</p>
Comments about how the service promotes individual or community wellbeing and reduces isolation	206	<p>For many isolated people, this is the only human contact they get, and reducing it will impact greatly on their mental health.</p> <p>It's my only meaningful contact with others.</p> <p>It is a vital source of contact (personal/human) for many and can prevent loneliness becoming a crisis situation for many people.</p> <p>It offers a service that supports the mental well-being of many people who cannot easily access library services in branch libraries on a regular basis, and it would be a retrograde step to withdraw it.</p> <p>It is an older generations link to the outside world for some it's their only link to conversation and peace of mind and well being.</p> <p>It is a privilege to have a mobile library service in rural Norfolk. To stop this would be detrimental to the wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>For some, it's more than just a library, it's a point of social contact. For some it maybe the only social interaction they have.</p> <p>I really value the service, was a lifeline to me when I was really depressed and needed something to look forward to.</p> <p>Was a god send when I had just had a baby and had little confidence leaving home.</p> <p>One gentleman I am aware of says that the mobile library driver is the only person who he speaks to apart from his wife who suffers from dementia.</p>
Generalised positive comment about the service	162	<p>Libraries are now a 'social service', offering a safe, accessible and open space to all, which is amazing.</p> <p>It is a brilliant service, very much loved by those who use it and to reduce it would be a travesty.</p> <p>I absolutely love this very valuable service and I would be so disappointed if my library van stop were axed :-(</p> <p>Myself & my 2 children age 2 and 8 LOVE the library bus and always take out our maximum allowance every month.</p> <p>It's the highlight of my week.</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

		<p>I am lucky to have a library near me but if I moved to an area that didn't I would be heartbroken if I didn't have this service.</p> <p>It is an amazing service.</p> <p>We love it, it is one of the few county council services that is of use.</p> <p>The pleasure of it turning up once a month is something to look forward to.</p> <p>I have used the mobile library service for over 30 years and would be very sad not to have it.</p> <p>You provide an expectational service!</p>
Comments about the importance of the service for rural communities which may lack other services or transport links	149	<p>One of the few, if not only services still (at present) available to those of us who live in more rural situation that actually brings a little pleasure.</p> <p>This village has nothing. I love to read I order quite a lot of books. Please do not take this away from me.</p> <p>The mobile service is really appreciated by people in villages especially older people with no transport.</p> <p>The Council has cut many services in rural areas. We don't have a shop, news agents or post office anymore and we have absolutely no public transport to Martham - our nearest stop for any services including the library. Losing the mobile library service would be devastating to our little community, especially the elderly who rely on it for socialising and providing entertainment and information.</p> <p>We don't get much for our council tax living in a rural area - seems a real privilege to use such a resource.</p> <p>Discontinuing it will convey the message that it is not important to provide services to rural communities.</p>
Comments about people's age	139	<p>At my age, I'd feel bereft without the mobile library service.</p> <p>Our children love the opportunity to go onto the library bus and pick their own books. It is an experience that many of them do not get elsewhere.</p> <p>The children love using the library van.</p> <p>Exceedingly convenient also needed for the village of all ages.</p> <p>It is essential for all people to have access to library books, particularly older people in rural areas.</p> <p>I am a lady in my mid seventies, I had to give up driving and I look forward to the visits of the Mobile Library van.</p> <p>I started using it to support the service for local older users but would miss it if it was stopped.</p> <p>Possibly the service is more aimed at the elderly and not necessarily something young people would consider using.</p>
Comments about mobile library staff/drivers	131	<p>Caring and helpful staff - a joy, and it would be terrible if they lost their jobs.</p> <p>I have been extremely impressed with Mark our driver. He is courteous, helpful and incredibly patient with elderly users. His cheery demeanour makes the monthly stop round the corner a pleasure.</p> <p>Staff always helpful.</p> <p>It is always useful to ask the mobile library staff their recommendations on the subject or the authors you are interested in reading. Their knowledge has always been extremely useful and introduced me to other authors.</p> <p>You are very lucky in the people employed.</p> <p>Your staff are so helpful and very good at saying where the latest books are.</p> <p>Our mobile librarian is brilliant.</p> <p>I have used the mobile library for many years and have always found the van drivers to be extremely nice people.</p> <p>The staff are very helpful and assist with choosing books that I will enjoy reading.</p> <p>I just like talking to the librarian with ideas of what I might like to read - it is lovely because the librarian seems to remember you and what authors you like.</p>
Comments about NCC's approach or underlying assumptions	103	<p>Removing this service in remote areas with little transport will increase isolation.</p> <p>One of the long term implications of isolation is increased social care issues alongside increased mental health issues. Viewing it as an isolated cost saving is "short termism" and will have a knock on effect on long term.</p> <p>The mobile library service is one way that NCC can show a presence in all rural communities. What other service does it deliver that has that visibility in rural communities.</p> <p>A more in-depth review is required, as it is always the vulnerable with the true need that get hit, but no one in their corner to stand up for them. After all you may be able</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

		<p>to balance the budget in one section of the council but it come back to bite in after care, which is not necessarily this sections budget responsibility.</p> <p>It would be good to hear that the Council did not accept these nationally imposed cuts without at least making its feelings known. How much more can you cut?</p> <p>There comes a point where Local Authorities ought to realise they are funded to provide services both basic / essential as well as those which may be considered non essential but yet form an important hub and social benefits.</p> <p>The mobile library service takes up a small amount of money relatively for a good service which brings a lot of benefits.</p> <p>Apart from my personal experiences as a (retired) Mobile Librarian , it is the fact that Norfolk County Council HAS A LEGAL OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE LIBRARY SERVICES. There could be a case to be made that in withdrawing any part of the service currently provided i.e. Mobile services, the C.C. is in dereliction of its STATUARY DUTY to "provide for all persons"!</p> <p>Any curtailment of this service is bound to lead to a decreased demand upon the service this a dangerous path leading towards its extinction. I trust that its the intrinsic value of the service that guides any decisions made.</p>
Comments about the role of the service in promoting literacy and encouraging people to read	97	<p>The UK has an appalling record of illiteracy. Cutting mobile libraries will make it worse.</p> <p>Our village book group benefits hugely from the monthly visit of the mobile library in that it has always supported us with the delivery of our chosen book. There may be other reading groups who get this support or, if not, this service might be a way of encouraging other communities to set up book groups of their own.</p> <p>I really think we need to encourage reading and learning of we are to ",level up" not " level down".</p> <p>To some parents who are illiterate, a library can be a very scary place. They want to do better for their children, but would need the personal relationships that are built up with face-to-face services, otherwise they would be less likely to use the service. I think for children especially, access to hard copy books is important to foster a lifelong love of reading. They should not be forced into reading on digital devices that require paid internet to use, especially if they are not within walking distance of a library branch.</p> <p>As a teacher, it saddens me that the mobile library services is potentially having its budget cut by almost half. Reading is so critically important- for everyone, especially children. Reading to inform ourselves, to give ourselves and our children a better life, reading for pleasure, reading to break down stereotypes and barriers, reading to open the mind to other cultures and languages...the list goes on.</p>
Comments about not cutting the mobile service	92	<p>I'm extremely disappointed and angry that you are going to cut any of it's services to save what is a pitiable amount and I believe it's extremely short sighted of you.</p> <p>It's a service we should not lose or cut back.</p> <p>I really don't want the mobile library service to be cut.</p> <p>I don't feel you want to continue the mobile library service. I feel you have planned to reduce use to justify cuts.</p> <p>Yes they are a vital service. Don't cut.</p> <p>Stop trying to cut back on services.</p> <p>Stop cutting services!</p> <p>NCC should not be considering cuts to any library services, including mobile library services.</p>
Comments about how the service saves people having to travel/the person can't travel/has no access to private or public transport	58	<p>Some older people have no transport so the only way they can get to library is a mobile one.</p> <p>The mobile library service is vital for rural villages that have limited transport links to a branch library.</p> <p>Mobile library's are a lifeline to people in rural communities who do not drive.</p> <p>Very helpful as public transport is practically nonexistent.</p> <p>It is a lifesaver for those living without a car or access to good, convenient public transport.</p>
Comments about the service in relation to the cost of living/cost of running the service	45	<p>I understand it is thanks to the cuts from the Conservative government that you are having to do this, but cutting an important life line for the elderly and disabled is the wrong thing to do. How about charging a very modest fee for books from the mobile library rather than cut them?</p> <p>With the current cost of living crisis, it may be a bad time to cut the service back.</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

		<p>I understand that the council has to make cuts, but to cut a service such as this I feel is a mistake. To deprive people of such a valuable service, which in the grand scheme of things budget wise, seems to cost very little, when the benefits of having the service are so many.</p> <p>It is my only access to the library as in the current economic climate with rising living and travel costs I cannot afford my own personal transport to get to a library, and as my village has no public transport the simple fact is that if I can't go to the mobile library then I can't get to library.</p> <p>As communities face increasing hardships, with less money available, libraries and mobile libraries are needed more than ever.</p>
Comments about the current date/time of stops or alternatives to existing schedule	42	<p>Could the rounds still continue but every 8 weeks instead of 4 weeks? Could the number of stops within the village be reduced to 1 central stop?</p> <p>Keep the same service but only come round every 8 weeks instead of 4.</p> <p>More advertising and maybe more weekend or late afternoon/evening could increase use.</p> <p>Would it be feasible to call, maybe 6 weeks, instead of nothing.</p> <p>I would be willing to wait longer between visits if that would help.</p> <p>Instead of halving the locations visited, why not halve the frequency of the visits to once a month instead of fortnightly.</p> <p>Going from 4 weeks to 6-8 weeks would be acceptable.</p>
Comments about advertising the mobile service	39	<p>The mobile library service is not well publicised.</p> <p>It needs to promote itself, many people in my village don't know it exists.</p> <p>We need special bus stop signs with times for those who don't or can't look online.</p> <p>The library service is excellent but it does not sell itself very well!</p> <p>Advertising the service more may also help. This would require a campaign aimed at rural communities - get local people and/or Parish Councils/local notice boards/community groups etc to help.</p> <p>There is not enough publicity promoting the service!</p>
Comments about not reducing the mobile service	18	<p>Please keep the mobile library going.</p> <p>Just keep it going. We enjoy what we have at the moment.</p> <p>IT'S FINE AS IT IS.</p>
Comments about the mobile service stock	17	<p>The mobile library seems to offer a greater variety of books than our local branch which is rather stale. I'm sure libraries used to rotate their stock.</p> <p>I always reserve new hardback books, shame paperbacks aren't released at same time as this would mean more books on the shelves of the van</p> <p>Old dusty books or a wait of six months to get a good read which is usually dusty and smelly.</p> <p>When I get books from the branch library I can only borrow them for 3 weeks and have to keep renewing them (if they are not already reserved).</p>
Comments about where the mobile library stops currently or should stop	17	<p>I think having a mobile library van close to where people are already visiting so they don't need to go out of their way is important. Supermarkets, gyms, schools, parks.</p> <p>Maybe focus stops on places such as community centres and churches when other groups such as parent/toddler, craft groups and jobclubs are convening to maximise library usage, facilitate social contact etc.</p> <p>Tie in the Visit with end of school - ask the school if you can park in their car park.</p>
General comments about people's health or disability	13	<p>More audiobooks for people deaf either 1 ear or in 2 ears ...</p> <p>I would feel embarrassed using a service for disabled people when I am fit.</p> <p>As I have stated, I have had a stroke that has left me housebound and I love reading.</p> <p>It provides an excellent service, especially for the very elderly who have no transport and could not walk far carrying books. ... A real stress reliever for my poor sighted neighbour with audio books.</p>
Comments about previous cuts to the service/the proposed change would be a further cut	11	<p>This is a diminishing service which has been drastically reduced in recent years and it would appear that the local authority are set on reducing the service to a point where they can justify scrapping the service entirely.</p> <p>This service has already been cut down to half the amounts of visits there were pre-covid, it is appalling that it is being cut again.</p> <p>The mobile library service has been pared away over the years to such an extent that the opportunity to use it in rural areas is low.</p> <p>A valued service, already cut once.</p>
#eqia 91 – please see Appendix 2		

Appendixes

APPENDIX 1 – Respondents' comments, by question

Note: Only comments which are 'tagged' more than ten times appear in the following tables.

Table 1: Q3 What is it that you like about our mobile library service?		
Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Generalised positive comment about the service	88	<p>A convenient service for rural communities.</p> <p>I have transport available but it is more convenient to walk to the mobile library stop.</p> <p>Where I lived previously I used the mobile library as far more convenient than driving to nearest library.</p> <p>It has a good selection of books. It is punctual and reliable.</p> <p>A fantastic service which encourages literacy and social connection.</p> <p>The librarians, the choice of books, everyone living nearby has access to a library.</p> <p>It is an indication that Norfolk values the provision of library services to outlying areas.</p> <p>My children love it.</p> <p>It's a fantastic service for those who cannot access a permanent building.</p> <p>It comes very close locally making it easy to use.</p> <p>Great for vulnerable people and to promote libraries.</p>
Comments about people's age in relation to the service	67	<p>My children love visiting it and get excited when they see it come down the road.</p> <p>The library van comes to our Pre school so it's a great experience for them.</p> <p>Children to be able to experience the library.</p> <p>By meeting others on the van, we encourage young and old in reading, sharing interests.</p> <p>We use it to introduce toddlers/small children to the library service.</p> <p>I see the use of it in my village for the children and elderly.</p> <p>Essential service in a village with limited bus service - north Norfolk has a high number of elderly people that is growing.</p> <p>Lots of elderly people living in Horsford.</p>
Comments about mobile library staff/drivers	64	<p>Interesting conversations with the librarians, their enthusiasms.</p> <p>Staff are always very helpful with my mobility issues.</p> <p>I like the one to one advice and recommendations the librarian can give.</p> <p>The drivers are all friendly and have good knowledge when it comes to advising on books; the only way I have access to a library.</p> <p>... I can have discussion about the books. In the local library I often walk in and out without having to speak or be spoken to, because of the machines, now used instead of staff.</p> <p>Drivers always friendly and helpful with any queries.</p> <p>The Librarian is so knowledgeable, knows us personally and recommends books which she knows would interest us.</p>
Comments about the service being vital, a 'lifeline', invaluable, and something people rely on	63	<p>I'm disabled and no transport it's a lifeline.</p> <p>It's a lifeline for the digitally excluded.</p> <p>It is a valuable service for those unable to get to a library, and a lifeline for lonely, isolated folks.</p> <p>Lifeline to get my reading material and get out of the house.</p> <p>An essential service for the elderly and disabled.</p> <p>It is a life saver for me. I look forward to it - I have never missed a visit.</p> <p>Essential as no bus service in village.</p> <p>Vital link for people who can't travel to nearby town.</p> <p>It's an essential service for people who have no transport, live in outlying villages etc.</p>
Comments about how the service promotes individual or community wellbeing and reduces isolation	59	<p>Residents feel part of the community.</p> <p>I want to improve my mental well-being by reading widely and often.</p> <p>It allows isolated people to get out and meet others.</p> <p>It is a lifeline for me, and one of the few faces I see as I live alone. Without my books I would be bereft.</p> <p>I like to keep reading for my mental health and the mobile service is how I do this.</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

		I love reading and the library van meets and exceeds all my requirements. The staff are excellent and the service is brilliant. My well being and general happiness is enhanced by the visit of the library van. It is a lifeline to books - my favourite past time. My main way of relaxing as a fulltime carer.
Comments about how the service saves people having to travel or people's difficulties in travelling	50	It enables people who are unable to get to a branch library books and other services. It is good for people with no transport. It is a service to those who cannot afford or takes buses to Kings Lynn and do not have their own transport. It's great for villagers that don't have transport. Essential as no bus service in village. I don't drive now, the mobile library is within walking distance, for me.
Comments about the role of the service in promoting literacy and encouraging people to read	42	My kids love going to the mobile library for the novelty value (in a good way!). It means even if we already have a few books they want to borrow more, and therefore read more. A fantastic service which encourages literacy and social connection. It makes me read more. My daughter visits when the bus goes to her nursery - it inspires children to love real books. It encourages me to read more and to talk to others about the books we've chosen.
Comments about the importance of the service for rural communities which may lack other services or transport links	38	In a rural setting with very limited bus services (1 weekly bus) it is the only means of using the library service. Rural areas are disadvantaged in that they have to travel to access a library, recent fuel costs make this even more difficult. Vital for rural villages, I teach at a rural village school and some of my class have no transport so no access to books etc. It's a life line to those who live in the countryside and don't have access to libraries. It is a useful service for people isolated in rural villages.
Comments about people's health or disability	26	Very helpful for limited mobility. A safe way to be able to choose books as ventilation is good for those who are vulnerable to infection. I am housebound and enjoy reading. I'm disabled.
Comments about the service in relation to the cost of living or cost of running the service	20	Access to local and free resources especially important at this time. It saves me getting the car out especially now petrol is so expensive. If you use your car you have to pay for parking and also petrol is so pricey. No fines for extended loans. Cost saving from using car.
Comments about the environmental impact of the service.	14	An environmentally friendly way to access books, reducing congestion and costs of travel. More economical and lower carbon than me (and all my neighbours) making separate library journeys. Reduces my carbon imprint by not having to travel ten miles to Swaffham and back. I don't have to use a car queuing into King's Lynn causing pollution.
EQIA information for Q3: #eqia 42, #age 67, #health 26 – please see Appendix 2		

Table 2: Q5 If the mobile library was not available how likely would you be to travel to a branch library for these services? ‘very or somewhat *unlikely*’

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about problems in travelling to a branch library	357	I have no way of getting to a branch library independently. No public transport from village to Acle (or any other) library. Unable to get to the local library , no transport and don't drive. I can't drive and rural transport is rubbish. As I am unable to drive I am reliant on the very limited public transport links to the nearest library. I have no transport and need assistance in walking. Only if I get a lift of someone. I don't drive and would have to go to Norwich. The bus is not always convenient.
Comments about people's health or disability	82	Do not drive now and books are heavy. Not able to drive due to health. Not easy for me to walk so getting to library not easy. The amount of books I take out, would be difficult to carry, with my health problems.
Comments about branch library	81	My local Library branch is not open when I have my day off work, so I can't visit it. Parking is a problem in KL and puts me off using the main library. V. limited parking at nearest branch, and not a lot more at nearest car park. Due to transport, no car readily available, Harleston Library not open on the days I have access to the car.
Comments about the cost of travelling to a branch library	68	Cost of fuel, parking charges. Taxi services are expensive and inconvenient. We're aware of rising fuel prices and restrict ourselves to essential journeys only. Due to the cost of travel to the nearest library.
Comments about people's age	52	I am mid eighties and do not drive. Not driving very much due to age. Elderly don't get out much.
Comments including a caveat	27	I would only go if I was already in a location with a library. Fuel at nearly £10/litre means I would think twice but I love to read so may go sometimes.
Comments about barriers to access associated with time.	21	I am a full time carer for my husband. I rarely get the chance to go to Dereham (nearest library I think) and when I do I don't have the time to spend time in the library. Haven't the time.
Comments about issues with living in a rural area	19	Transport is limited in rural areas. No public transport from village to Acle (or any other) library.
Generalised positive comment about the service	18	I use the mobile library because it is so convenient. Travelling to a branch library is not. The structure of a regular visit by the mobile library suits my lifestyle.
EQIA information for Q5 ‘very or somewhat <i>unlikely</i>’: #eqia 66, #age 52, #health 82 – please see Appendix 2.		

Table 3: Q5 If the mobile library was not available how likely would you be to travel to a branch library for these services? ‘very or somewhat *likely*’

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about respondents’ ability to access branch libraries	63	I have a bus pass so can get into the Dereham branch. Friends would transport me. We are fortunate to have a car and can get to the branch library. Because at present I’m able to drive and have a car. I value libraries and have a car so I can, and do, travel to other libraries. Have a car and the money for petrol.
Comments about respondent’s willingness/ability to travel to a branch but with a caveat	56	We would have to find the time but it would be less often I am able to travel to a branch library but enjoy visiting the mobile library to chat to other users. I suppose I would go to Dereham library but nothing would replace the sheer convenience and specialness of the library van. I like physical books so will use a branch library if no mobile library (but I prefer the mobile library as I get 2 months to read my books).
Comments about the role of the service in promoting literacy and encouraging people to read	34	Reading is knowledge and we all need that but it is not convenient to travel to my local library and my visits could not be as often. We love the library it’s a great way to access books, I personally do not like digital books and my young daughter needs to learn to read traditionally not on a screen. I must have books!
Comments about difficulty in travelling to a branch library	34	The nearest branch is not close and not served well by public transport. I would still try and use the library no matter what but it would make it increasingly difficult because of the insufficient transport links in Norfolk. We like reading different books however the nearest branch library is far enough away to be reached only by car.
General positive comment about the service	26	Because I value the Library Service and books enrich our lives. I enjoy using the library services so would continue using them. Because I love libraries, could not live without them.
Comments about people’s age	20	If I can still drive (I am 86). Our local library is a 20 min drive but would try and get there to keep using books for children.
Comments about branch library	14	It depends on the opening hours of the library. Difficulty of parking near enough to not have to carry heavy books and/or having to pay to park.
Comments about the service in relation to the cost of living/cost of running the service	13	Costs of driving into town and parking. Time saving and cost saving as I can walk to the mobile bus.
EQIA information for Q5 ‘highly or somewhat <i>likely</i>’: #eqia 3, #age 20, #health 6 – please see Appendix 2.		

Table 4: Q8 What do you think are the most important factors when deciding where library services should be provided?

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about services in rural areas	62	In a rural location in Norfolk with infrequent public transport and no other services locally. I think stops in villages in rural Norfolk are really important especially if there are limited services i.e buses etc. In rural areas with a large proportion of elderly residents. Rural communities benefit massively from the library vans. They are ideal for the elderly and those with young children who are unable to travel to other locals.
Comments about services where specific groups of people need a stop	47	Communities with aging populations and council used B&B accommodation. In areas with high populations of elderly and children. In a location that has a large amount of disadvantaged children and adults. In places where there are residents liable not to be able to visit other locations, towns etc, so sheltered housing areas, over 60's residents, areas with mental health sufferers.
Comments about people's age	34	In rural areas with a large proportion of elderly residents. In location where there is aging population, and limited facilities locally. Walking distance for elderly residents.
Comments about how the service promotes wellbeing and reduces isolation	23	This is the one community meeting place. In communities with elderly population and communities with young parents who may otherwise be isolated. The elderly with no transport or access to transport. Social contact even more important as services are withdrawn.
Comments about services at a specific site or type of establishment	23	Near primary schools. Near to care homes where people find great difficulty using a bus with a rolator and a heavy bag of books. Family centres. Rural Preschool.
Comments about the service being vital, a 'lifeline'	22	This is a vital service for any community. Elderly residents it's often their only life line. ... We also have a high number of elderly people who rely on this service
Comments about services wherever there is a need	20	In as broad and diverse a range as possible. Mobile library services should be being increased, not cut. Provide a mix of provision, ie rural communities also community centres etc
EQIA information for Q8: #eqia 17, #age 34, #health 5 – please see Appendix 2.		

Table 5: Q9 What do you think are the most important factors to consider when deciding how long a mobile library visit should be?

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about duration in hours/mins or ways of calculating stop duration	22	<p>Average number of visitors.</p> <p>The number of people regularly using the service.</p> <p>Maybe an hour or two at least in each location.</p> <p>Each stop needs to be at least half an hour otherwise the visit feels too rushed.</p> <p>Time of day: early evening visits may attract people after work. Frequency of visits: vans may be busier if they come less often.</p> <p>I would like a longer time to choose 15 mins is not always long enough as the libarirain needs to find certain books I like. Usually I know where to look but I like something different at times.</p> <p>The number of people who visit and the age of people e.g. a child often takes more time to choose a book.</p>
Comments about using activities to calculate stop duration	19	<p>Basically time to choose a book and return books ask briefly a question. After all it's mostly books the older folk want or DVD etc.</p> <p>Time to talk, library staff are good at signposting other services run by the council.</p> <p>You need time to choose books and not feel hurried also need time to discuss anything about the books with staff.</p> <p>Not all parents are literate, so support may be needed to help access books/reading and encourage children to love reading.</p>
Comments about how the service promotes wellbeing and reduces isolation	16	<p>Connection with people, it might be the only contact someone has that day.</p> <p>Help bring community to getthe.</p> <p>Older folk need more time to look for books. Many do not have tablets etc. In the winter it is especially important to look forward to the van coming.</p>
Comments about NCC's approach or underlying assumptions	11	<p>Why are they needed? Ridiculous waste of money when everything can be done digitally now.</p> <p>Unless the new generation of mobile libraries has space and connectivity then, research will be difficult. How many searches can be done in an hour, never mind 15 minutes? Is 'reading with children' a mobile function? Surely other agencies, or, indeed parents are doing this?</p> <p>The current period of times seem fair. The way the mobile library works at the moment is excellent. No doubt these are grounds to change it for the worse. Pretty much everything else is.</p>
EQIA information for Q9: #eqia 7, #age 9, #health 1 – please see Appendix 2.		

Table 6: Q13 If we were to reduce routes, in your opinion how should we prioritise which routes and stops to keep?

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about not reducing routes	43	You shouldn't reduce them at all. I don't think you should reduce the routes as its a life line for many. Routes shouldn't be reduced forever. The needs of individuals& communities are constantly changing especially with an ageing population & cost of living restricting people's ability to travel. Do not reduce any routes, what ever ones you choose would affect some users
Comments about services in rural areas	37	Keep rural services where people have little or no access to services so the community is still supported. Keep routes where there is lack of public transport in isolated rural areas.
Comments about NCC's approach or underlying assumptions	30	it is the only visible service you provide locally! Why don't you ask what people want to spend their taxes on instead of just doing what you want. Nobody wants your crappy bus lanes and cycle lanes, and once we've all gone electric what difference will they make. I am appalled that this is being considered. Libraries are one of the things which form a civilised society. I'd rather pay higher council tax.
Comments about prioritising routes/stops based on current take up	29	Only remove routes with low usage and reasonable access to other nearby library services. It should be based on usage on that particular route, also what public services are provided in that location. Well used stops should keep the service.
Comments about people's age	26	Need to encourage more use by young families and retired villagers. There would be a need to look at the demographics of a location, ie: number of elderly residents who would find it difficult to travel. A bi monthly visit many who use the mobile DO NOT use Broadband some near me are 85+ & 90.
Comments about reducing frequency rather than cutting routes	23	Maybe it would be better to reduce the number of visits eg every 6 weeks not 4. I don't think you should reduce stops, perhaps cut back on how often, say every 6-8 weeks, which we could choose more books to cover the extra time. Maybe cut back on some stops in the same village or increase the time between visits.
Comments about prioritising routes/stops where there are few other services (not #rural)	17	Prioritise areas with limited access to other services. Prioritise routes where there are limited services and no other means of accessing reading material. Usually routes that are close to other services ie towns have better broadband.
Comments about the service being vital, a 'lifeline', invaluable, and something people rely on	13	Our villages need the library van. I cannot stipulate enough the importance of this service. I don't think you should reduce the routes as its a life line for many. In our close only a couple of old ladies as well as myself use it but they are desperate for it to stay as they can't get to Poringland and really rely on it.
Comments about how the service promotes wellbeing and reduces isolation	11	With no transport of my own and limited mobility, mobile library stop near my home is very much appreciated a very important factor for independence. Don't stop any routes, it helps with mental health nowadays and gives people something to look forward to.
EQIA information for Q13: #eqia 16, #age 26, #health 3 – please see Appendix 2.		

Table 7: Q15 How likely are you to use our digital and online services if we were to reduce the mobile service? ‘Very or somewhat unlikely’

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about preferring paper books	181	<p>I like to read a paper book not on a laptop or tablet etc.</p> <p>I want to borrow and read books, I don't like digital books, I like to hold and turn pages. Nothing better than holding a book.</p> <p>I prefer to have a physical book in my hand, not a fan of digital books or online media.</p> <p>I have online access at home but like paper books to read before going to sleep at night.</p> <p>For the children its the excitement of a book in their hand ... they spend enough time on devices.</p> <p>Nothing beats a book. I find reading digital matter doesn't relax me as much as reading a proper book. And visiting a library allows you to peruse lots of books and broaden my reading.</p> <p>I want to read a book with a cover and a printed page format! There is NO substitute for that pleasure.</p> <p>I use the library to get real books to read. Having a laptop on the bed would not be the same at all and would not happen in my home. Reading is an unwinding process that would not be the same if I then had to start logging off and turning off computers when I wanted to go to sleep. Reading text on screen is done enough in the day job and not what I want from my pleasure reading.</p>
Comments about lack or skill or interest in using technology	152	<p>Reading a book is precious and online services does replace this. As we get older using online services will become increasingly more difficult and confusing.</p> <p>Find online services difficult prefer not to use.</p> <p>Not confident or overly competent using technology.</p> <p>Don't like or understand digital technology. And it's intrusive nature. Hackers/ adverts/using personal information.</p> <p>Not digitally Capable.</p> <p>I don't find digital services usable. They confuse me the moment they don't work, so I give up.</p>
Comments about lack of hardware (laptop/tablet) or access (internet)	138	<p>I do not find online services very user friendly and our broadband in this area is unreliable and cantankerous.</p> <p>No mobile phone or laptop held , broadband service is poor.</p> <p>I have no broadband connection or laptop/computer.</p> <p>I do not have the internet, a computer or any digital devices.</p> <p>My only connection in a land line.</p> <p>Cannot use it, don't have it. could not afford it even I knew what to do with it (and I don't).</p> <p>very poor broadband coverage.</p>
Comments about preference for a physical service and face to face contact with staff rather than digital services	57	<p>Why is everything going online, it is actually nice to talk to a human being and being social.</p> <p>Prefer face to face rather than digital.</p> <p>Online is not a substitute for face to face.</p> <p>Physical books and physical people. Online can't provide that.</p> <p>I use the library to borrow books to read and to get advice and discuss books with staff on the bus.</p> <p>We go (with child) to choose physical books. To browse the titles, get recommendations. This can never never be replaced by an online service.</p>
Comments about existing use of digital services or willingness to use digital services	53	<p>Only use online for basic requirements prefer visiting library.</p> <p>I use the online services at home for myself. My children use the library bus for books, they do not use digital services.</p> <p>Can access online services at home. Happy with Broad band - home pc - and telephone but reading printed word is important to us.</p> <p>Already have access online but it's not what I use the library for; to browse books and have a hard copy to borrow.</p> <p>I use my laptop and ipad when necessary but prefer books.</p> <p>I already use your online services to search the catalogue and to reserve books that can be delivered by the mobile library.</p>
Comments about people's age	53	<p>I am an elderly widow of 92 and totally rely on the Mobile library for reading matter.</p> <p>It is difficult to read non fiction books on devices and the elderly still prefer books.</p> <p>Digital and on line services are no good for an 81 year old technophobe.</p> <p>We are elderly and not very good at digital services but we love a good book!</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

		Visiting with my children is an experience this is not replaceable.
Comments about preference for reading print or concerns with screens	43	I get a lot of books out for my children. I might order them online but I want physical books for us to read together at bedtime not on a tablet or device. Older people often read in bed at night when we are advised not to use screens! I mainly read at night so using tablets or other devices is not healthy. Cannot spend more time looking at screens. Reading books online is not good for eyesight.
Comments about the role of the service in promoting literacy and encouraging people to read	21	Because I could access it now if I wanted to, not everything should be made digital all the time- visiting the library bus and choosing books is such a great way to engage children in reading and away from screens. I love books there is nothing like picking up a new book and starting to read. It's about the children experiencing the full factor of a library bus meeting the librarian and being able to choose books independently. Our children thrive on this!
Comments about NCC's approach or underlying assumptions	20	Not sure what question means. If service very reduced so accessing a mobile library is difficult there is little point using the online service to reserve a book, for example. I have limited IT skills and deplore the inference taken by authorities that everyone is or needs to be IT skilled. Our use of the mobile library service has nothing to do with our usage of online or digital availability. there are many for whom online does not work! This is discriminating against those who are not digitally literate.
Comments about how the service promotes wellbeing and reduces isolation	13	It's more than about books, it's vital community time and it would be very sad to se this reduced. The van is a way for community to come together. Many people are lonely and feel isolated. We need the library van. You cannot be sociable or interact with others online too impersonal creates mental health probs and does not benefit the lonely. Because I have plenty of other digital access and using a library helps social engagement, especially with a disabled husband.
Comments about barriers to take up of service for self or others	13	There would be no one to help at home. Trying to reduce screen time.
EQIA information for Q15 'very or somewhat unlikely': #eqia 17, #age 53, #health 8 please see Appendix 2.		

Table 8: Q15 How likely are you to use our digital and online services if we were to reduce the mobile service? 'Very or somewhat *likely*'

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about existing use of digital services or willingness to use digital services	68	Already use Libby which is excellent for those with a PC or other devices. I already use the online service to search the catalogue, renew books, etc I currently use these services in conjunction with the mobile library I use the digital library very frequently: it is convenient and open all hours. I already borrow audiobooks online and very much appreciate this service. I already use your online services, including to reserve items for collection from the Mobile.
Comments about already using digital services but with a caveat about choice	30	Already do so, but not everything is available digitally. I would have no other choice especially when I have to give up driving my car so need my mobile library. There are many more print book titles in Norfolk, which can all be requested, than e-books.
Comments about preference for paper books	20	Reading a digital book is a poor substitute for reading a real book. I do use the on line service but ver[y] much prefer to read a book in paper form to one on line. It is much more relaxing. I would need assistance downloading books onto my iPad. I prefer a book in my hand.
Comments about lack of skill/interest in using technology	13	No much of a digital buff. Not very clever using the internet and really like holding a book - even a heavy one!
EQIA information for Q15 'very or somewhat <i>likely</i>': #eqia 0, #age 3, #health 1 please see Appendix 2.		

Table 9: Q16 Which, if any, of the following activities would interest you *if* services could be provided alongside the mobile library service?

Theme and tag	No.	Comments
Comments about no interest in/need for additional activities, or should stick to core library services only	54	None of these. It's a mobile library service not a day centre/toddler group/. Not interested in above ideas. It is not a private place on the van! to discuss money and health issues. None of the above - stick to what a library should do which is provide reading matter. All I want is to have some books to read, I don't need any of the other things. Just Library services.
Comments about NCC's approach or underlying assumptions	38	There is no logic to what you're asking. A mobile library service is for books. This option looks like a cynical opportunity for the council to privatise the library service by combining it with another service which may contribute to the funding of the library. I'm not sure how this will work in the mobile setting, ie on a bus. You are thinking of cutting back on our mobile service and then asking what other activities we be interested in. "you're having a laugh". Just provide the mobile library service you cannot afford these random and ill thought out ideas.
Comments about health services in the library van	15	Whilst I wouldn't use basic health checks myself, I think this is a good idea. Drs and dentists etc. drop in clinics Any routine face-to-face health service would be useful.
Comments about reading activities in the mobile library	13	Literacy skills for adults. Great to have write ups & scores of books by other people borrowing books. The mobile library provides access to books, and that is the most important thing. To help, when you are less able, to pass the time! and keep me active.
Comments about how the service promotes wellbeing and reduces isolation	11	Anything that can help adult social services in a preventive care way. Anything that brings our small community together. It is no nice to meet up with friends. Nutritious farm groceries and basics from local people. This would be an excellent service for the elderly and everyone especially in winter if snow were here. A chat would help the elderly and lonely. Could be a lifeline to some.
EQIA information for Q16: #eqia 1, #age 7, #health 15 – please see Appendix 2.		

Appendix 2 - Equality Impact Assessment Evidence

The following sample of comments provide EQIA evidence for each question. Please note that where a respondent has referenced age or a health issue or disability in a general way and it is not clear how they could be affected by the proposed change, their comment has been tagged #age or #health, rather than #eqia. This distinction avoids making any assumptions about the meaning of the comment but ensures the reference is noted, included, and provides additional contextual information to support the EQIA. In total, there were 270 comments relevant to the EQIA.

The number of times general comments about age or health were made for each question is shown in the table below. Comments about age and health can be found in Tables 1-9 (where they are mentioned more than ten times).

EQIA Evidence	
Question	Comment
Q3 What is it that you like about our mobile library service? #eqia 42 #age 67 #health 26	<p>I am disabled and cannot leave my house so rely on the mobile library service.</p> <p>It enables me to regularly select audio books for a neighbour with limited sight and limited ability to leave the house without assistance.</p> <p>As a wheelchair user it is very important, no imperative, to me that I have the use of a mobile library.</p> <p>It is essential in order to provide access to people who cannot easily visit a library branch (building).</p> <p>Many people in Norfolk are Either Elderly or Disabled, so this is their only outside contact.</p> <p>I'm disabled. I cannot easily travel to a library.</p> <p>I am housebound so my carer walks up the road to the library van.</p> <p>It enables Norfolk Xounty Council to fulfill its Statutory Duty under the 1964 Act to provide library services to "all people".</p> <p>Having been diagnosed with cardiac and blood conditions, extreme tiredness means I am rarely able to walk far. The mobile library is a close lifeline for me. I dread to lose it.</p> <p>I am not very mobile so I read a lot. The loss of library van would be devastating to me and many others in my position.</p> <p>I am blind so the driver sorts the books out for me. So we just have to pick them up.</p> <p>It enables me to regularly select audio books for a neighbour with limited sight and limited ability to leave the house without assistance.</p>
Q5 If the mobile library was not available how likely would you be to travel to a branch library for these services? #eqia 75 #age 81 #health 97	<p>I am disabled & have no other way to visit a library.</p> <p>I have M.E so this is the only way I can visit a library.</p> <p>I am elderly and incapacitated with no transport of my own. I need a wheelchair (blue badge user) not all buildings allow ease of use.</p> <p>I am elderly frail and unable to get into a car.</p> <p>Have no transport as registered visibly impaired.</p> <p>As my physical condition worsens I will not be able to drive to my nearest library or carry the books.</p> <p>I had brain surgery four years ago and I had to give up my driving license. If my husband had to give up driving due to ill health I would need a taxi.</p> <p>Do not drive - no regular bus service - am disabled so cannot get to branch library - this is a lifeline for me. Do away with this - is doing away my life and a lot of people in my position.</p> <p>There would be no way we could take children to the library each month as we are in a village.</p> <p>Because I am disabled and my family members live a little way away and work so they could rarely take me.</p>
Q8 What do you think are the most important factors when deciding where library	<p>We have a school in our village and I know other families would not travel for the library services so the mobile library is the only accessible service for some children. We also have a high number of elderly people who rely on this service.</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

<p>services should be provided?</p> <p>#eqia 17 #age 34 #health 5</p>	<p>Can only walk very few yards. Unless parking 'on doorstep' can not access anything much. Blue Badge - Don't have one - if no parking available for disabled - no help! Mobile Library parks where I can "legally" stops.</p> <p>Many people in village are elderly and have limited ability to travel far - reading is an important leisure pursuit for house-bound people and the inability to access a range of books would be detrimental.</p> <p>In places where no easy physical way for residents to access library due to lack of mobility, e.g. older people, those with physical ailments, or other restrictions.</p>
<p>Q9 What do you think are the most important factors to consider when deciding how long a mobile library visit should be?</p> <p>#eqia 7 #age 9 #health 1</p>	<p>Accessible for people who have disabilities and additional needs.</p> <p>It is important to be inclusive and reach out to all members of the community. Finding time and space to do the latter two items would mean bigger vans and fewer stops. This may well be suitable for some remoter areas.</p> <p>Time to allow less mobile users to travel up and down on the lift.</p>
<p>Q13. If we were to reduce routes, in your opinion how should we prioritise which routes and stops to keep?</p> <p>#eqia 16 #age 26 #health 3</p>	<p>Look at the kinds of people using your stops and keep those used by folk who cannot easily access other local libraries in other villages because of mobility or sight issues in travelling there.</p> <p>Reduce based on age of community. Older people are less likely to have the option of going online or driving to a physical library or mobile stop.</p> <p>Keep routes that serve the disabled, disadvantaged, disaffected.</p> <p>Sometimes I visit a different stop to my nearest, but I know the lady I meet there would not be able to travel as she only has one leg and walks with a frame.</p> <p>Please don't reduce it on numbers visiting, but keep it for the disabled and elderly who don't want to computers and can travel independently to a main branch, or very rural locations.</p>
<p>Q15. How likely are you to use our digital and online services if we were to reduce the mobile service?</p> <p>#eqia 19 #age 66 #health 10</p>	<p>Internet is too expensive due to cost of living and disability.</p> <p>Sight issues can make using too much screen time difficult. Much kinder on the eyes to have traditional paper books to read.</p> <p>Often help is needed using online services, especially for the older population who have not had the benefit of learning about computers or using them at school.</p> <p>Not everyone has the use of a computer especially the elderly, so to be able to have the opportunity to have a book is vital.</p> <p>I'm have macula degeneration, so have limited vision. Viewing a screen is mentally tiring.</p>
<p>Q16. Which, if any, of the following activities would interest you if services could be provided alongside the mobile library service?</p> <p>#eqia 1 #age 7 #health 15</p>	<p>Removing our library will be a blow to some people, those disabled, living alone and non drivers.</p>
<p>Q17. Which other organisations could we consider working with to deliver services to rural locations?</p> <p>#eqia 2</p>	<p>The Norfolk deaf association has outreach services. Work with church groups and museums. I'd like accessibility to be a priority because people with disabilities are often isolated, public transport can be unreliable or not wheelchair friendly and poverty is an issue too.</p> <p>Maybe Age UK, as well as organisations that replaced Sure Start. It is always the most vulnerable people who suffer from council cuts, and those are less likely to complain!</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

<p>Q20. Is there anything else you want to tell us about the mobile library service that you think might be useful?</p> <p>#eqia 91 #age 139 #health 13</p>	<p>Visiting the mobile library is one of the few things I can still do independently without troubling someone else.</p> <p>Please consider people with a disability and the cost of living when you make cuts. The important thing about retaining the mobile library service is it's importance to those who are not able to use conventional walk-in or online libraries due to age, understanding or disability.</p> <p>This service is valuable to local people who are elderly or have mental health issues who wish to retain face to face contact with people.</p> <p>A relative who is partially sighted and cannot drive relies entirely on this service for audio books and would be lost without it.</p> <p>Need to consider the elderly, disabled, blind and deaf adults and children particularly with transport problems.</p> <p>As I am visibly impaired and a pensioner being able to borrow audio books is my lifeline. Please make it accessible for ALL members of society as mentioned.</p> <p>People with disabilities are not very mobile and to think you are thinking of moving stopping points is disgusting, somebody needs to live in the real world and but themselves in our position.</p> <p>Giving extremely disabled people independence. Not having to rely on 'kind neighbours', to transport them to the nearest library.</p> <p>The mobile library service is critical for me as I am housebound and suffer from mobility issues.</p> <p>I rely on the service as I am disabled and do not drive.</p> <p>One of our neighbours is over 90 and has bad eyesight and hearing. He uses the mobile library for large print books and dvd's, if you stop this service he will be a very lonely man. I'm sure this will apply to many other elderly who don't have access to transport to travel to a library.</p>
---	---

Appendix 3 – Ideas/Suggestions

Respondents made suggestions for improving the service: comments about topics not covered elsewhere in the analysis are shown in the table below.

Comment
<p>Q8 Location of stops</p> <p>Charity donation tins e.g. books for schools in developing countries.</p>
<p>Q9 Duration of stops</p> <p>Can we not simplify this by making it online and through the efficient postal service?</p> <p>Provide a mix of services at different times, all the above are important for different people ie once a month provide child event, and another time chat and borrow to take into account loneliness and an opportunity o meet people</p> <p>The van comes in the day during school time, so no school children are on there. But it would be an excellent idea to put it in the village school playground and we can all walk up there and use it - including staff and children - some of whose parents are possibly "too busy" to take them to a library at the weekends, considering how far away they are.</p>
<p>Q13 Prioritising routes and stops</p> <p>Reduce visits to schools, care homes etc. as these users have access to helpers. The lonely people in their own homes need this service.</p> <p>Have deviated services - e.g. a buddy that visits rural communities and one the travels educational settings like nurseries.</p> <p>Reduce routes that are close to public library but check to ensure regular users can get to one. Consider Library Buddies to help vulnerable people access the library, even deliver books/media if necessary.</p> <p>Rationalise routes. For example, Bodham only had 1 10 minute slot. Weybourne, a village of similar size, has 5. West Beckham has zero.</p> <p>Maybe do all route but just rotate them.</p> <p>Although individuals who really, really need and appreciate this service may then completely miss out as they might not have people to help them like I helped my late Nan. Is there any way the libraries/mobile libraries can have a list of people who would love to use the service but would find it difficult to visit a stop further away or not have anyone to go for them? Is there a way volunteers or even the drivers could deliver books for these less fortunate people? I just know how much having this regular mobile service, and so convenient to us, really helped the wellbeing of my late Nan so much for decades of her life.</p>
<p>Q15 Likelihood of using digital and online services</p> <p>Could you offer community transport to take folk to these vital services instead of them trying to get to them?</p> <p>Yet again rural areas are disadvantaged here. Mobile networks and internet speed is vastly different to that in urban areas. Put the mobile vans where they need to be- in rural villages where there are zero permanent services currently and those and where there are those who have to drive 15 minutes before they can open a book or access the internet.</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Q16 Other activities

Please continue the brown paper bags like hygiene packs and keeping warm packs. As everything gets more expensive I think these will be used more. Maybe extending these with charities like food banks? We would like to borrow story sacks. Seed libraries.

Nutritious farm groceries and basics from local people. This would be an excellent service for the elderly and everyone especially in winter if snow were here. A chat would help the elderly and lonely. Could be a lifeline to some. I'd love to see a recycling books area where i can bring new or used books I've bought elsewhere and leave them for others to read, either to bring them back later or buy them for a small amount like 20p or more then redonate if they wish. This would raise some funds too.

Q17 Other organisations

If you ran double decker buses you could offer other services upstairs but you would need a lift instead of stairs. The most useful would probably be health checks and other screening.

If any routes are discontinued could there be a publicised appeal for volunteers to step in and assist vulnerable people who lose the visiting service? If they had some tech to show which books are in stock they could reserve and pick up for neighbours.

Why don't you set up library facilities in village halls. / Parish councils to provide library services in local village halls manned by volunteers. This is done by other local authorities (Worcestershire).

Village halls? Schools? WI & local clubs, scouts etc, Parent & Toddler/Playgroups, Garden groups, local cafe - stop there so people wait with cuppa tea & stay to chat after choosing books?

I think you need to be more creative and joined up with your services, in France for example postmen/women check in on elderly persons that live on their own.

If the mobile library was given the same stature as a fixed building, working with the parish and district councils, communities could use them as hubs for many different services which they no longer have.

Charity collection, a notice board would be useful - advertising local events or classes. Buy and sell adverts on a small scale - within area that my mobile library covers.

Bus and train timetables from Saunders and Greater Anglia.

Q20 Anything else?

If an option for a reminder text could be sent to remind people that it is that weeks visits as I miss visits as forget what week we are on and when the service is available.

Rather than cut it to the bone, trim some fat from the millenium library. Multiple copies of books, dvds should be reduced and people should expect to wait longer. Do you still need to buy expensive dvds when the vast majority who like films watch on a subscription service? Reduce the hours of opening in the library.

The reason I stopped using the service was its unreliability. If it doesn't turn up, you've wasted half an hour, and especially in the winter, been stood out in rotten weather for the privilege! That's not sustainable, especially for the elderly population/those with young children who would probably be the greatest users of the service. Could you tie in the service with nearby bus stops and provide those indicators which tell you when the next bus/service is going to be there? That would also increase use of buses I imagine, because the unreliability must be a big factor in why people don't use them.

Try to provide a greater range of books, and change the selection on different vehicles.

Is it possible you could also include businesses in the mobile library offer as that would mean they could pay towards the running of the service eg mobile banking. Many bank branches are closing and this would help.

The library could be flexible to any number of tasks as in the distribution of lateral flow tests.

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

I think that the library service should be much more radical and creative in its approach. Two ideas: 1. Deposit collections in village halls, churches, community spaces etc and don't bother with record keeping. Far cheaper to dump 200 books in a village hall and forget about them than run a mobile service (plus I suspect you have significant volumes of surplus bookstock currently). 2. Allow readers in rural areas free request service and deliver books direct to people's door.

It would be great to publicise how neighbours can help others to access the library. For example I could easily get to Wells once a week and take book requests and returns from the village... But I've never thought about it until now! Perhaps there could be letters to Parish Councils who could then cascade the information if volunteers are needed once the cuts come in.

The local school was telling me that MATS were not buying into the service and that other schools (small rural schools) were having the services cut to them because of it. I think that MATS should be investing in the buses particularly as the SEND review talks about more cooperation between them and sharing resources. I feel that so much more could be made of the service to make it better, more commercial and something that really supports rural communities and schools. utilising a mobile service that has the flexibility to deliver different services to the community could enable growth and build on helping and supporting children and elderly residents in rural setting as well as providing crucial services to whole communities such as health and wellbeing.

Pennoyers [venue, café, museum in South Norfolk] is a brilliant local hub to be investigated.

Just as many government departments are now co-located in single buildings to streamline costs and services, I think the secret to maintaining the mobile library service is going to be working with as many other organisations as possible to deliver as many services in one hit as possible.

However as I said, I would consider dropping the visits to every other month to save money. OR would it save money if we could we have books sent to us instead? We reserve them and they are sent? Max of 3 per month or something?

Aske large booksellers to sponsor.

Instead of reducing routes completely, could you consider having request stops...so on any given week, we could log on to request that the library bus comes on its allocated day...then, if no one requests it, the driver wouldn't need to stop there that day. A bit like a train halt stop. Elderly could be supported in advance to learn how to request it stop online or a telephone number could be provided for ease. Just a thought.

How about charging a very modest fee for books from the mobile library rather than cut them?

It would be good to have alternate dates when our visit coincides with bank holidays as this at present limits the visits per year every year.

A bigger choice of children's books would be good.

Our mobile library is one of the best in the county, they are efficient, helpful in searching for books, chase down reservations. They cover a very large area, perhaps you should keep the mobile libraries and half the town libraries instead. don't see why rural library users should suffer when there are two libraries in kings lynn a mile apart! Close the one at Gaywood and that would save rent and rates. Maybe the mobile library can replace it instead!!

Perhaps a mini bus to take people to the library instead along with the community buses or in addition.

The buses are not needed in some areas as books could be delivered, by estate car to village halls and residents could be assisted to order books online. This would help make residents familiar with the online ordering system. No point saving library service 200k if it is going to ultimately cost Adults department more.

I would be happy to pay £1.00 per visit to a mobile library buty realise many wouldn't be able to do this. Maybe a voluntary contribution?

I very much appreciate having the use of this and would be willing to pay for this service with ie monthly/annual charge!

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

The service provides an essential lifeline to those who are elderly, maybe housebound, or disabled, and the human touch is not to be under-estimated. Working with local voluntary organisations such as a church or charity makes sense, as they are in touch with their community, and can provide some service at less cost. For example a monthly opportunity to deliver/collect/order books, whilst having contact would work, with the last mile made possible by volunteers for the housebound. Simple training plus a laptop to check books etc in and out would suffice, with a monthly delivery/collection. This could be used to develop simple skills to enable use of a digital reader, which could be loaned to those in need.

More audio listening headsets as there are very few on the mobile vans.

As a volunteer with the RVS Home Library Service I believe the service could be expanded to cover service users in more areas as long as volunteers are willing and able to travel to more rural locations. The service probably needs to be marketed more widely so more people are aware of it's existence. Perhaps this is something NCC can do.

I think there may be options for greater integration with the HLS. In particular, coordination to allow volunteers to help users access the mobile library, eg help with wheelchairs or other walking aids to reach the van.

Most book readers have many books collected over the years. If each time you used the mobile library we all took a couple of books and gave them to the library (they would have to be in good condition) the library would not have to purchase so many books.

Have larger vehicles with more changes of books.

Appendix 4 – Comments about the consultation process

There were 69 comments about the consultation process. A sample of comments covering the main themes is shown in the table below.

Comments about the consultation process
<p>Q3 What is it that you like about our mobile library service?</p> <p>It provides a service for others who do not have the capability to visit fixed libraries, and who do not have the facility to complete this questionnaire.</p>
<p>Q5 Likelihood of travelling to branch library</p> <p>It [travelling to a branch library] would not be as convenient but I am a car owner others who use the service are not car owners nor do they have internet access to complete this survey.</p> <p>I can drive and use a computer, so why I don't use the service but there are elderly residents who don't have either option so need this invaluable service, so I am doing this survey for them.</p>
<p>Q8 Location of stops</p> <p>I am not sure why I am only permitted one answer here, as I think all of the above are good reasons to have a mobile library service, each has its own merit and are equally important.</p> <p>Impossible to choose ONE of your given options!</p> <p>Why does this question say 'factors' (plural) when you are asked to tick only one box.</p>
<p>Q9 Duration of stops</p> <p>Re: above the last two options show that whoever prepared this survey has no idea of the facilities available on a mobile library van - neither of them are available on these vehicles!!</p>
<p>Q13 Prioritising routes and stops</p> <p>Argue for more money from central government. There is no publicity on the issues with funding councils. Tell us what you do spend money on so I am able to give you an informed answer here.</p> <p>You have clearly decided to do this already, and this consultation is little more than an exercise in public relations.</p> <p>Loaded questions -eg what does 'closer proximity to other services' mean in specific or comparative distance.</p> <p>Hard question but public transport/branch opening times would need to be considered.</p>
<p>Q15 Likelihood of using digital and online services</p> <p>Not sure what you mean by this question, maybe give examples.</p> <p>It sounds like halving the budget is already decided and this is a , " well, we did ask people".</p> <p>Not sure what question means. If service very reduced so accessing a mobile library is difficult there is little point using the online service to reserve a book, for example.</p>

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

I already use the digital and online services. Pointless question, as the two are not doing the same thing. Not sure what the digital and online services are.

I'm not sure what services you mean - but I would and do make reservations online and renew sometimes. What exactly do you mean by "digital and online services?"

The question is too vague to give a proper response.

What exactly do you mean by "digital and online services?"

Do not understand the question.

Not understanding the meaning of the question.

Q16 Other activities

When you ask if there was a service nearby, you don't state a distance.

You are thinking of cutting back on our mobile service and then asking what other activities we be interested in. "you're having a laugh".

Again this shows the person who created this survey has very little idea of what is available or what space there is on a mobile library vehicle!

Q17 Other organisations

Don't really understand the question.

I am not sure what you mean. We don't get any services in our village so there is no-one with whom the library service could combine.

Q20 Anything else?

This is a poor survey. The questions only 'work' for those that currently use mobile libraries.

I feel the questions on here do not give us an opportunity to give informed answers.

Cut your use for very expensive consultations I imagine this form had to be paid for by someone's budget.

I think that to just make this survey apply to existing mobile library service users is wrong - as a County we have a duty to support the learning and development of all our citizens - whether this is new babies or the elderly adapting to a more IT based life or having to adapt to living alone or in more isolated circumstances - i.e. illness or not being able to drive oneself any more.

It can be a vital link for people, including those who are not able to answer this survey for varying reasons.

I'm a Norfolk Library member who lives rurally but doesn't use the Mobile Library Service, simply because I'm a technically competent OAP and prefer to use the Libby & PressReader download service. However, despite the survey not being aimed at people who use library digital services, I was interested to read and complete as much as possible your survey on mobile services.

This survey is designing for those using this service now. It is not wanting opinion of someone who does not use it. For example you should ask why I do not use it. Your first question is do you use it, then all subsequent questions presume usage. Rather a narrow survey.

If you want to do the best and right thing, ask the library staff for ideas, and spend time meeting those who actually use the service. This way you will get really valid feedback.

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

For some reason I couldn't take part in the survey as it would only let me save and come back later, go back or go to the first page and not to continue.

Questions on survey not relevant to my situation.

If your plan is to remove the mobile library service completely then just do it and stop hiding behind so called public consultations. We all know that you've planned what you want to do and the people of Norfolk have no say - unless they're on the council.

Please do not cut these services. They are vital for many people in rural Norfolk (many of whom will not be able to voice their opinion on these online surveys due to lack of online access).

I think that the majority of mobile library users are the elderly so having an online survey to decide the future of mobile libraries is shocking.

I feel a lot of people that use the service won't get the chance to register their views for all manner of reasons. It concerns me that perhaps this survey has not reached everyone that uses the service. ... Question 19 is predetermined on the basis that you don't know about the Home Library Services are, so you shouldn't really consider responses to this poorly worded question.

Just like to say that this is a very poorly constructed survey. I've left a few questions as they could not be answered accurately.

How much is this consultation costing to run? If it is an in-house process are the staff running it doing it in addition to their current jobs, hopefully so. If the consultation is out sourced what is the time period to offset its cost?

Hempnall Parish Council discussed the proposed cuts to the Mobile Library Service at their meeting on the 16th August 2022. Whilst expressing surprise that the Council had not been contacted as one of the key partners and stakeholders it was agreed to respond to the consultation.

I don't know how you can consider reducing the mobile library service to save over £200k when there appears to be plenty of money to construct cycle ways, not used much of the time. Also, vast amounts of money is regularly used to pay consultations for various projects.

Only that you can't wait to cut these services because your organisation has been so incompetent wasting so much money! I've taken the time and trouble to fill this form in, but I have reservations as to whether you actually take any notice of it at all. As a council you have wasted so much money - why would my opinion count now. It is probable that many elderly residents are not computer users, and so their voices may be under-represented in your consultation.

Appendix 5 - List of organisations that responded

This list was from respondents writing in the box which asked if they were responding on behalf of an organisation. Some answers such as 'individual' or 'none' or organisations that were not local, have been removed from the below list.

2nd hellesdon scout group
Beetley & District Preschool
Beetley and district preschool
Beetley and district preschool
Beetley and District Preschool
Beetley Preschool
brinton parish council
Brockdish
Carer
Change Grow Live
Child care centre
Childrens setting
Churchwarden for Southburgh and Cranworth
City College Norwich
City Councillor for Eaton
Clenchwarton Parish Council
Clerk to ashill Welfare Charity
Community Champions GY
Conkers day nursery
Conkers Day Nursey
Councillor Alexandra Kemp
County Councillor
Ditchingham Day Nursery
Early year practitioner
Education
Elephant and castle child care centre
Elsing Happy Circle/Knit and Natter
Elsing Parish Council
Emma Mills tutoring
Ex parish councillor and parish clerk.
Family centre
Great Witchingham Primary
Hempnall Parish Council
Hempnall Parish Council
Hickathrift House Care Home
Hingham Town Council
Home and Parish Councilllor
Hunstanton Town Council
I am a volunteer with the RVS Home Library Service
Litcham childcare
Litcham childcare
Little Owls Day Nursery

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Local Government
Magic tree
Magic tree
member of the Scoulton village hall committee
Mulberry Bush Day Nursery
Mulberry Bush Day Nursery
NCC - Children's services
Necton little oaks preschool
Neighbour
Nhs
Norwich City Councillor
Parish council
Parish Council
parish council
Parish Council and village hall committee
Phoenix Group
Preschool
Queen's Hill Primary School
Rainbow Children's Nursery Ltd
Rainbow Children's Nursery Ltd
Resident of West Winch and Parish Councilor
RVS volunteers
Scanning Pre school
Scoulton Village Hall coffee morning presently hosting monthly mobile library
Scouting
Shipdham Paridh Council
Shipdham Parish Council
Spixworth Infant School
St Andrews Church Thursford - Churchwarden
St Andrews PCC
Stalham & Surrounding Areas Community Hub
Stow Bridge Village Hall
Stow Bridge Village Hall
Swanton Morley Parish Council
Teacher
Teacher at local village school
The church
The Crown Rest Home
The Crown Rest Home
The Pulham Market Society
The Treasure Box
Tilney All Saints Parish Council
UEA
University of East Anglia
Use personally and school secretary at Lingwood.
Village Hall
Village hall member

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

West Norfolk Befriending
West Norfolk Befriending
West walton family centre
West Winch & Setchey Parish Council
West-Norfolk Disability Information and Advice Service.
Worstead Parish Council
Worstead Parish Council

Appendix 6 - Answers to Question 6 ‘Where is your nearest library stop?’

The table below shows the frequency of answers to question 6. Some answers were grouped together present a more condensed version of this table. For example, if a user wrote Goldsmith Way, Pulham St Mary it is listed in this table under ‘Pulham St Mary’.

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Variations Of 'Near Where I Live'	176
Birchfield Gardens, Mulbarton	24
Spixworth	19
East Harling	19
Lingwood	18
Terrington St Clement	15
Yaxham	12
Great Ellingham	12
Queen's Hill Primary School	12
Clenchwarton	11
Saxlingham	10
Eaton	10
Lyng	10
Necton	10
Pulham St Mary	9
West Winch	9
Briston	9
Drayton	8
Dog Lane, Horsford, Norwich	8
Brisley	8
Dereham	8
Thursford	8
Mattishall	8
Rocklands	8
Devon Way, Trowse	7
Barnham Broom	7
Swanton Morley	7
Cringleford	7
Little Melton	7
Newton Flotman	7
Mileham	7
Beetley	6
Ashill	6
Blossom End, Snettisham	6
Bradwell	6
Rockland St Mary	6
Northrepps	6

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Buxton	6
Scole	6
Tunstead	6
Tasburgh	6
Easton	6
Ormesby	6
Roydon	6
Runham	6
Weeting	6
Bradenham	5
Dickleburgh	5
Hardwick Bridge	5
Blo Norton	5
Ludham	5
North Walsham	5
Pott Row	5
Croxton	5
Church Road, Topcroft	5
Coltishall	5
Costessey	5
Denton	5
Docking	5
Hemsby	5
Surlingham	5
Gressenhall	5
Middleton	5
Hickling	5
Hempnall	5
Marshland St James Village Hall	5
South Wootton	5
New Buckenham	5
Sporle	5
Stoke Holy Cross	5
Little Plumstead	4
Bowthorpe	4
Ditchingham	4
Upwell	4
Potter Heigham	4
Rollesby	4
Brooke	4
Bramerton	4
Upton	4
Grimston	4
Great Massingham	4
Dussindale	4

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Thorpe Marriott	4
Watlington	4
Foulsham	4
Hainford Village Hall	4
North Pickenham	4
Kenninghall	4
Kingsleigh Close Trunch	4
Pentney	4
Elsing	4
Old Catton	4
Newton Close, Newton St Faith	4
Southburgh	4
Syderstone	4
Sharrington	4
Stoke Ferry	4
Swainsthorpe	4
New Buckenham	3
Blofield Heath	3
Back Street Bungalows, Garboldisham	3
Barningham	3
Bawdeswel	3
Blakeney	3
Colkirk.	3
Bunwell	3
Castle Acre - St James Green	3
Catfield	3
Swardeston	3
Felmingham	3
Feltwell	3
Filby	3
Welney	3
Overstrand	3
Hindringham	3
Hockwold	3
Honing	3
Horning Village Hall	3
Knapton	3
North Elmham	3
Shipdham	3
Ringstead	3
Stow Bridge	3
Swanington Village Pump	3
Taverham	3
The Green, Edington	3
The Street Great Cressingham	3

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Walcott	3
Walpole	3
Wimbotsham	3
Wood Norton	3
East Winch	2
Abbey Park, Bestoon Regis	2
Alby	2
All Saints Close	2
Thetford	2
Ashwellthorpe	2
Hill Farm	2
Beeston	2
Badersfield	2
Barney	2
Bodham	2
Brancaster	2
Burnham Market	2
Gayton	2
Welborne	2
Dersingham	2
Diss	2
Earsham	2
East Carleton	2
Eckling Grange	2
Emneth	2
Erpingham	2
Fersfield	2
Forncett St Peter	2
Foxley	2
Gables Avenue Southrepps	2
Garvestone	2
Hanworth	2
Happisburgh	2
Havergate Complex	2
Haveringland	2
Cranworth	2
High Road Bressingham	2
Wicklewood	2
Holt	2
Honingham	2
Horningham	2
Thorpe Abbotts	2
Aldborough	2
Shelfanger	2
Ingoldisthorpe	2

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Ingworth	2
Kings Lynn	2
Mannington Hall	2
Marlingford	2
North Wootton	2
Old Buckenham	2
Old Norwich Road	2
Oulton Street	2
Peddars Way, Holme Next The Sea	2
Pine Walk, Weybourne	2
Tuddenham	2
Rainbow Nursery - Worstead	2
School Road, Tilney All Saints	2
Scratby	2
Sedgeford	2
Southery	2
Sprowston	2
Tharston South Norfolk	2
The Chapel/Clement Court	2
The Grange, Scottow	2
Walton	2
Thorpe End	2
Thorpland Lane, Runcion Holme	2
Weasenham Road	2
West Raynham	2
West Runton	2
Westfields, Tilney St Lawrence	2
Westgate Street Hilborough	2
Wiggenhall St Germans Shop	2
Bircham	2
Shouldham	2
Drymere, Beechamwell	1
Acle	1
Ashby St Mary	1
Ashmanhaugh	1
Astley Cooper Place	1
Heacham	1
Attleborough	1
Baconsthorpe	1
Beachamwell	1
Bilney Hall	1
Winterton On Sea	1
Bottom Of Foxwood Hemblington	1
Boughton	1
Bradeham Drive	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Brandon	1
Braymeadow Lane	1
Burnham Norton	1
B1shy Barnabee Way	1
Car Park, Handover Gardens	1
Chequers Lane, South Lapham	1
Cherry Croft Lay-By Bridgham	1
Cherry Tree Close, North Lopham	1
Cherry Tree Farm, Stanfield	1
Chestnut Square, Great Hockham	1
Cheynam Mount	1
Church Road Cantley.	1
CHURCH ROAD NEATISHEAD	1
Clapham Rd S, Lowestoft	1
Claxton	1
Collingwood Close Hearcham	1
Quidenham,	1
Little Dunham	1
Deopham	1
Dilham	1
Dovedale Road Tacolneston	1
Durverlin Close	1
East Runton	1
East Ruston	1
East Tuddneham Post Office	1
Easy Reach	1
Edgefield	1
Eldens Lane, Methwold.	1
Ex-Post Office, Whissonsett	1
Fransham Station Rd (A47 Corner)	1
Frettenham Well Green	1
Gately Hall Lodge, Gateley	1
Gorleston	1
Great Houlton	1
Greenways	1
Greggs Close	1
Grove Road Brockdish	1
Gt Ryburgh	1
Haddiscoe	1
Hales	1
Hanover Court	1
Hapton- Next To The Church	1
Harleston	1
Harlingford Way	1
Harvey Estate Gimingham	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Hay Green Rd	1
Hethel Church	1
Hevingham Pound Road	1
Hickathrift House	1
Hindolveston	1
Hobland	1
Hockering	1
Hole In The Wall, Snetterton South End	1
Holt House Farm Road In Leziate	1
Cherrywood	1
Westacre	1
Kerdiston	1
Kerridges	1
Keswick Hall Car Park	1
Limpenhoe Village	1
Linford Estate	1
Lion End, Thurne, Gt Yarmouth	1
Long Beach Estate	1
Lord Nelson Drive	1
Margaret Close, Ferry Rd,	1
Mile Cross	1
Mill Fields, Hempall	1
Mundham Common Road	1
Noel Close. Hopton.	1
North Burlingham Post Box	1
Northgateway	1
Norton Subcourse	1
Spicers Lane Cottages	1
Ashwell Court Chapel Break Village Hall	1
Old Fakenham Road, Coxford	1
Old Hunstanton	1
Old Swan Public House	1
On Neves Close	1
Orange Tree, High Street, Thornham	1
Orchard Close Walington	1
Outwell Road Elm	1
Pennygate Barton Turf	1
Pioneer Road Norwich	1
Pockthorpe Pond End	1
Post Office Close	1
St. Williams Way	1
Reedham Station Forecourt	1
Reepham Road	1
Regis Avenue	1
Ridlington	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Roughton, Old Mill Lane	1
Kirby Road	1
Seething Post Office	1
Saham Toney	1
Sainsburys Pound Lane	1
Salhouse	1
Salthouse	1
Scarning Mayfair	1
School Top Of Station Road North In Walpole Cross Keys, PE34 4HD	1
Scoulton Village Hall Car Park	1
Sheval Close, Aslacton	1
Skeyton	1
Smithson Drive, Hunger Avenue	1
Sneath Common	1
South Creak Bluestone Farm	1
South Pickenham	1
South Runcton	1
Spooner Row	1
St Augustines Way	1
St Peter's Close, Strumpshaw	1
St. Annes Crescent	1
St. Georges Close Thrurton	1
Staden Park	1
Station Road Holme Hale	1
Station Road Thorpe Market	1
Stibbard	1
Stokesby	1
Styleman Way	1
Fellowes Road	1
The Firs (The Common)	1
The Grove, Shotesham	1
The Hill Brisly	1
The Oak Tree, Wretton	1
The Poplars, Swanton Abbott	1
The Square East Rudham	1
The Street, Kettlestone	1
The Swan, Ringland	1
The Triangle, The Street, Suffield Green	1
Thelverton Lay-By	1
Thurton St Georges Close	1
Thwaite St Mary, Bungay Road, Norfolk	1
Tivetshall St Mary Post Office	1
Top Of Common Lane Tamworth - Opposite Priory Lane	1
Top Of White Hart St. East Barking First Stop On Route	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.1

Name of Stop	Number of Times Mentioned
Topcraft Church Road	1
Upper Street	1
Village Hall - Posturck	1
Vulcan Road North	1
Walnut Place The Street, Gooderstone	1
Walsingham	1
Watton	1
Waxham	1
Wereham Village Hall	1
Winfarthing	1
Wisbech	1
Yelverton Community Centre	1
Bottom Of Post Office Lane	1
Bracon Ash Village Hall	1
Chapel Car Park Lync	1
Chapel Road School Lay-By	1
Village Hall	1
Village Shop	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2
Annex 7.2: List of the stops that will cease [AMENDED]

Key:

Type	Reason
1	1 mile from branch library
2	1.5 miles from branch library
0	Dead stops
=	Amendment – stop removed from this list [COMPARED TO POSITION REPORTED TO CABINET 30/01/2023]

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
1	WED	315	2	BRADWELL	10:05	10:20	CURLEW WAY (Opp Raven Close)	NR31 8LY	00:15	2
2	WED	315	4	BRADWELL	10:25	11:15	MILL LANE COMMUNITY CTRE	NR31 8NY	00:50	6
2	WED	315	6	GORLESTON	11:30	11:55	POTTERS FIELD + Hsecall	NR31 7HL	00:15	2
2	WED	315	8	GORLESTON	12:00	12:30	BUSY BEES AT GT. YARMOUTH	NR31 6LA	00:30	5
1	MON	214	2	OLD CATTON	10:00	10:45	GARRICK GREEN - SCHL term time only	NR6 7AL	00:30	25
0	MON	214	4	OLD CATTON	10:50	11:05	IVES ROAD (Nr Community Centre)	NR6 6DY	00:15	0
1	MON	214	6	OLD CATTON	11:10	11:30	CATTON COURT	NR6 7AJ	00:30	3
1	MON	214	8	OLD CATTON	11:35	11:55	WOODLAND DRIVE (Nr No.12 - Opp No.5)	NR6 7AX	00:30	1
2	MON	214	10	OLD CATTON	12:00	12:25	TAYLORS LANE	NR6 7BE	00:25	3

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	MON	214	12	OLD CATTON	12:30	12:50	NORMAN DRIVE	NR6 7HN	00:20	0
0	MON	214	14	OLD CATTON	14:00	14:15	EDGEFIELDS CLOSE	NR6 7HP	00:15	0
1	MON	214	16	OLD CATTON	14:20	14:35	THE PADDOCKS (Nr Three Corner Drive)	NR6 7HR	00:25	1
1	MON	214	18	OLD CATTON	14:40	15:05	PIONEER ROAD (Nr No.11)	NR6 7PA	00:10	3
0	MON	214	20	OLD CATTON	15:10	15:20	PROCTOR ROAD (Nr No. 129 lay-by)	NR6 7PE	00:10	0
1	MON	214	22	OLD CATTON	15:30	15:50	MORRISONS CAR PARK	NR6 7HS	00:20	2
2	MON	214	24	OLD CATTON	16:00	16:30	THE WARREN (Nr No.27 opp ally to Warren Close)	NR6 7NL	00:15	3
0	MON	214	26	OLD CATTON	16:35	16:50	COLKETT DRIVE (Opp. No.1)	NR6 7ND	00:15	0
0	MON	116	2	BRAMERTON	12:05	12:30	SUNBEAMS PLAYGROUP (village hall term-time only)	NR14 7EQ	00:25	
0	THURS	417	2	FELTHORPE	10:15	10:30	LAY BY Nr MARINERS PUB	NR10 4AB	00:15	0
0	THURS	417	8	HAVERINGLAND	11:15	11:35	HAVERINGLAND HALL, CARAVAN PARK	NR10 4PN	00:20	0
2	THURS	417	10	BOOTON	11:45	11:55	NEWINGTON HOUSE	NR10 4NZ	00:10	2
1	MON	120	4	COSTESSEY	12:20	12:50	CLEVERCLOGS NURSERY	NR5 0SG	00:30	8
=	THU	419	16	RINGLAND	14:15	14:25	THE SWAN	NR8 6AB	00:10	
1	THU	419	24	NEW COSTESSEY	16:15	16:40	LORD NELSON DRIVE - HAMPDENS ESTATE (opp play area)	NR5 0UE	00:40	2

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
1	THU	419	26	NEW COSTESSEY	16:45	17:15	BRITANNIA WAY (Bus stop - not used)	NR5 0UW	00:30	2
2	TUES	220	14	MERTON	12:30	12:45	BROOM HILL FARM	IP25 6QQ	00:15	1
0	TUES	220	16	CARBROOKE	14:00	14:15	CHURCH STREET	IP25 6SW	00:15	0
0	TUES	220	20	GRISTON	14:45	15:00	CHURCH RD/CARBROOKE RD	IP25 6QE	00:15	0
=	TUES	220	22	WATTON	15:45	15:45	REDHILL PARK	IP25 6RE	00:30	
0	TUE	219	30	BUNWELL	15:00	15:30	VILLAGE HALL	NR16 1SW	00:30	0
0	MON	115	4	HALVERGATE	14:20	14:35	BAKERS ROAD	NR13 3PY	00:15	0
2	MON	114	12	DUSSINDALE	16:30	16:50	TURNHAM GREEN (Opp Minion Close)	NR7 0TU	00:20	4
2	MON	114	14	DUSSINDALE	16:55	17:10	SKIPPON WAY (Opp Joyce Way)	NR7 0RU	00:15	6
0	TUE	213	12	KIMBERLEY	11:55	12:05	THE GREEN	NR18 9HA	00:10	0
0	TUE	213	16	HACKFORD	12:40	12:55	CHURCH LANE		00:15	0
0	TUE	213	26	MORLEY ST PETER	15:35	15:50	ASH TREE COTTAGE, ATTLEBOROUGH RD		00:15	0
1	WED	322	2	OLD CATTON	10:00	10:20	IVES ROAD GREENFIELDS PLAYGROUP (term time)	NR6 6DY	00:20	2
0	WED	319	18	MATTISHALL	12:40	12:55	THYNNE'S LANE		00:15	0
0	WED	319	28	MATTISHALL	15:12	15:20	CEDAR CLOSE No 18	NR20 3NN	00:08	0

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
=	WED S	320	22	FRITTON	15:15	15:35	NEW ROAD - NR PLAYGROUND	NR31 9HP	00:15	
0	TUES	216	26	LENWADE	16:10	16:20	NORWICH ROAD LAY-BY (Nr shop)	NR9 5AE	00:10	0
=	FRI	522	22	ALPINGTON/YE LVERTON	15:00	15:10	FORTUNE GREEN	NR14 7NP	00:10	
1	WED	317	2	COSTESSEY	10:10	10:45	ROUNDWELL TRAVELLERS SITE		00:35	0
2	WED	317	6	LITTLE MELTON	11:10	11:25	POST OFFICE	NR9 3NL	00:15	2
2	WED	317	8	LITTLE MELTON	11:30	11:45	BRAYMEADOW LANE	NR9 3NQ	00:15	2
2	WED	317	10	LITTLE MELTON	11:50	12:05	CROSSWAYS	NR9 3NN	00:15	2
0	WED	317	14	WRAMPLINGHAM	12:20	12:35	MILL HOUSE	NR18 0RX	00:15	0
2	WED	317	22	LITTLE MELTON	15:00	15:45	LITTLE MELTON SCHOOL	NR9 3AD	00:45	11
2	WED	317	24	LITTLE MELTON	15:50	16:15	RINGWOOD CLOSE	NR9 3NY	00:25	1
0	FRI	513	18	ALBURGH	14:05	14:25	THE STREET (Lay-by opp no.38)	IP20 0DN	00:20	0
0	FRI	513	24	EARSHAM	15:45	16:00	VILLAGE HALL	NR35 2TF	00:15	0
1	THU	413	2	BOWTHORPE	09:50	10:05	BELOE AVE - SEABROOK COURT	NR5 9BL	00:15	2
1	THU	413	4	BOWTHORPE	10:10	10:25	RAWLEY ROAD - BRADECROFT COURT	NR5 9DS	00:15	1
1	THU	413	6	BOWTHORPE	10:30	10:45	YAXLEY WAY	NR5 9DU	00:15	2
1	THU	413	8	BOWTHORPE	10:50	11:05	BENDISH WAY - ASHWELL COURT	NR5 9NW	00:15	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
1	THU	413	10	BOWTHORPE	11:15	11:30	BISHY BARNABEE WAY	NR5 9HD	00:15	1
1	THU	413	12	BOWTHORPE	11:40	12:15	CHAPEL BREAK COMMUNITY CENTRE	NR5 9LU	00:35	1
1	THU	413	14	BOWTHORPE	12:20	13:00	LISLE ROAD - ALNWICK COURT	NR5 9LD	00:40	4
1	THU	413	22	BOWTHORPE	16:45	17:15	PEVERELL ROAD (VILLAGE HALL)	NR5 9AT	00:30	3
2	THU	418	2	EATON(Waitrose only)	09:45	12:30	WAITROSE CAR PARK	NR4 6NU	02:45	20
2	THU	418	4	CRINGLEFORD	12:35	12:50	OAKFIELDS ROAD (Opp. No.27)	NR4 6XE	00:15	2
=	THU	418	16	CRINGLEFORD	16:55	17:20	THE RIDINGS	NR4 6UJ	00:25	
0	THU	421	14	BROCKDISH	12:05	12:15	WAVENEY HEIGHTS	IP21 4LD	00:10	0
0	THU	421	22	DICKLEBURGH	14:20	14:35	CULROSE NURSING HOME	IP21 4NS	00:15	0
1	THU	422	2	BOWTHORPE	09:50	10:20	SEEDLINGS NURSERY	NR5 9AA	00:30	6
1	THU	422	4	NEW COSTESSEY	10:30	10:55	BASELINE CTR - WOODHILL RISE	NR5 0JS	00:25	5
2	THU	422	6	OLD COSTESSEY	11:05	11:20	ST EDMUNDS CLOSE	NR8 5DJ	00:15	1
2	THU	422	8	OLD COSTESSEY	11:30	11:45	TOWER HILL	NR8 5AP	00:15	2
2	THU	422	10	OLD COSTESSEY	11:50	12:05	WEST END AVENUE	NR8 5BA	00:15	1
=	THU	422	12	CRINGLEFORD	12:25	12:35	STRATFORD CRESCENT	NR4 7SE	00:10	
2	THU	422	14	CRINGLEFORD	12:40	12:55	NEWFOUND DRIVE	NR4 7RY	00:15	2

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
1	THU	422	16	EATON	14:15	14:30	LINDFORD DRIVE	NR4 6LT	00:15	4
2	THU	422	18	EATON	14:35	14:50	CHURCH LANE/LINDFORD DRIVE JUNCTION	NR4 6NY	00:15	2
1	THU	422	20	EATON	14:55	15:10	BUCKLAND RISE	NR4 6EU	00:15	3
1	THU	422	22	EATON	15:15	15:35	AMDERLEY DRIVE	NR4 6HZ	00:20	2
1	THU	422	24	EATON	15:40	16:10	GREENWAYS/DUVE RLIN CLOSE	NR4 6PD	00:30	3
1	THU	422	26	EATON	16:15	16:35	GREENWAYS/CRAN LEIGH RISE JUNCTION	NR4 6HF	00:20	1
2	THU	422	28	EATON	16:40	17:20	WAITROSE	NR4 6NU	00:30	5
0	WED	323	14	DITCHINGHAM	12:25	12:35	ALL HALLOWS HOSPITAL	NR35 2QL	00:10	0
0	WED	323	26	DITCHINGHAM	16:00	16:15	VILLAGE HALL/NR SHOP	NR35 2RD	00:15	0
1	FRI	519	2	DRAYTON	10:15	10:30	HURN ROAD	NR8 6BN	00:15	6
2	FRI	519	4	DRAYTON	10:35	10:50	HERBERT NURSEY CLOSE	NR8 6DD	00:15	2
2	FRI	519	6	DRAYTON	10:55	11:25	CARTER ROAD outside No 39	NR8 6DY	00:30	3
0	FRI	519	8	DRAYTON	11:30	11:40	MOBILE HOMES	NR8 6HE	00:10	0
0	FRI	519	10	DRAYTON	11:45	12:00	HIGHFIELD ROAD nr No3	NR8 6ER	00:15	0
2	FRI	519	12	DRAYTON	12:05	12:20	FAIRVIEW CLOSE (LOW ROAD)	NR8 6RT	00:15	1
2	FRI	519	14	DRAYTON	12:25	12:40	ORCHARD BANK	NR8 6RN	00:15	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	FRI	519	16	TAVERHAM	13:50	14:00	SETON ROAD	NR8 6QE	00:10	0
2	FRI	519	18	DRAYTON	14:05	14:20	DRAYTON GROVE	NR8 6PU	00:15	2
2	FRI	519	20	DRAYTON	14:25	14:45	VILLAGE HALL	NR8 6DN	00:20	2
1	FRI	519	22	THORPE MARRIOTT	14:55	15:25	THE SQUARE (Nr.SUPERMARKET)	NR8 6XE	00:30	2
1	FRI	519	24	THORPE MARRIOTT	15:30	15:55	FELSHAM WAY	NR8 6XZ	00:25	2
2	FRI	518	8	UPTON	11:50	12:10	CARGATE LANE	NR13 6AU	00:20	2
2	FRI	518	10	UPTON	12:15	12:30	RIVERVIEW DRIVE	NR13 6BH	00:15	3
0	FRI	518	12	UPTON	12:35	12:50	OLD POST OFFICE	NR13 6BT	00:15	0
1	FRI	518	14	UPTON	14:00	14:10	SOUTHEND COUNCIL HOUSES	NR13 6AN	00:10	1
2	FRI	518	16	BLOFIELD CNR & HEATH	14:25	14:40	CUTTONS CORNER	NR13 4PS	00:15	1
2	FRI	518	18	BLOFIELD CNR & HEATH	14:45	15:30	ALLENS CLOSE	NR13 4QR	00:45	1
0	FRI	518	20	THORPE ST ANDREW	15:40	16:10	POUND LANE - SAINSBURYS	NR7 0SR	00:30	0
0	Thurs	420	2	BURSTON	10:05	10:50	BURSTON HOUSE HOSPITAL	IP22 5TU	00:25	0
2	Thurs	420	18	ROYDON	15:50	16:50	HIGH RD LAYBY - RECYCLING CENTRE	IP22 5RB	01:15	5
2	WED	318	2	THARSTON	10:10	10:30	THE STREET - WILLOW FARM LODGE	NR15 2YP	00:15	2
2	WED	318	4	THARSTON	10:35	10:45	HIGHFIELDS COUNCIL HOUSES	NR15 2YS	00:10	1

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
2	WED	318	6	WACTON	10:55	11:15	VILLAGE HALL	NR15 2UH	00:10	3
2	WED	318	8	WACTON	11:20	11:30	HALL ROAD	NR15 2UH	00:10	1
0	WED	318	16	TIBENHAM	13:05	13:20	EX POST OFFICE	NR16 1AP	00:15	0
0	MON	117	10	GISSING	15:30	15:40	RECTORY ROAD HSECALL	IP22 5XB	00:10	
=	MON	117	14	TIVETSHALL	16:40	16:20	VILLAGE HALL	-	00:10	
1	Thurs	412	8	BEESTON REGIS	11:40	12:00	REGIS AVENUE	NR26 8SW	00:20	4
1	Thurs	412	10	BEESTON REGIS	12:05	12:25	CAXTON PARK	NR26 8SU	00:20	2
1	Thurs	412	12	BEESTON REGIS	12:30	12:50	ABBAY PARK	NR26 8SP	00:20	3
1	Thurs	412	14	BEESTON REGIS	12:55	13:05	OFF PRIORY CLOSE	NR26 8SL	00:10	1
2	Thurs	412	18	EAST RUNTON	14:45	15:00	BUXTON CLOSE	NR27 9PJ	00:15	2
0	Thurs	412	20	EAST RUNTON	15:02	15:10	ST ANDREWS	NR27 9PG	00:08	0
=	Thurs	412	26	WEST RUNTON	15:55	16:40	CHURCH HALL	NR27 9QD	00:15	
0	Tues	209	6	EAST RUSTON	11:10	11:20	YOUNGMANS LANE, ASH TREE COTTAGE	NR12 9JN	00:10	0
=	Tues	209	12	HAPPISBURGH	11:25	11:40	BEACH ROAD	NR12 0PP	00:15	
0	Tues	209	16	RIDLINGTON	13:05	13:20	OLD SHOP	NR28 9NT	00:15	0
=	Tues	209	26	BACTON	14:35	14:45	BEACH ROAD	NR12 0EP	00:10	

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
=	Tues	211	20	ANTINGHAM	14:55	15:10	ALPHA' - The Street	NR28 0NP	00:15	
0	tues	211	22	NORTHREPPS	15:05	15:30	VILLAGE HALL (playgroup and after school)	NR27 0LB	00:25	0
0	tues	211	28	OVERSTRAND	16:30	16:45	CARR LANE	NR27 0PS	00:15	0
0	tues	210	4	SUTTON	10:50	11:10	VILLAGE HALL - playgroup	NR12 9RB	00:20	0
0	tues	210	18	POTTER HEIGHAM	14:50	15:05	POST OFFICE STORES	NR29 5JB	00:15	0
0	tues	210	26	POTTER HEIGHAM	16:25	16:45	REYNOLDS LANE	NR29 5LY	00:20	0
0	Tues	222	24	ANTINGHAM	15:45	16:00	CHAPEL HOUSE FARM	NR28 0NW	00:15	0
1	Tues	222	28	NORTH WALSHAM	16:30	16:50	BROOKES DRIVE	NR28 0SL	00:20	2
0	THUR	411	20	CORPUSTY	15:00	15:30	SCHOOL	NR11 6QP	00:30	0
0	THUR	411	24	SAXTHORPE	16:10	16:25	OLD POST OFFICE	NR11 7BL	00:15	0
0	THUR	411	26	CORPUSTY	16:30	16:45	ADAMS LANE	NR11 6QJ	00:15	0
0	Fri	512	8	SLOLEY	11:05	11:15	BURLEY ROAD	NR12 8HH	00:10	0
0	Fri	512	16	SKEYTON	12:40	13:00	THE MANOR HOUSE CARE HOME	NR28 0LU	00:20	0
0	Fri	512	18	SKEYTON	14:10	14:20	SKEYTON CORNER?	NR10 5AP	00:10	0
0	Fri	512	22	SWANTON ABBOTT	14:50	15:05	VILLAGE HALL CAR PARK	NR10 5DU	00:15	0
=	Fri	512	26	SWANTON ABBOTT	15:35	16:00	EX WEAVERS ARMS	NR10 5AH	00:25	

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	THUR S	412	12	SALTHOUSE	12:15	12:25	VILLAGE GREEN	NR25 7AJ	00:10	0
1	THUR S	410	22	HOLT	15:15	15:30	DAY CARE CENTRE & NURSERY	NR25 6DA	00:15	1
2	FRI	509	2	WEST SOMERTON	10:15	10:30	IVY HOUSE - HORSEY RD	NR29 4DW	00:15	1
0	FRI	509	6	HEMSBY	11:15	11:35	Opp KINGS HEAD PH (nr Taylors Loke)	NR29 4LR	00:20	0
0	FRI	511	6	ORMESBY ST MARGARET	11:10	11:25	BECK AVENUE	NR29 3LF	00:15	0
0	FRI	511	20	CALIFORNIA	15:40	15:55	ROTTENSTONE LANE BUS STOP	NR29 3QN	00:15	0
0	FRI	511	16	RUNHAM	14:35	14:55	COUNCIL HOUSE	NR29 3EA	00:20	0
0	FRI	510	6	REPPS WITH BASTWICK	10:50	11:00	EVANS LOMBE CLOSE	NR29 5JR	00:20	0
0	FRI	510	8	FLEGGBURGH	11:15	11:45	KINGS ARMS PUB	NR29 3AG	00:30	0
0	FRI	510	22	HORNING	15:05	15:30	HORNING SCHOOL		00:25	0
0	WED	309	14	BELAUGH	12:45	12:55	HILL PIECE	NR12 8UZ	00:10	0
=	WED	309	26	HORSTEAD	16:15	16:35	RECRUITING SERGEANT	NR12 7EE	00:20	
0	WED S	306	18	BURNHAM THORPE	14:55	15:05	GOODRICKS	PE31 8HP	00:10	0
0	WED S	306	26	COLKIRK	16:35	16:45	14 DEREHAM ROAD [HOUSECALL]	NR21 7NH	00:10	0
0	FRI	508	24	GREAT SNORING	14:45	15:00	OLD SCHOOL HOUSE	NR21 0HA	00:30	0
0	THUR	406	14	NORTHWOLD	12:25	12:40	MANOR PLACE	IP26 5NF	00:15	0

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	FRI	505	18	LT WALSINGHAM	14:30	15:00	ST PETERS ROAD	NR22 6DW	00:30	0
2	FRI	505	22	LT WALSINGHAM merge	15:20	15:50	21 CLEAVES DRIVE	NR22 6EQ	00:30	
0	WED S	308	10	TITTLESHALL	11:45	11:55	4 PEAK HALL ROAD (Opp. No.2)	PE32 2QE	00:15	0
0	WED S	308	28	MILEHAM merge stop26	16:55	17:15	POST OFFICE	PE32 2TR	00:25	
0	Tues	205	6	HILLBOROUGH	10:20	10:30	THE SWAN PUBLIC HOUSE	IP26 5BW	00:10	0
0	Tues	208	16	NARBOROUGH	12:25	12:40	EASTFIELDS	PE32 1ST	00:15	0
0	Tues	208	22	MARHAM	14:25	14:40	HILLSIDE	PE33 9JJ	00:25	0
=	Tues	208	30	SHOULDHAM	15:50	16:05	HALLFIELDS (MERGE 100YRDS FROM STOP28)	PE33 0DN	00:10	
2	Friday	506	4	LEATHERINGSE TT	11:10	11:30	LEATHERINGSETT HALL	NR25 7YA	00:20	1
0	Friday	506	6	LEATHERINGSE TT	11:35	11:50	THE GREEN	NR25 7AR	00:15	0
=	Friday	506	8	LITTLE THORNAGE	12:00	12:15	THORN ROSE COTTAGE	NR25 7JQ	00:15	
0	THUR S	405	8	BLAKENEY	11:45	11:55	LITTLE BUTTS	NR25 7PB	00:10	0
0	THUR S	405	20	LANGHAM	16:00	16:15	CORNFIELDS	NR25 7DQ	00:15	0
=	THUR S	407	32	SWANTON MORLEY	17:00	17:25	ROBERTSON BARRACKS	NR20 4LA	00:25	
0	WED	312	8	NECTON	11:30	11:45	MINI MARKET (parking not good)	PE37 8EY	00:15	
0	WED	207	8	BRADENHAM	11:15	11:30	CHURCH STREET	IP25 7QL	00:15	0

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	TUES	207	22	SHIPDHAM	15:30	15:40	PARK ESTATE (H/CALL)	IP25 7PD	00:10	0
0	WED	207	22	SHIPDHAM	15:00	15:10	POUNDGREEN CLOSE	IP25 7LW	00:10	0
1	WED	207	28	SCARNING	16:35	17:05	SCHOOL PLAIN (no users)	NR19 2PW	00:30	0
0	FRI	523	12	ASHILL	12:25	12:40	THE GREEN	IP25 7AS	00:15	0
1	FRI	523	18	SAHAM TONEY	14:35	14:50	LAY-BY	IP25 7EW	00:15	1
2	FRI	523	20	SAHAM TONEY	14:55	15:35	POUND HILL NR SCHOOL		00:40	1
0	THUR S	408	6	NORTH TUDDENHAM	10:40	10:50	SPRINGFIELD FARM	NR20 3DP	00:10	0
=	DEL	302	28	SOUTH WOOTTON	15:15	15:30	THETFORD WAY/WALSINGHAM CLOSE	PE30 3TF	00:15	
0	Wedn esday	302	32	SOUTH WOOTTON	16:00	16:15	THE BIRCHES	PE30 3JG	00:15	0
0	DEL	301	6	SEDFEGFORD	09:50	10:00	KING WILLIAM PUB	PE36 5LU	00:10	0
0	Wedn esday	301	22	SNETTISHAM	12:50	13:05	ST MARY'S CHURCH HALL	PE31 7RQ	00:15	0
0	Wedn esday	301	40	INGOLDISTHO RPE	17:10	17:30	SANDY WAY	PE31 6NJ	00:20	0
=	DEL	502	20	CLENCHWART ON	13:40	14:05	36 STATION ROAD	PE34 4DG	00:20	
0	DEL	202	8	WIGG ST GERMANS	10:30	10:45	LEGGE PLACE	PE34 3HB	00:15	0
0	DEL	202	10	SADDLEBOW	10:55	11:10	OPPOSITE METHODIST CHAPEL	PE34 3AR	00:15	0
0	DEL	202	12	SETCHEY	11:25	11:35	WILLOW LANE	PE33 0PD	00:10	0

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	DEL	202	16	WEST WINCH	12:00	12:10	MAFEKING TERRACE	PE33 0PA	00:10	0
1	TUES DAY	201	2	HUNSTANTON	09:35	09:45	DRIFTWOOD HOUSE	PE36 5HL	00:15	2
1	TUES DAY	201	4	HUNSTANTON	09:50	10:10	HANOVER GARDENS	PE36 5DS	00:30	2
2	TUES DAY	201	6	HEACHAM	10:20	10:40	ROBIN HILL	PE31 7TF	00:20	1
1	THURS	402	4	OLD HUNSTANTON	10:15	10:30	HOWARDS CLOSE	PE36 6HR	00:15	1
1	THURS	402	6	OLD HUNSTANTON	10:35	10:50	POST OFFICE	PE36 6JX	00:10	1
0	del	402	22	BRANCASTER	14:30	14:40	MILL ROAD	PE31 8AQ	00:10	0
0	DEL	402	34	DOCKING	16:35	16:45	THE CHURCH	PE31 8LH	00:10	0
0	DEL	401	2	WOLFERTON	09:30	09:40	CHURCH	PE31 6HD	00:10	0
0	DEL	401	6	WEST NEWTON	10:10	10:25	CAERNARVON COTTAGES	PE31 6AS	00:15	0
0	Thurs day	401	6	HILLINGTON	10:30	10:45	WHEATFIELDS	PE31 6BH	00:15	0
0	Thurs day	401	12	GRIMSTON	11:40	11:55	WESLYAN CHAPEL	PE32 1AB	00:15	0
0	DEL	401	22	POTT ROW	13:10	13:30	COMPASS PRE-SCHOOL	PE32 1BY	00:20	0
=	DEL	401	26	POTT ROW	14:55	15:05	18 VONG LANE	PE32 1BW	00:10	
0	DEL	401	28	POTT ROW	15:10	15:35	HOLLY MEADOWS SCHOOL	PE32 1BW	00:25	0
0	Thurs day	401	36	ROYDON	16:50	17:05	52 STATION ROAD	PE32 1AW	00:15	0

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
2	Friday	501	6	SANDRINGHAM	10:25	10:40	YORK COTTAGE	PE35 6EN	00:15	3
2	Friday	501	8	DERSINGHAM	10:50	11:20	HANOVER COURT	PE31 6LR	00:30	5
0	Friday	501	2	SHERNBORNE	09:55	10:10	HALL ROAD	PE31 6RU	00:15	0
0	DEL	501	4	SHERNBORNE	10:15	10:30	RED BARN COTTAGE	PE31 6SB	00:15	0
2	Friday	501	10	INGOLDISTHORPE	11:30	11:45	LITTLE OWLS NURSERY	PE31 6PE	00:15	0
=	DEL	501	10	NORTH LYNN	12:00	12:20	LISBON COURT	PE30 3FB	00:20	
1	DEL	501	12	NORTH LYNN	12:25	12:45	WATERSIDE	PE30 2NA	00:20	2
0	DEL	501	14	NORTH LYNN	12:50	13:05	COLUMBIA WAY BUNGALOWS	PE30 2LA	00:15	0
1	DEL	501	16	FAIRSTEAD	14:15	14:45	WINDMILL COURT + 2 H/CALL	PE30 4XP	00:30	2
1	DEL	501	18	FAIRSTEAD	14:50	15:20	MINSTER COURT	PE30 4XN	00:30	3
1	DEL	501	20	FAIRSTEAD	15:25	15:55	HANOVER COURT	PE30 4ST	00:30	5
2	Friday	501	20	INGOLDISTHORPE	14:50	15:15	32 GROVELANDS	PE31 6PG	00:25	4
2	Friday	501	22	INGOLDISTHORPE	15:20	15:45	CHURCH HALL - HILL ROAD	PE31 6NZ	00:25	3
2	Friday	501	24	INGOLDISTHORPE	15:50	16:15	THE DRIFT	PE31 6HG	00:25	1
0	DEL	408	4	HILLINGTON	10:10	10:20	TAPPING HOUSE HOSPICE Deposit	PE31 6BH	00:10	0
0	DEL	408	18	GRIMSTON	12:20	12:35	CHURCH CLOSE	PE32 1BN	00:15	0

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	DEL	408	20	BAWSEY	12:45	12:55	INNISFREE CARAVAN SITE	PE32 1EX	00:10	0
0	DEL	408	28	GAYTON	15:10	15:25	LIME GROVE	PE32 1QU	00:15	0
0	DEL	408	30	GAYTON	15:30	15:45	HILLS CRESCENT	PE32 1PE	00:15	0
0	DEL	408	36	GAYTON	16:30	16:45	SPRINGVALE	PE32 1QY	00:15	0
0	DEL	307	18	FAIR GREEN	12:45	13:00	PAUL DRIVE/GATE INN	PE32 1RU	00:10	0
0	FRI	503	10	HARPLEY	11:45	11:55	ST LAWRENCE CLOSE	PE31 6TS	00:10	0
0	FRI	503	14	HARPLEY	12:15	12:30	CHURCH LANE	PE31 6TX	00:15	0
0	FRI	503	18	LITTLE MASSINGHAM	13:00	13:15	MIDDLE FARM	PE32 2JT	00:15	0
0	TUES	505	8	EAST RUDHAM	11:00	11:10	GROVESIDE	PE31 8RL	00:10	0
0	THUR	404	10	WEETING	11:05	11:15	ALL SAINTS WAY	IP27 0QH	00:10	0
0	THUR	404	18	HOCKWOLD	12:40	12:55	THE CHURCH	IP26 4HZ	00:15	0
0	TUES	204	10	EMNETH	11:30	11:40	THE WROE	PE14 8AN	00:10	0
0	TUES	204	32	OUTWELL	16:40	17:00	METHODIST CHURCH	PE14 8PA	00:20	0
0	FRI	504	14	WALTON HIGHWAY	12:00	12:15	SCHOOL ROAD (Opp No.190)	PE14 7DR	00:15	0
0	FRI	504	22	WALPOLE ST ANDREW	14:30	14:45	SCHOOL	PE14 7LJ	00:15	0
=	DEL	203	6	TERRINGTON ST CLEMENT	10:30	10:45	NORTHGATE WAY	PE34 4LE	00:15	

Appendix 7: Review of Mobile Library Service – Annex 7.2

Type	Day	Route	Stop Number	Village	Arrive	Depart	Stop Name	Postcode	Duration	CUSTOMER NUMBERS
0	del	203	26	TERRINGTON ST CLEMENT	16:20	16:35	THE SALTINGS	PE34 4PB	00:15	0
0	WED	304	14	UPWELL	12:15	12:30	TOINTONS ROAD	PE14 9HP	00:15	0
0	WED	304	24	UPWELL	15:15	15:30	ST PETERS ROAD - outside No 47	PE14 9EL	00:15	0
0	WED	304	30	UPWELL	16:20	16:40	CROFT ROAD (outside 133)	PE14 9HQ	00:20	0
0	WED	303	24	TERRINGTON ST JOHN	15:05	15:20	BURMAN HOUSE, MILL RD	PE14 7SF	00:15	0
0	FRI	503	4	WIMBOTSHAM	09:40	09:55	TURNERS CLOSE	PE34 3QG	00:15	0
0	FRI	503	10	TOTTENHILL	10:45	11:00	ELLA PLACE	PE33 0RX	00:15	0
0	FRI	503	14	WEST DEREHAM	11:45	12:00	TELEPHONE BOX	PE33 9RE	00:15	0
0	FRI	503	20	WEREHAM	12:45	13:05	VILLAGE HALL		00:20	0
0	FRI	503	22	HILGAY	14:15	14:35	MANBY CLOSE	PE38 0JX	00:15	0
0	FRI	503	24	TEN MILE BANK	14:45	15:05	THE SCHOOL	PE38 0EJ	00:20	0

Report taken to Cabinet

Item No.5 Annexe 2

Report Title: Capital Strategy and Programme 2023-24

Date of Meeting: 30 January 2023

Responsible Cabinet Member: Cllr Andrew Jamieson (Cabinet Member for Finance)

Responsible Director: Simon George (Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services)

Is this a Key Decision? Yes

If this is a Key Decision, date added to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions: 31 March 2022

Introduction from Cabinet Member

This report presents the proposed capital strategy and programme and includes information on the funding available to support that programme. The capital programme remains central to the continued development of key services: enabling the transformation of social services to meet growing need, promoting regeneration and sustainable development, enabling the development of carbon reduction initiatives, generating efficiencies using information technology and making provision for the continuation of development of our libraries into local multi-service hubs.

The papers summarise the development of the proposed capital programme, including proposed new schemes, and a summary of forecast capital receipts.

Executive Summary

The proposed programme is based on a capital strategy and consists of two main elements – schemes included in the current programme and new schemes to be funded through borrowing, capital receipts or grants and other anticipated contributions from third parties.

The new schemes to be added to the 2023-27 programme total £35.056m, including the following:

- County Farms refurbishment and carbon reduction schemes (£9.4m)
- The rolling Technology Improvement programme (£8.2m)
- Scottow Enterprise Park refurbishment (£8.6m),
- Estate Buildings Decarbonisation initiatives (£4m)
- Various highways improvements (£2.5m)
- Fire and Rescue services equipment and site improvements (£1.2m)
- expansion of waste recycling sites and services (£0.51m)
- 1 Million Trees for Norfolk (£0.5m),

In addition, the proposed programme seeks to extend the following schemes within the current 2022-23 Capital Programme into future years:

- £84k per annum recurrent uplift to the Local Members Highways Schemes; totalling £0.336m over the next 4 years
- £0.7m per annum uplift to the Library Stock replenishment scheme for 24-25, 25-26 and 26-27 totalling £2.1m
- £0.5m addition to the Ash Die Back scheme for 2024-25
- £0.3m per annum recurrent capital management costs for 24-25, 25-26 and 26-27 totalling £1.2m
- £4.143m addition to the MyOracle programme comprising of £2.511m in 2022-23 and £1.632m over the next 4 years

When proposed new schemes are added to the existing £916.781m programme for future years, the future capital programme totals £956.971m.

Recommendations

1. To agree the Capital Strategy at Appendix A as a framework for the prioritisation and continued development of the Council's capital programme;
2. To agree the proposed 2023-27+ capital programme of £956.971m, subject to additional amounts for schemes yet to be re-profiled from 2022-23;
3. To refer the programme to the County Council for approval, including the new and extended capital schemes outlined in Appendix D;
4. To recommend to County Council the Council's Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy for 2023-24 as set out in Section 5;
5. To note known grant settlements as summarised in Section 3 and agree that future capital grants will be added to the programme when confirmed;
6. To note the forecast of estimated capital receipts to be generated to achieve the target of £18m, subject to market conditions, over the next three years to support schemes not funded from other sources, as set out in Table 5.

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. The Council needs to set a capital programme prior to the beginning of each financial year and to commit the revenue and capital resources required to deliver the programme.
- 1.2. Historically, most schemes are prioritised within the two major capital programme areas of transport and schools, with corporate property, Adult Social Care, IT and loans to subsidiary companies also important themes.

- 1.3. Schemes are considered by the appropriate team to ensure that the capital programme integrates with business and service planning, with revenue implications taken into account. Highways schemes are prioritised within CES. Schools schemes are prioritised through the member-led Children's Services Capital Priorities Group. Large property sales and purchases are co-ordinated through the Council's Corporate Property team and are reported through Cabinet.
- 1.4. Schemes not covered by the major headings above are developed by the relevant chief officer, and where corporate funding is required are considered by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, who review the overall affordability of the programme.
- 1.5. The Council's overall capital programme is formed by combining service capital programmes, and ensuring that sufficient funding is available before seeking Council approval.
- 1.6. This report sets out the proposed capital programme for 2023-27+. It is supported by a strategy aimed at securing a structured, affordable, and prioritised approach for the development of future years' capital programmes.

2. Proposals

- 2.1. The attached report introduces the proposed capital programme for 2023-27+.
- 2.2. The proposed programme consists of two elements – schemes included in the current programme and new schemes funded through borrowing, capital receipts or grants and other anticipated contributions from third parties.
- 2.3. The programme is supported by a prioritisation model to help guide the best use of resources.
- 2.4. The size of the capital programme reflects capital grant settlements, forecast capital receipts, other external and internal funding sources and proposed borrowing as set out in the attached Annex.
- 2.5. The Council's ability to prudentially borrow to fund future schemes is limited by the budgetary pressures which the Council continues to face. Information regarding the revenue implications of prudential borrowing for new schemes is provided in Section 6.

3. Impact of the Proposal

- 3.1. The recommendations set out in this report are intended to enable Full Council to approve a capital programme for 2023-24+ and provide a basis for the longer -term programme.
- 3.2. The proposals will impact upon the nature and type of services and facilities provided by the council, as well as delivering transformation to underlying council structures and operating models. Examples of high-profile transport projects in the programme include the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing and the Long Stratton bypass. Transformational projects include an ambitious programme to improve SEND school provision, the Castle Keep Museum and

funding for greenways, natural capital and improvements to the national and Norfolk Trails network as well as Active Travel schemes.

4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision

- 4.1. The attached Annex summarises the development of the proposed capital programme, including proposed new schemes, and a summary of forecast capital receipts.

5. Alternative Options

- 5.1. The papers appended to this report represent the culmination of the process to develop capital schemes to be recommended to Full Council which will improve services, promote efficiencies, and address deficiencies. However, at this stage it remains the case that new capital proposals have not been agreed and could be removed from the proposed capital programme.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1. The financial impacts of the proposed capital programme including expenditure, funding, financing and the impact on future revenue budgets are dealt with in detail in Sections 3 to 6 of the attached Annex.

7. Resource Implications

- 7.1. **Staff:** A number of the schemes included in the proposed capital programme are necessary to enable staff to provide services in an efficient and effective way, and in safe and well-maintained premises.
- 7.2. **Property:** Several schemes included in the proposed capital programme support the development and improvement of the school's estate, and the exploitation, enhancement and consolidation of the Council's operational and office property. Saving plans include activities linked to property budgets, and assumptions around levels of capital receipts to be achieved.
- 7.3. **IT:** A number of the schemes included in the proposed capital programme support IT projects and initiatives, including the development, implementation and exploitation of new systems and approaches. Existing saving plans include activities linked to IMT budgets.

8. Other Implications

8.1. Legal Implications

None identified.

8.2. Human Rights implications

None identified.

8.3. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

A public consultation process on the 2023-24 Budget has been undertaken. As in previous years, this public consultation has informed an equality impact assessment in respect of both new 2023-24 Budget proposals and the Council's Budget as a whole, which includes the revenue impact of capital spending decisions. In addition, councillors have considered the impact of

proposals on rural areas.

The proposed capital programme includes a recurring capital budget specifically to resolve access and other Equality Act issues.

The Council is maintaining a dynamic [COVID-19 equality impact assessment](#) to inform decision making during the pandemic.

8.4. **Health and Safety implications**

The proposed capital programme includes capital budgets specifically to address health and safety issues, including funding for fire safety related projects, asbestos removals, and a minor works budget to address works needed after health and safety audits.

8.5. **Sustainability implications**

The proposed capital programme recognises the Council's strategic aim to reduce carbon emissions and ensure that the capital programme is environmentally and ecologically sustainable.

The programme includes various decarbonisation studies of Council sites, the replacement of fossil fuel heating systems, the introduction of electric vehicles and electric charging points, the consolidation and flexible use of community property assets, and highways schemes intended to support active travel.

8.6. **Any other implications**

Significant issues, risks, assumptions and implications have been set out throughout the papers appended to this report.

8.7 **Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA)**

DPIA is not required as the data reported in this paper does not drill down to the personal data level.

9. Risk Implications/Assessment

9.1. There is a long-term risk to the Council's ability to deliver services without sufficient investment in maintaining its assets. To mitigate this, the capital programme is aligned to the Council's asset management plans and property client function ensuring that assets are well-maintained or disposed of if surplus to requirements.

9.2. The programme requires regular monitoring, management and budgetary control to deliver schemes on time and within budget. This is addressed through regular capital finance monitoring reports which are reported to Cabinet.

9.3. The capital programme is set on the basis of best estimates of cost. Through good procurement practice, the Council will continue where possible to manage down the costs of capital schemes, and to minimise the need to borrow.

9.4. There is a risk that anticipated grants and other third-party contributions will not be received for reasons out of the authority's control. In these circumstances, the programme will be amended to reflect the reduced funding.

10. Select Committee comments

10.1. None.

11. Recommendations

11.1. Recommendations are set out in the introduction to this report.

12. Background Papers

12.1. A Vision for Norfolk in 2021: [Link](#)
Better Together, For Norfolk – 2021-2025: [Link](#)
Together for our Future - [Link](#)
Norfolk County Council Environmental Policy - [Link](#)
Local Transport Plan and Norwich Area Transport Strategy - [Link](#)
County Council Budget 2023-24, (on this agenda)
Finance Monitoring Report 2022-23 (on this agenda)
Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 (on this agenda)

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about the matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Simon George	01603 222400	simon.george@norfolk.gov.uk
Joanne Fernandez Graham	01603 306228	j.fernandezgraham@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this Agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Norfolk County Council

Capital strategy and programme 2023-24

Report by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services

1. Background and introduction

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This report introduces the proposed overall capital programme for 2023-24 and following years.
- 1.1.2. The proposed programme consists of two elements – schemes included in the current programme funded through borrowing, capital receipts when available, or grants and contributions from third parties, and new schemes requiring additional prudential borrowing.
- 1.1.3. The size of the capital programme reflects capital grant settlements that have been announced by central government, forecast capital receipts, other external and internal funding sources and proposed borrowing as set out in this report.
- 1.1.4. The Council pays from future revenue budgets the interest costs of borrowing undertaken for capital expenditure purposes. In addition, in accordance with its MRP policy, the Council will set aside an amount from each future revenue budget to re-pay its borrowing.

1.2. Government spending plans

- **Norfolk Devolution Deal:** The Department of Levelling Up Housing and Communities (DLUHC) published its policy paper on the County Deal on 8 December 2022 setting out the transfer of new powers and a £240 million capital funding over 30 years to the Council as part of the Norfolk Investment Fund. The deal includes £6.98 million investment in brownfield funding and £5.9m to support the delivery of housing, regeneration and development priorities in Norfolk. The deal is subject to public consultation with other public sector partners, local communities and businesses.
- This deal adds to the collaborative interventions and investment undertaken by the Council and central government to promote growth, skills, infrastructure upgrades and net zero solutions including:
 - £65.4 million in Town Fund, Future High Streets Fund and Community Renewal Fund
 - £271 million shared with Suffolk through Getting Building Fund, Growth Deal and Growing Places Fund
 - 6 Enterprise Zones that combined with Suffolk zones have created over 4400 jobs through to 2021.

- The deal also incorporates an integrated transport settlement starting in 2024-25
- **Autumn Budget 2022:** The Chancellor of the Exchequer presented the Autumn Statement for 2022 on 17 November 2022, which set out the government's priorities for economic stability, growth and public services in a time of significant economic challenge for the UK and global economy. Economic stability relies on fiscal sustainability and the government's Autumn Statement reversed nearly all the measures in the Growth Plan 2022. Whilst the Autumn Statement confirms that total departmental spending will grow in real terms at 3.7% a year on average, departmental capital spending will grow slower than the economy; at around 2.5% and be maintained in cash terms for 2024 to 2028. The government maintains its commitment to delivering £600 billion of investment over the next 5 years through major infrastructure projects, particularly in the NHS, social care and education.
- The government also set out new fiscal rules in the Autumn Statement which require public sector net debt (excluding the Bank of England) to be falling as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and public sector net borrowing to be below 3% of GDP by 2027-28.
- The Autumn statement reaffirms the commitments made in Strategic Review 2021 (SR21) which includes
 - Additional funding for the NHS and Adult Social Care to improve emergency, elective and primary care performance back to pre-pandemic levels and support adult social care and discharge
 - Increased investment in schools
 - Increase public R&D and innovation to £20 billion a year by 24-25
 - Acceleration of infrastructure projects for transport, railways, energy and water resources
 - Project Gigabit; aiming for at least 85% Broadband coverage by 2025 and full nationwide coverage by 2030
 - The Net Zero strategies including reduction in carbon emissions and decarbonisation of the power system by 2050

The Autumn Statement also confirmed the second round of the Levelling Up Fund allocation of £1.7 billion to priority local infrastructure projects.
- **UK Shared Prosperity Fund:** On 5 December 2022 the UK government approved local spending plans for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) worth £2.6 billion over the next three years and rising to £1.5 billion by 2024-25. The fund aims to "help people access new opportunities in places of need" with a strong emphasis on improving community facilities, supporting local businesses and skills development and job creation. As part of the County Deal, NCC will plan and deliver the UKSPF from 2025-26. The Norfolk UKSPF allocation is set to rise to £6.63 million in 2024-25 and will be subject to a future Spending Review and reconfirmation of overall UKSPF policy and delivery arrangements from 2025-26.

- **UK Community Renewal Fund (CRF):** In March 2021 the government announced £220 million of government funding through the UK Community Renewal Fund (CRF) to help local areas prepare for the launch of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF). The fund aims to support people and communities most in need across the UK to pilot programmes and new approaches and invest in skills and supporting people into employment. On 3 November 2021 the successful bids were announced, and the County Council secured £6.558m funding for 14 projects encompassing Net Zero Carbon initiatives, Youth Enterprise schemes and skills development.
- **Transforming Cities Fund:** On 25 September 2020, the government announced just over £32 million of government funding from the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) to overhaul local transport links in Norwich, including a new bus interchange at Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, improvements to cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities, and a junction redesign at Heartsease.
- **Active Travel:** In May 2020 the government announced final funding allocations of the active travel fund to support local transport authorities develop cycling and walking facilities. Tranche 1 enabled the installation of temporary projects related to the COVID-19 pandemic and Tranche 2 is for longer-term projects with Norfolk allocated approximately £1.2m for capital projects. This has been expanded further with £0.285 million funding to promote e-cycles across Norfolk via the Pushing Ahead Access Fund
- **Public Works Loan Board:** Local authorities invest billions of pounds of capital finance every year in their communities and the government supports this activity, in part, by offering low-cost loans through the Public Works Loan Board (PWLb).

1.3. Local joint working

- Norfolk County Council works with several other authorities and bodies in the development of capital and infrastructure projects and investments.
- Examples of current joint working include:
- **Local plans:** The Council's various initiatives to promote sustainable growth and infrastructure are captured within the [Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework](#). The Framework is overseen by the Council and its partners. It pulls together information on the key infrastructure needed to deliver economic growth in Norfolk. As well as transport and housing, it covers digital connectivity, education and the Offshore Transmission Network, and it lists a number of major projects in which the Council and its partners have control or a significant interest, covering road, rail, utility, sustainability, education and regeneration projects.
- Further details of major transport project and improvement plans in Norfolk can be found at [Major projects and improvement plans - Norfolk County Council](#). A Highways Capital Programme and Transport Asset Management Plan will be presented to Cabinet in March 2023.
- **One Public Estate:** Together with the district councils in Norfolk, the County Council is closely involved in the "One Public Estate" programme. The aim of

this programme is to use public assets more effectively to deliver programmes of major service transformation and local economic growth.

- The Council works closely with the **New Anglia LEP**, which has resulted in the LEPs direct financial support for a number of infrastructure projects as well as direct support to businesses in Norfolk. This close working relationship will develop further under the auspices of the County Deal over the next 3 financial years
- The **Norfolk Joint Museums Committee** consists of representatives from district councils and the County Council. The Norfolk Museums Service is run by Norfolk County Council with capital schemes managed and reported as part of the Council's financial monitoring. The Norwich Castle Keep "Gateway to Medieval England" project is a nationally significant scheme which will see the Keep reimagined and reinterpreted.
- Having been awarded just over £6.1m in 2019 for schemes to transform travel in Greater Norwich, Norfolk County Council, in partnership with Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk submitted a revised proposal for additional **Transforming Cities** funding (details above).
- Norfolk's councils set up the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership (NCCP) in January 2020 to work on climate change issues by decarbonising local authority assets and supporting Norfolk's aspirations to expand its clean renewable energy production, particularly with the acceleration of offshore wind deployment.

2. The Proposed Capital Programme 2023-27+

2.1. Background

- The capital programme for 2022-23 was agreed by the County Council in February 2022. This was prepared based on schemes brought forward, information from the Government on known and forecast funding levels available at that time, plus new schemes requiring additional prudential borrowing approved at the time.
- The capital programme has been updated through the year to include the latest estimates of capital funding available to the Council and schemes added to the programme during the year as approved by Cabinet and County Council. Further information on external funding is included in Section 3.
- The proposed capital programme is underpinned by a Capital Strategy (Appendix A to this report) which is being recommended to Cabinet for endorsement on 31 January 2023. Schemes are scored against priorities reviewed by the Capital Quarterly Review Board and included in Appendix B for the approval of Cabinet.
- The Capital Programme Quarterly Review Board reviews, prioritises and provide oversight of the Council's overall programme. Including the Cabinet member for Finance, the board will provide a forum for officers from all services to discuss new schemes added to the programme, as well as existing schemes.
- The 2022-27+ programme reflects all amounts re-profiled up to and including month 8 (November) and significant changes made in month 9 (December). Re-profiling of schemes between years to reflect the revised timing of project delivery is reported to each Cabinet.
- The new capital programme reflects known government grant settlements for 2022-23 and beyond. The programme also sets out the necessary borrowing to be approved in order to provide sufficient funding for agreed schemes.
- A schedule of existing schemes included in the on-going capital programme is attached at Appendix C to this Annex, with new schemes listed in Appendix D.
- Particular attention should be drawn to those schemes which are to be funded from borrowing and capital receipts. The budget proposals provide for the direct use of capital receipts for the repayment of debt. As a result, there will be very limited capital receipts available to support new capital expenditure. An analysis of receipts and their proposed use is included in Section 4.

2.2. The Existing Programme

The current capital programme below is based on period 9 balances as at 31 December 2022. This position will vary through to 1 April 2023 as schemes are reprofiled, with all movements reported to Cabinet.

Table 1: Existing programme, excluding proposed new schemes

Service	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
Adult Social Care	14.130	12.473	22.482	15.401	13.200	77.686
Children's Services	38.977	118.296	61.323	21.325	36.294	276.213
CES Highways	150.836	106.492	104.374	153.006	106.673	621.380
CES Other	28.677	57.975	22.098	0.500	0.517	109.767
Finance and Comm. Servs	47.385	40.915	13.715	8.765	0.960	111.741
Strategy and Governance	0.432	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.432
Total	280.438	336.150	223.992	198.997	157.643	1,197.219

Note: this table contains rounding differences

2.3. Existing Schemes reprofiled

The Capital Review Board undertook a detailed review of the 2022-23 capital forecast of existing projects in September 2022 across the services with the relevant officers. This review identified £155.845m slippage in the 2022-23 capital plan which has been transferred to future years, leaving £280.438m planned expenditure for 2022-23 and £916.781m for future years. Further reprofiling for capital slippage in quarter 4 of the 2022-23 financial year will be reported to Cabinet in June 2023.

2.4. Uplifts and Extensions to Existing schemes

The Councils officers also updated the forecasts for existing schemes taking into account recent developments in these schemes and ensuring consistency with the MTFS. This review identified £8.279m additions to future years as set out below.

Table 2: Uplifts to existing schemes

Service	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
CES Highways		0.084	0.084	0.084	0.084	0.336
CES Other			1.200	0.700	0.700	2.600
Finance and Comm. Servs	2.511	1.135	0.832	0.432	0.432	5.343
Total	2.511	1.219	2.116	1.216	1.216	8.279

Note: this table contains rounding differences

2.5. New schemes

Schemes not included in previous capital programmes will result in the following additions to the capital programme subject to approval:

Table 3: Proposed investment in new schemes

Service	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
CES Highways	0.000	1.350	1.200	0.000	0.000	2.550
CES Other	0.219	0.731	0.185	0.000	0.000	1.135
Finance and Comm. Servs	0.416	11.604	5.441	10.983	2.928	31.372
Total	0.634	13.685	6.826	10.983	2.928	35.056

Note: this table contains rounding differences

A full list of the new schemes proposed is available in Appendix D

2.6. The Total Proposed Capital Programme (existing and new)

The full Capital Programme for 2022-27, combining existing and proposed schemes, is summarised in the following table.

Table 4: Proposed Total Capital Programme

Service	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
Adult Social Care	14.130	12.473	22.482	15.401	13.200	77.686
Children's Services	38.977	118.296	61.323	21.325	36.294	276.213
CES Highways	150.836	107.926	105.658	153.090	106.757	624.266
CES Other	28.896	58.706	23.483	1.200	1.217	113.501
Finance and Comm. Servs	50.312	53.654	19.989	20.180	4.320	148.456
Strategy and Governance	0.432	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.432
Total	283.583	351.054	232.934	211.196	161.787	1,240.555

Note: this table contains rounding differences

2.7. The existing programme includes on-going schemes, and new schemes approved in-year:

Major programmes and schemes, for example

- Schools basic need and capital maintenance
- Living Well - Homes for Norfolk: to develop extra care housing in Norfolk
- SEND transformation programme to create 500 extra specialist school places
- Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing
- Norwich Western Link
- Transport capital maintenance
- Better Broadband for Norfolk

Where additional funding for existing capital schemes have been received during the current financial year, they have been added to the programme, with all changes reported to Cabinet. New schemes requiring borrowing have been approved by Cabinet and County Council.

New schemes approved during the 2022-23 financial year (to date) include

- LED Streetlighting Upgrade (£7.5m)
- Electric Vehicles charging points (£0.201m)
- Kings Lynn Multi-User Hub (£3m)
- Great Yarmouth Operations and Maintenance Campus (£3.4m)
- Norwich Castle: Royal Palace Reborn (£0.095m)

- Schools ICT Refresh (£2.00m)

A full summary of schemes in the existing programme can be found in Appendix C.

In addition, the County Council approved the flexible use of £3m capital receipts to fund the Adult Social Services transformation work and Children's Services Demand Management & Prevention Strategy in 2022-23 and future years, as set out in 5.13 below.

2.8. 2.8 New schemes proposed for addition to the capital programmes include:

Examples of new and existing projects requiring borrowing or unallocated capital receipts:

- County Farms various schemes for improvements to Agricultural buildings and Farm Houses, including the replacement of fossil fuel heating systems (£9.4m)
- Various Fire and Rescue Service schemes, including equipment, property capital maintenance and building improvements, and fire training facilities (£1.2m)
- Improvements to recycling facilities and reuse shops across Norfolk and replacement vehicles and new site equipment to enhance the waste disposal and recycling facilities (£0.5m) – thus improving the management of residual waste and reducing the environmental footprint
- Decarbonisation studies across the County's estate (£4m) – initial investment into the design and development of initiatives to reduce carbon emissions of Council properties. The studies are a precursor to a more comprehensive programme of retro-fitting and refurbishment of the Council's properties in line with the aims of the Environment Policy to work with our partners to achieve "net zero" carbon emissions on our estates by 2030 and work towards carbon neutrality across the wider region
- Scottow Enterprise Zone – refurbishment and improvements on site to increase the lettable office space (£8.6m)
- ICT rolling programme for infrastructure and devices (£8.2m)
- Uplift to the MyOracle Programme of (£1.632m) allowing for the full realisation of process efficiencies and savings potential available within Phase 2 and the quarterly upgrades of the Oracle Fusion system
- Extension of the Ash Die Back scheme (£0.5m)
- Extension of the Library Stock replenishment scheme (£2.1m)
- Uplift to the Local Members Highways Schemes (£0.336m)
- Extension of the capital management recharges (£1.2m)

New schemes (grant funded) not requiring additional borrowing

- Highways new DfT grants not already included in the programme are added as and when funding is secured.
- Schools basic need and capital maintenance grants from the DfE.

Details of all the new schemes above are given in Appendix D.

- 2.9. Major known funding sources (eg structural maintenance grants) are already in the programme for 2022-23 and future years. Other external funding will be added to the programme as and when secured.
- 2.10. The prioritisation system used to rank schemes has been developed in accordance with good practice and the Council's priorities. It provided a firm basis for comparing unfunded/unsupported schemes and is summarised in Appendix B.

3. Financing the Programme

- 3.1. The capital programme is financed through a number of sources – grants and contributions from third parties; contributions from revenue budgets and reserves; and external borrowing and capital receipts.
- 3.2. For the purpose of the table below, it is assumed that future capital receipts will be applied to the funding of short life assets, the direct re-payment of debt or the flexible use of capital receipts as set out in Table 6.
- 3.3. Proposed new schemes will result in an additional £43.336m of new borrowing over the period of the programme, subject to alternative sources of funding becoming available. This will result in a total borrowing need of £474.639m to fund the capital programme. This amounts to a considerable investment and is a reflection on the ambition of the programme, decreasing relative levels of central government capital grant, and increasing pressures on the revenue budget.
- 3.4. The funding of the proposed programme is set out in the table below:

Table 5: Funding of the Proposed Capital Programme £m

Service	22-23 £m	23-24 £m	24-25 £m	25-26 £m	26-27 £m	Total £m
External Grants and Contributions including Government grants	178.013	152.917	106.943	140.268	113.575	691.716
Revenue and Reserves	0.199	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.199
Capital receipts (see note)	24.000	20.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	74.000
Borrowing	81.371	178.137	115.991	60.929	38.212	474.639
Total	283.583	351.054	232.934	211.196	161.787	1,240.555

This table may be subject to small rounding differences

Note: capital receipts will be allocated to fund the programme and reduce borrowing as and when they are not required for other purposes and have been secured.

- 3.5. Grants and contributions funding the programme include grants received or announced in previous years, not yet spent. Non-government external funding is primarily from developer contributions relating to highways and school's schemes around new developments, Better Broadband rebates from BT Openreach and the heritage lottery fund in respect of the Norwich Castle Keep development. The largest external grants are received from the government Departments for Transport and Education.
- 3.6. The Department for Education condition funding methodology was updated in April 2022. Norfolk's DfE Basic Need allocation for 2022-25 is £27.292m, its

High Needs Allocation was £19.321m for 2022-2024 to support the provision of high needs places needed for the 2023 and 2024 academic years.

- 3.7. For schools capital maintenance, the DfE allocates devolved formula capital (DFC) for schools to spend on their own capital priorities, and a school condition allocation (SCA). In 2022-23 these amounted to £0.989m and £4.875m respectively. At the time of writing the 2023-24 allocation has not yet been announced.
- 3.8. Highways funding from the Department for Transport (DfT) for both Structural Maintenance and Integrated Transport Block grants has been based broadly on a 6-year formula which was extended to 2024-25 totalling £209.372 million and split as follow:
- Major Road Schemes - £178.983 million over 3 years
 - Bus and Public Transport schemes - £17.617 million over 3 years
 - Active Travel schemes - £2.338 million over 3 years
 - Local Road and Safety schemes – 10.434 million over 3 years

This summary is based on Appendix A of the Highways Capital Programme 2022/23/24 and Transport Asset Management Plan brought to Cabinet in March 2022

- 3.9. The transport funding environment has becoming more complex and varied over the past few years with allocations “top-sliced” to allow councils to bid into one-off “challenge” and “incentive” pots. The Council continues to look towards alternative sources of funding such as the Transforming Cities Fund and the UKSPF22 (see section 1 above).
- 3.10. In the 2018 Autumn Budget the Government, announced a £98m grant for a new lifting bridge across the River Yare in Great Yarmouth (the Third River Crossing) as part of its Large Local Major Schemes Programme. On 25 November 2020 the final business plan was approved, and the funding unlocked. The project is expected to cost £121 million overall, with the remainder of funding coming from local sources. Construction began in early 2021 with the bridge aiming to open for use in early 2023.
- 3.11. The government has also approved £26.2 million contribution to the A140 Long Stratton Bypass, subject to Full Business Case and is considering business case proposals for the Norwich Western Link and the A10 West Winch Housing Access Road
- 3.12. The government is introducing a new £450 million local electric vehicle infrastructure (LEVI) scheme for local authorities to support local EV infrastructure delivery and Norfolk will receive a portion of this funding.
- 3.13. Norfolk’s Bus Service Improvement Plan received £49.5 million funding from central government and £3.2 million to purchase 14 electric buses as part of the Zero Emission Bus Regional Areas (ZEBRA) funding.
- 3.14. In May 2020 the government announced final funding allocations of the active travel fund to support local transport authorities develop cycling and walking facilities. Tranche 1 enabled the installation of temporary projects related to

the COVID-19 pandemic and Tranche 2 is for longer-term projects with Norfolk allocated approximately £1.8m in total.

- 3.15. Details of highways funding and proposed allocations are detailed in the Highways Capital Programme and Transport Asset Management Plan which is due to be presented to the March 2023 Cabinet.
- 3.16. A Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) is received as part of the Better Care Fund. The Spending Review 2021 confirmed that the iBCF grant will continue in 2022-23 and be maintained at its current level. The Disabled Facilities Grant, which is forwarded to district housing authorities to administer, will also continue. While the BCF in 2022-23 remains largely unchanged, the government recognises that the proposals set out in the Health and Care Bill will impact longer-term system thinking and planning. So future iterations of the BCF may require the Council to consider its response in strategic planning to:
 - Integrated or joint commissioning of services after hospital discharge
 - Plans to prevent the need for longer-term services, admission prevention and independent living
 - Plans to stimulate the care market and develop asset based community approaches to delivering quality and value in a sustainable care market

4. Capital Receipts forecast

- 4.1. Where capital receipts are generated through the sale of assets or repayments of loans by third parties, these may be:
 - used to fund in-year capital expenditure, reducing the need to borrow
 - held to offset future capital borrowing requirements
 - used to repay existing borrowing, or
 - used to fund the “Flexible use of capital receipts” (see section 5 below).

In accordance with the Council’s constitution, some of the farms Capital Receipts are reinvested back into the Farms Estate. Otherwise, capital receipts are a corporate asset and not ring-fenced to any specific service or function.

- 4.2. The Council continues to review its assets seeking to ensure that their ongoing use supports the Council’s future priorities. Assets that do not meet this need have been identified and form the basis of a continually updated disposal schedule.
- 4.3. The property sales figures included in the schedule below are currently the best estimate of the value of properties available for disposal, pending formal valuations, market appetite, planning decisions, timing of sales and delivery options, particularly in relation to housing schemes.

Table 6: Draft Capital Receipts forecast £m

Capital Receipts	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
Capital Receipts brought forward	5.291	28.137	10.179	3.797	21.126
Loan repayments from subsidiaries	10.745	1.364	1.978	20.688	0.707
Loan repayments from LIF	6.903	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	22.938	29.501	12.157	24.485	21.833
Forecast Property Sales *					
High likelihood	30.424	2.546	1.441	3.536	3.25
Medium likelihood	0.225	1.132	3.149	2.695	0.535
Low likelihood (likely to move to future years)	1.550	0.000	0.05	0.41	0.000
Total	32.199	3.678	4.64	6.641	3.785
TOTAL CAPITAL RECEIPTS FORECASTED (A)	55.137	33.179	16.797	31.126	25.618
Use of Capital Receipts					
Funding in year capital expenditure	24	20	10	10	10
Potential for flexible use of capital receipts (see below)	3.000	3.000	3.000		
TOTAL USE OF CAPITAL RECEIPTS FORECASTED (B)	27.000	23.000	13.000	10.000	10.000
Capital Receipts carried forward	28.137	10.179	3.797	21.126	15.618
Property Sales analysed by farms/non-farms property					
Farms	1.060	1.301	3.400	2.15	0.000
Non-farms	30.767	1.834	3.337	2.071	0.000
Major development sites (farmland)	0.376	0.600	3.425		0.000
	32.203	3.735	10.162	4.221	0.000

***Property available for disposal schedule estimates £m**

4.4. Any repayments of capital loans made by NCC will be included in the value of capital receipts used to repay debt or to support the capital programme.

5. Flexible use of capital receipts

Introduction

- 5.1. DLUHC Statutory Guidance on the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts (updated), dated March 2016, has offered local authorities flexibility in the use of capital receipts. Originally these covered receipts generated between April 2016 and March 2019. The Local Government Finance Settlement 2018-19 originally extended to 2021-22 and on 10 February 2021 a further extension of three years beginning in 2022-23 was announced. The details of the extension of this flexibility were published on 2 August 2022 to extend this flexibility to 2025.
- 5.2. Qualifying expenditure is expenditure on any project that is designed to generate ongoing revenue savings in the delivery of public services and/or transform service delivery to reduce costs and/or transform service delivery in a way that reduces costs or demand for services in future years for any of the public sector delivery partners. Within this definition, it is for individual local authorities to decide whether or not a project qualifies for the flexibility.
- 5.3. Local authorities can only use capital receipts from the disposal of property, plant and equipment assets received in the years in which this flexibility is offered. Local Authorities may not use their existing stock of capital receipts or loan repayments to finance the revenue costs of reform.
- 5.4. The direction issue on 4 April 2022 clarifies that capital receipted eligible for flexibility must be disposals by the local authority outside the “group” structure. In addition, the local authority must submit its plan for the use of the flexibility in advance of each financial year to the DLUHC.

Background

- 5.5. Regulation 23 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 made under section 11 of the Local Government Act 2003, specify the purposes for which capital receipts may be used. The main permitted purpose is to meet capital expenditure together with other specified types of payment. Permitted purposes do not include use to support revenue expenditure.
- 5.6. Under section 16(2)(b) of the 2003 Act the Secretary of State is empowered to issue directions providing that expenditure of local authorities shall be treated as capital expenditure for the purpose of Part 1 of the 2003 Act. Where such a direction is made the expenditure specified in the Direction is from that point on capital expenditure which can be met from capital receipts under the Regulations.

Process

- 5.7. For each financial year, a local authority should ensure it prepares and publishes at least one Flexible use of Capital Receipts Strategy prior to exercising the flexibilities allowed. The strategy must be presented to full Council, and this can be part of the annual budget setting documents.
- 5.8. Ideally, the strategy will be prepared before the start of any financial year. Where the need or opportunity has not been anticipated, the strategy can be presented to full Council at the earliest opportunity.

5.9. Examples of projects which generate qualifying expenditure include:

- Sharing back-office services
- Service reform pilot schemes
- Service reconfiguration, restructuring or rationalisation
- Driving a digital approach to the delivery
- Aggregating procurement
- Setting up commercial or alternative delivery models
- Integrating public facing services across two or more public sector bodies

Strategy content

5.10. As a minimum, the Strategy should list each project that plans to make use of the capital receipts flexibility and that on a project-by-project basis details of the expected savings/service transformation are provided.

5.11. The Strategy should report the impact on the local authority's Prudential Indicators for the forthcoming year and subsequent years.

5.12. Each future year's Strategy should contain details on projects approved in previous years, including a commentary on whether the planned savings or service transformation have been/are being realised in line with the initial analysis.

Strategy for the flexible use of capital receipts

5.13. As stated in section 4 above, the value and timing of capital receipts is hard to predict and is not known at this stage. In order to support the revenue budget, the 3rd party loan repayments received are applied directly to the repayment of debt. Then capital receipts are allocated to fund in-year capital expenditure subject to a proportion of capital receipts from the sale of farmland being ring-fenced.

5.14. Given the extension of the flexibility to 2025, capital receipts of £3m will be put forward to fund transformation projects from 2022-23 to 2024-25. The £3m set aside for 2022-23 is funding transformation projects including service restructuring and demand management:

- which are in accordance with Statutory Guidance on the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts (updated) issued by the DCLG, dated August 2022 and
- subject to scrutiny of proposals by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services.

5.15. Any changes to this strategy will be reported through Cabinet.

Specific proposal for the flexible use of capital receipts

5.16. On 25 September 2017 Policy and Resources Committee considered a report entitled Demand Management & Prevention Strategy: Children's Services. This resulted in the allocation of £12-£15m into children's services over the four years 2018-22

5.17. The investment will fund a programme of transformational change, including investment in specialist, well supported alternatives to residential care, better

16+ provision, workforce training and development and better targeted interventions.

- 5.18. Subject to approval and availability, up to a maximum of £3m capital receipts per annum for 2022-23 will be applied to transformation projects and similarly £3m capital receipts per annum will be applied to transformation projects that meet the flexible use criteria from 2022-23 for 3 years, in accordance with the extension of this flexibility.

Impact on Prudential Indicators

- 5.19. By using capital receipts to fund this proposal, there is an opportunity cost of not being able to use the capital receipt for other purposes which could be the direct repayment of debt, or to fund capital expenditure (avoiding the need to borrow).

- 5.20. Assuming £3m of capital receipts are used to fund transformation projects:

Prudential indicator – impact of using £1m flexibly:	-compared with using capital receipts for the direct re-payment of debt	-compared with using capital to fund capital expenditure
Capital expenditure payment forecast	Expense classed as capital expenditure increases by £3m.	No impact
Ratio of Capital Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream	No impact	Interest payable + MRP increases approx. £0.27m pa. Ratio increase 0.03%.
Capital Financing Requirement	No impact	CFR increases by £3m
Authorised Limit for External Debt	No impact	Authorised Limit increases by £3.2m
Operational Boundary Limit for External Debt	No impact	Operational Boundary increases by £3.0m

- 5.21. Capital Receipts not needed for this flexible use purpose are now carried forward to repay future debt instalments or to fund short-life capital expenditure.
- 5.22. Reducing the capital receipts available for the future repayment of debt would have a direct impact on future revenue budgets through the MRP.

6. Revenue Impact of the Proposed Capital Programme

- 6.1. Where the Council uses borrowing to support the capital programme, it must set aside revenue funds on an annual basis to repay the capital borrowed. This is required by statute and is known as Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). The revenue impact of MRP depends on the expected life of the underlying asset.
- 6.2. In addition to MRP, the Council will need to fund any additional interest costs through future revenue budgets. The Council has the capacity to borrow from the Public Works Loan Board with interest rates currently in the region of 3.6% and anticipated to increase to 5%.
- 6.3. The table below is an estimate of the maximum incremental revenue impact of proposed new schemes before savings expected to be generated from direct revenue savings, transformation and other related spend to save schemes.

Table 7: Estimated incremental revenue costs of new capital schemes to be approved

	2022-23 £m	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m
Assumed interest rate	3.60%	5.00%	4%	4%	3%
Incremental impact					
Cumulative interest cost	1.465	4.453	2.436	1.127	0.573
MRP	2.034	4.453	2.900	1.523	0.955
Total	3.499	8.907	5.336	2.650	1.528

Note: interest costs assume mid-year spend

- 6.4. MRP and interest forecasts assume schemes delivered as set out in the programme. It is likely that a significant proportion of spend will be slipped into future years as schemes are developed and timing of expenditure becomes more certain.
- 6.5. The table above shows the incremental costs associated with new schemes, all other things being equal. It does not take into account the use of capital receipts to fund in-year capital expenditure, thus reducing the Capital Financing requirement and the associated Minimum Revenue Provision.
- 6.6. The actual budgeted financing costs and percentage of the net revenue stream this represents by the revenue costs of borrowing is set out in the Treasury Management Strategy report to this committee.

Appendices

Appendix A: Capital strategy 2023-24

Appendix B: Capital bids prioritisation

Appendix C: Capital programme 2022-27 – existing schemes summary

Appendix D: New and extended capital schemes

Appendix A: Capital strategy 2023-24



Capital strategy

2023-24

1 Capital Strategy Introduction

- 1.1 As local authorities become increasingly complex and diverse it is vital that those charged with governance understand the long-term context in which investment decisions are made and all the financial risks to which the authority is exposed. With local authorities having increasingly wide powers around commercialisation, more being subject to group arrangements and the increase in combined authority arrangements it is no longer sufficient to consider only the individual local authority but also the residual risks and liabilities to which it is subject.

2 Purpose and aims of the Capital Strategy

- 2.1 The CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (2021) states that authorities should have in place a capital strategy that sets out the long-term context in which capital expenditure and investment decisions are made and gives due consideration to both risk and reward and impact on the achievement of priority outcomes.

- 2.2 The capital strategy is intended to:

- give a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of services along with an overview of how associated risk is managed and the implications for future financial sustainability;
- demonstrate that the authority takes capital expenditure and investment decisions in line with service objectives and properly takes account of stewardship, value for money, prudence, sustainability and affordability.

- 2.3 The development of a capital strategy allows flexibility to engage with full council to ensure that the overall strategy, governance procedures and risk appetite are fully understood by all elected members

- 2.4 In considering how stewardship, value for money, prudence, sustainability and affordability can be demonstrated local authorities should have regard to the following key areas:

- Capital expenditure
- Debt, borrowing and treasury management
- Commercial activity
- Other long-term liabilities
- Knowledge and skills.

The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services has considered the affordability and risk associated with the capital strategy and where appropriate has taken specialised advice.

3 County Council Strategy and transformation

As a Council, our approach to all work is guided by four key principles:

- Offering our help early to prevent and reduce demand for specialist service;
- Joining up our work so that similar activities and services are easily accessible, done well and done once;
- Being business-like and making best use of digital technology to ensure value for money;
- Using evidence and data to target our work where it can make the most difference.

A vision for Norfolk in 2021, “Caring for our County”, outlines the Council’s commitment to meet the wide range of challenges the Council faces, with a focus on:

- Good Growth: Building communities we can be proud of;
- Making the most of our beautiful County;
- Starting a new relationship with Norfolk families;
- Investing in children and families; and
- Helping our population remain independent, resilient and well.

Better Together for Norfolk is the County Council's business plan updated in 2021 for 2021-2027. It outlines our commitment to invest in Norfolk’s future growth and prosperity by:

- Focusing on inclusive growth and improved social mobility;
- Encouraging housing, infrastructure, jobs and business growth across the County;
- Developing our workforce to meet the needs of the sectors powering our local economy;
- Work to reduce our impact on the environment.

This way we can help Norfolk have a growing economy, full of thriving people living in strong communities we are proud of.

Our services support our ambitions by ensuring children and young people have the best start in life, protecting vulnerable people, developing strong infrastructure, maintaining a safe road system and helping improve the economy. The Council’s transformation programme, Norfolk Futures, provides the mechanism to realise these ambitions for the County across all of its activities.

In July 2021 we convened **Rising to the Challenge Together** bringing together partners from across all sections to look at the impact of COVID-19 on Norfolk and explore how best to achieve our common priorities. Our strategic priorities for the next 4 years are set out below:

1. A vibrant and sustainable economy;
2. Better Opportunities for Children and Young People;
3. Healthy fulfilling and independent lives;
4. A greener, more resilient future.

The Covid-19 pandemic has accelerated changes in the way we work to best use new systems and technology. As an organisation, we will be more flexible about when and where we work, and how we creatively use space and technology to

find new and more efficient ways of doing things in a safe, modern, and business-like way.

4 Capital expenditure

4.1 Governance process for approval and monitoring of capital expenditure

The Council's capital programme is approved as part of the budget setting process. Prior to the start of each financial year, usually in February, the County Council agrees a future three or four-year capital programme including a list of projects with profiled costs and funding sources.

At the year-end unspent capital funding on incomplete projects is carried forward to the following year as part of the closedown process and reported to the Council's Cabinet, with any changes to the budget approved by County Council.

New schemes added during the year which require prudential borrowing are also approved by County Council based on recommendations from Cabinet. Where additional external funding is received by on-going capital projects, this is added to the programme and noted by Cabinet on a monthly basis.

An outturn report each year gives details of actual expenditure and funding.

4.2 Policies on capitalisation

4.2.1 Property, Plant and Equipment

Expenditure on the acquisition, creation or enhancement of Property, Plant and Equipment is capitalised on an accruals basis, provided that it is probable that the future economic benefits or service potential associated with the item will flow to the Authority and the cost of the item can be measured reliably. The de-minimis level for property, plant and equipment is £40,000.

The Council does not capitalise borrowing costs incurred whilst assets are under construction.

4.2.2 Heritage Assets

Heritage Assets are assets which increase the knowledge, understanding and appreciation of the local area and its history. The recognition of Heritage Assets is consistent with the Council's Property, Plant and Equipment policy, including the £40,000 de-minimis.

Apart from Heritage Assets previously accounted for as Community Assets, Heritage Assets acquired before 1 April 2010 have not been capitalised, since reliable estimates of cost or value are not available on a cost-effective basis.

4.2.3 Intangible Assets

Expenditure on non-monetary assets that do not have physical substance but are controlled by the Council as a result of past events (eg software licences) is capitalised when it is expected that future economic benefits or service potential will flow from the intangible asset to the Council.

Internally generated assets are capitalised where it is demonstrable that the project is technically feasible and is intended to be completed (with adequate resources being available) and the Council will be able to generate future

economic benefits or deliver service potential by being able to sell or use the asset. Expenditure is capitalised where it can be measured reliably as attributable to the asset.

Expenditure on the development of websites is not capitalised if the website is solely or primarily intended to promote or advertise the Council's goods or services.

4.3 Long-term view of capital expenditure plans

4.3.1 The Council's Service areas consider their capital expenditure plans in the context of long-term service delivery priorities and the Council's vision and plan. Historically, larger government capital grants development and capital maintenance of highways and schools have formed the basis of an affordable capital programme. This is supplemented by other funding sources, specific grants, and prudential borrowing. Long term capital planning includes the following major capital programmes:

4.3.2 **Adult Social Services - Living Well – Homes for Norfolk:** capital investment of up to £29m over 10 years has been approved to accelerate the development of extra care housing in Norfolk, with the aim of reducing unnecessary residential care admissions. Each individual scheme will be subject to a rigorous feasibility and financial assessment. Over a 10-year period it is estimated that the total programme could require between £17m and £30m depending on progress and grant subsidy levels.

4.3.3 **Transport and infrastructure** – In September 2020, the Secretary of State for Transport approved a Development Consent Order application to construct, operate and maintain the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing and its approaches. Prior to this the Council secured £98m DfT funding towards the £120m anticipated cost. Subject to government approval of a final business case for the project, construction began in early 2021 with the bridge open for use in early 2023.

Officers are developing strategic schemes (with partners where applicable) which may attract funding. Examples of schemes being taken forward are:

- Norwich Western Link – this project has conditional entry into DfT's 'Large Local Majors' funding programme with £145m DfT funding agreed subject to final approval of the outline business case
- A47 improvements (Highways England committed £300m to improve the A47 with work begun in 2020)
- Long Stratton bypass - following £0.5m funding from the DfT an outline business case has been approved and a further £1.7m has been secured from the DfT. The total anticipated cost of this project is £46.2m.

As well as smaller road projects, the Norfolk Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan covers other infrastructure aspirations including Superfast Broadband, rail, utilities and sustainable walking and cycling infrastructure projects.

Following the review of Fire Services Estate, Vehicles, Plant and Equipment, officers have developed schemes to refurbish fire stations, develop training facilities and upgrade the "red fleet" totalling £21.8m

4.3.4 Children's Services:

SEND provision: As part of the transformation of Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) provision in Norfolk, the Council has allocated £120m to create 500 extra specialist school places. As well as new and extended specialist units in mainstream schools, the programme is delivering three new specialist schools including:

- Bure Park Specialist Academy - a new school in Great Yarmouth for young people with social, emotional and mental health (SEMH) needs which opened on 20 September 2021;
- The Bridge Easton - a 170 place complex needs school in the greater Norwich area; which is nearing completion and due to open in early 2023;
- Duke of Lancaster School in Fakenham - a new school for children and young people with autism in the Fakenham area which opened in January 2022 and
- The expansion of current specialist resource bases (SRB) for children with SEND creating a further 170 learning places

Schools: The Council has a duty to secure sufficient pupil places to meet the demands of the school-age population. Government capital grants, along with funding from other sources such as developer contributions are used to support the Council's strategic plans for the provision of additional places in areas of population growth, and for improving the quality of existing Council-maintained school buildings. To ensure the programme can deliver the required places, the Council has agreed to underwrite £30m of capital expenditure on the basis that grants and other funding will be used where possible.

There is also a £3m expansion programme for Children's Homes aimed at addressing the increased demand for residential places within Children's Social Services.

The total borrowing forecasted for the Children's Services capital programme for 2021-27 is £154 million.

4.3.5 Trading through companies / capital loans

The Council controls a number of wholly owned companies and has made loans for capital purposes available to Hethel Innovation Ltd, Repton Property Developments Limited, and companies within the Norse Group. In addition to loans to group companies, the Council has made a small number of capital loans to local housing developers.

These loans are approved as part of the capital programme, and are for capital purposes. Records are maintained to ensure that the loans are not disproportionate in terms of either the overall capital programme, or the Council's net and gross expenditure. Loans are subject to due diligence, and relate to the Council's powers to trade, or to assist third parties who are helping to further the Council's priorities, including housing and economic development.

4.3.6 Capital project prioritisation

4.3.6.1 The Council has to manage demands for investment within the financial constraints which result from:

- The limited availability of capital grants
- The potential impact on revenue budgets of additional borrowing and
- The level of capital receipts generated.

As a result, prioritisation criteria have been developed to assess any capital bids that ensure the Programme is targeted to Council priorities.

4.3.6.2 Capital bids that require financial support must be set out in a Business Case that demonstrates

- Purpose and Nature of scheme
- Contribution to Council's priorities & service objectives
- Other corporate/political/legal issues
- Options for addressing the problem/need
- Risks, risk mitigation, uncertainties & sensitivities
- Financial summary including costs, potential efficiency savings, funding and timing

4.3.6.3 The corporate capital prioritisation model was first used for the 2015-16 capital programme and operates at a programme level, with most schemes prioritised at a more detailed level within the major capital programme areas of transport and schools. Prioritisation criteria are reviewed annually to ensure they continue to reflect the changing needs and priorities of the Council.

4.3.6.4 Schemes are considered within the appropriate service to ensure that the capital programme integrates with business and service planning, with revenue implications taken into account. Highways schemes are prioritised within CES. Schools schemes are prioritised through the Children's Services Capital Priorities Group. The majority of non-school property schemes are administered by the Council's Corporate Property team. Other schemes not covered by the major headings above are developed by the relevant chief officer, and where corporate funding is required are considered by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, who considers the overall affordability of the programme.

4.3.6.5 The Council's capital programme is formed by bringing the various capital programmes together, and ensuring that sufficient funding is available before seeking Council approval.

4.3.6.6 For schemes with no funding source, a benchmark has been applied, being the score for a dummy project of simply re-paying debt. Even for fully funded schemes, the scoring checks that revenue implications are considered, and the project contributes to the Council's objectives.

4.3.6.7 Although the prioritisation model has been broadly applied, it is primarily applicable to new projects and projects requiring the use of borrowing and/or capital receipts to provide funding.

4.4 Overview of asset management planning

4.4.1 Asset management planning

The majority of asset management planning falls under three major areas of capital spend: highways, schools, and corporate property.

4.4.1.1 Highways

As the highways authority for Norfolk, the Council has a responsibility to maintain, operate and improve its highway assets (eg roads and bridges). The landscape is one of increasing financial pressure, significant backlogs of maintenance, accountability to funding providers and increasing public expectations.

The Council's Transport Asset Management Plan identifies the optimal allocation of resources for the management, operation, preservation and enhancement of the highway infrastructure. This plan is developed in the context of longer-term local transport plans such as "Local Transport Plan 4 (2020-2036)" and Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Delivery plans.

Norfolk's Local Transport Plan can be found at:

<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/roads-and-transport/transport-asset-management-plan-full-document.pdf>.

4.4.1.2 Schools

Each year the Council rolls forward its approved schools' capital building programme, making revisions to the existing programme and adding new schemes to reflect pressures and priorities.

The member led Children's Services Capital Priorities Group monitors the progress of the capital programme and considers in detail projects of concern, based on a regular risk assessment.

The impact of housing developments on both funding and demand for new and expanded school provision was set out in a Schools Capital Programme report to June 2022 Cabinet.

4.4.1.3 Corporate Property

The Council's Corporate Property Team has responsibility for property and asset management, supported by the Corporate Property Strategy Group.

The Council's Strategic Property Asset Management Framework will set out a plan for property management. The framework will build on the latest published Corporate Asset Management Plan 2016-2019 "One Public Service – One Public Estate" which identifies the key strategic policy and resource influences affecting Norfolk and the Council. The plan can be found at:

<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/policies-and-strategies/finance-and-budget/corporate-asset-management-plan-2016-to-2019.pdf>.

4.4.1.4 Capital Programme Quarterly Review Board

The Capital Programme Quarterly Review Board co-ordinates and provide oversight of the Council's overall capital programme. It is led by the Cabinet Member for Finance and attended by officer representatives from each major service. The board provides a forum to discuss, review and, if necessary, prioritise new schemes to be added to the programme, as well as on-going schemes.

4.4.2 Capital Funding Sources

There are a variety of different sources of capital funding, each having different advantages, opportunity costs and risks attached.

4.4.2.1 Borrowing

The Prudential Capital Finance system allows local authorities to borrow for capital expenditure without Government consent, provided it is affordable taking into account prudent treasury management practice.

As a guide, based on recent long term rates, borrowing incurs a revenue cost of approximately 8%. This is made up of two parts: the interest on the loan (maximum 5% assumed), and provision for the repayment of debt (known as the Minimum Revenue Provision or MRP) which for an asset with a life of 25 years is 4% per annum. The Council needs to be satisfied that it can afford this annual future revenue cost.

Local Authorities have to earmark sufficient revenue budget each year as provision for repaying debts incurred on capital projects, in accordance with its MRP policy.

4.4.2.2 Grants

The challenging financial environment means that national government grants are reducing or changing in nature. A large proportion of this funding is currently un-ringfenced which means it is not tied to particular projects. However, capital grants are allocated by Government departments which clearly intend that the grants should be for certain area such as education or highways. Sometimes, for major projects such as the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing, grant funding is not sufficient to meet total costs, and other sources of funding will be sought to fund the gap.

4.4.2.3 Capital Receipts

Capital receipts are estimated and are based upon the likely sales of assets as identified under the Asset Management Plan. These include development sites, former school sites and other properties and land no longer needed for operational purposes. Receipts are critical to delivering our revenue budgets through the direct repayment of debt and, where allowed, the flexible use of capital receipts. Receipts not used for that purpose can be used to reduce future borrowing requirements.

4.4.2.4 Revenue / Other Contributions

The Prudential Code allows for the use of additional revenue resources within agreed parameters. Contributions are received from other

organisations to support the delivery of schemes with the main area being within the education programme with contributions made by individual schools and by developers.

4.4.3 Capital Programme overview

- 4.4.3.1 The Capital Programme should support the overall objectives of the Council and act as an enabler for transformation in order to address its priorities.
- 4.4.3.2 Over the last four years Norfolk County Council's capital expenditure has been as follows:

Financial year (£m)	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Capital expenditure	158.5	177.6	219.5	254.9

Capital expenditure increased in 2021-22 partly due to large projects like the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing, refurbishment of the Castle Keep Museum and the 3 SEND schools delivered. The COVID-19 pandemic has also impacted schemes causing slippages in timing and increased costs due to disruptions in building works and scarcity of building materials. Capital expenditure projected to be between £250m and £280m in 2022-23.

The Council's 2021-22 capital programme was split by funding type as follows:

Funding type	£m	%
Capital grants and contributions	131.832	51
Revenue and reserves	2.84	1
Capital receipts applied	8.99	4
Borrowing	111.20	44
Total	254.869	100

4.4.4 Costs of past and current expenditure funded through borrowing


4.4.4.1 Actual borrowing and borrowing requirement

	£m
Borrowing b/fwd 1 April 2022	854.2
New Borrowing April – November 2022	10.0
Principal repayments 2022-23 – PWLB loans	-15.3
Forecast additional borrowing 2022-23	40.0
Forecast borrowing 31 March 2023	888.92
Other long-term liabilities (PFI + leases) 31 March 2023	43.6
Forecast borrowing and long-term liabilities 31 March 2023	932.52
Capital financing requirement 1 April 2022	969.8
Borrowing requirement after assumed slippage	50.3
MRP and other financing movements	-32.9
Forecast capital financing requirement 31 March 2023	987.1
Forecast borrowing requirement 31 March 2023	50.0

(Note: forecasts as at 31 December 2022)

4.4.4.2 Repayment profile of borrowing

The Council borrows in order to fund capital expenditure. This chart shows the repayment profile of borrowing undertaken as at the end of November 2022:



Due to the setting aside of an annual minimum revenue provision (see below), the charge to annual revenue budgets is based on notional borrowing and asset lives, rather than the actual maturities shown in the graph above.

The unusually high repayment due in 2043-44 includes £20m of commercial borrowing. The Council, with its treasury advisors, will consider re-financing options as and when they are offered which may smooth the repayment profile.

4.4.4.3 Interest and MRP costs

This table shows the cost of interest on borrowing and MRP forecasted for 2022-23. MRP (minimum revenue provision) is the amount the Council sets aside each year from revenue in order to service the repayment of debt, and is based on the cost and estimated life of assets funded through supported borrowing to 2008 and prudential borrowing thereafter.

Borrowing revenue costs (as at November 2022)	£m
Forecast external loans interest costs 2022-23	31.4
Calculated MRP 2022-23	33.0
Theoretical revenue costs of borrowing	64.4
Use of external contributions	
Annual revenue costs of borrowing 2022-23	64.4

Additional borrowing will increase the cost of interest. The recent dip in PWLB interest rates compared with the higher rates of borrowing on repaid debt is assisting with the funding of new borrowing costs in the current year.

The reduction due to previous overpayments of MRP was fully used in 2021-22. Thereafter, full MRP is accounted for in the MTFS, and all additional debt-funded capital expenditure will increase annual MRP.

4.4.5 Maintenance requirements

Services include the revenue costs of maintenance in their revenue budgets, including the costs and savings relating to capital investment.

4.4.6 Planned disposals

The Council actively manages its property portfolio in accordance with the adopted Asset Management Plan. Property is acquired or disposed of as a reaction to changing service requirements, changing council policies or to improve the efficiency of the overall portfolio.

Assessments are carried out by the Corporate Property Officer (the Head of Property) in consultation with the Corporate Property Strategy Group (CPSG) with decisions taken through Cabinet in accordance with Standing Orders. The Corporate Property Officer reviews options for maximising income from surplus properties usually by open market sale. External advice, for example valuation and/or planning, is taken where appropriate.

4.5 Restrictions around borrowing or funding of ongoing capital finance

Apart from the general requirements on local authorities to ensure that their borrowing is prudent and sustainable, there are no specific external restrictions around the Council's borrowing or funding of ongoing capital finance.

5 Debt, borrowing and treasury management

5.1 Projection of external debt and use of internal borrowing

The Council uses external debt and internal borrowing (from working capital cash balances) to support capital expenditure. As shown above there will be a forecast borrowing requirement at 31 March 2023 of £50m.

Except in the case of specific externally financed projects (such as the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing), new borrowing is applied to the funding of previous capital expenditure, effectively replacing cash balances which have been used on a temporary basis to avoid the cost of 'carrying' debt in the short term. The Council continues to use cash balances for this purpose and will continue to balance the long-term advantages of locking into favourable interest rates against the costs of additional debt.

Based on the capital programme, an allowance for slippage, forecast interest rates and cash balances, new borrowing of £80m in 2022-23 and £60m 2023-24 is anticipated.

Assuming outstanding borrowing of approximately £1bn with a maximum life of 50 years, and annual MRP exceeding £30m pa from 2021-22, a factor in any borrowing decision will be to smooth out the repayment profile such that new borrowing does not cause debt maturing in any one year to exceed £28m, except 2042-43 which for historic reasons includes a large repayment of commercial and PWLB debt.

5.2 Provision for the repayment of debt over the life of the underlying debt

Provision for the repayment of debt over the life of the underlying debt is made through the setting aside of the minimum revenue provision each year. Based on an assumption of between £55m and £80m capital expenditure funded by borrowing each year (in line with an ambitious but realistic capital spend), with assets having an average estimated life of 25 years, forecast provision at the time of writing for the repayment of debt is as follows:

Financial year	MRP (Note 2)	MRP over- payment reduction	Net MRP forecast (Note 1)
	£m	£m	£m
2022-23	33.00		33.00
2023-24	35.66		35.66
2024-25	37.46		37.46
2025-26	38.24		38.24
2026-27	42.91		42.91

Note 1: impact on revenue budget will be reduced by the use of capital receipts to fund short-life capital expenditure, repay debt, and external contributions to debt repayment.

Note 2: the estimate of annual expenditure is based on the approved capital programme, adjusted for re-profiling based on historic patterns of spend.

5.3 Authorised limit and operational boundary for the following year

The Council's authorised borrowing limit and operational boundary for 2022-23 will be based on the approved capital programme at the time of budget setting.

5.4 Approach to treasury management

The Council's approach to treasury management including processes, due diligence and defining the authority's risk appetite will be set out in the annual Investment and Treasury Strategy, approved annually by the County Council.

6 Commercial activity

Together for Norfolk, the County Council's business plan for 2019-2025, outlines the Council's commitment to invest in Norfolk's future growth and prosperity by encouraging housing, infrastructure, jobs and business growth across the County.

This strategy was refreshed in July 2021 when the Council brought together over 100 partners from across all sectors to look at the impact of COVID-19 on Norfolk and to identify opportunities for long-term economic and social recovery. Better Together for Norfolk 2021 to 2025 sets out the Council's strategic priorities for the next 4 years with its focus on working with partner to deliver common priorities including:

- Building a vibrant and sustainable economy
- Better opportunities for children and young people
- Healthy, fulfilling and independent lives
- Strong, engaged and inclusive communities
- A greener, more resilient future

Elements of the capital programme are focussed on these strategic priorities through the provision of capital loan facilities to the council's wholly owned companies.

The Council's capital investments are policy driven. It has no capital or property investments which are held 1) purely to generate a return or 2) out of County.

Non-treasury investments, including loans to companies, and investment properties as defined for statutory accounting purposes, are listed in detail in regular Treasury Management reports.

7 Other long-term liabilities

7.1 The Council's other long-term liabilities comprise PFI liabilities (six schools in the Norwich area, and street lighting throughout Norfolk) and lease liabilities (for example vehicles and ICT equipment).

7.2 The PFI arrangements continue to be monitored to ensure performance is in accordance with contract requirements. All PFI arrangements are subject to member approval. No PFI arrangements are currently being pursued.

7.3 All leases are subject to general budgetary constraints, with service departments taking budget responsibility for the length of the lease. Finance leases are arranged through Link Asset Management, the Council's treasury management advisors. From 2022-23, the International Financial Reporting Standard will require more arrangements to be accounted for in the same way as finance leases, including arrangements currently classed as operating leases, as well as service contracts where the Council controls the use of specific assets.

7.4 As set out in the Council's annual Statement of Accounts the Council has historically given several financial guarantees for project funding. Since 2008 financial guarantees have to be accounted for as a financial instrument – there are no such guarantees material to the accounts. Any capital guarantees and contingent liabilities are costed and approved as part of the annual capital programme.

8 Knowledge and skills

8.1 The Council has a number of specialist teams delivering the capital programme, including schools, transport and the Corporate Property Team.

8.2 These teams are supplemented by professional external advisors as necessary, including Norfolk Property Services, professional highways consultants, and external valuers.

8.3 The Capital Programme is kept under continual review during the year. Each scheme is allocated a project officer whose responsibility is to ensure the project is delivered on time, within budget and achieves the desired outcomes.

8.4 Capital finance monitoring reports are prepared monthly and presented to Cabinet. New schemes are approved by Cabinet and then County Council. Various Project Boards, specialist teams of officers, and member-lead Working Groups, such as the Children's Services Capital Priorities Group, oversee the co-ordination and management of significant elements of the Capital Programmes.

Appendix B: Capital bids prioritisation model

The three main objectives in compiling an affordable capital programme are:

- to provide an ambitious and deliverable programme
- to minimise unaffordable revenue costs, mainly by avoiding unsupported expenditure.

Funding for capital schemes comes from a variety of sources. Significant capital grants are received annually from the departments for Transport and Education, in the expectation that they will be spend on maintaining and improving the schools and highways estates. Other funding, often relating to specific projects, comes from a variety of sources. Capital receipts can be used to fund capital expenditure, but where there are no unallocated capital receipts borrowing is necessary.

In developing the capital programme, the following are taken into account:

1. Existing schemes and funding sources: a large part of the capital programme relates to schemes started in previous years or where funding has been received in previous years and will be carried forward.
2. Additional capital schemes approved during the year.
3. Prioritising new and on-going schemes on a Council-wide basis to ensure the best outcomes for residents.
4. If a limit has to be applied to the amount of funding available in any year, the model may have to be developed to categorise schemes, for example into those that are Essential, Priority (short term), Priority (longer term) and Desirable, and to limit spend on scalable projects or programmes funded through prudential borrowing.
5. The prioritisation process gives a higher weighting to schemes which have funding secured. Where non-ringfenced capital grants are received there is a working assumption that they will be allocated to their natural home: for example DfT grants to highways, DfE grants to the schools capital programme.
6. Where a scheme does not have a funding source, priority is given to schemes which can provide their own funding. Where revenue or reserves cannot be identified, then it may be possible to identify future revenue savings or income streams which can be used to re-pay borrowing costs;
7. If there are unallocated capital receipts, these will be used to provide funding for higher priority unfunded schemes, or short life schemes where this gives a favourable MRP position.

The capital project marking guide(Annex 1) was reviewed by the Capital Quarterly Review Board in November 2022 and reflects the current priorities of the Council.

Norfolk County Council
Capital programme prioritisation 2022-27

Capital Annex 1 –Marking scheme – with marking guide

Allocation of resources will be based on ranking. Schemes will be included up to the point that funding is available. This might mean that projects are banded into different funding categories.

Although the prioritisation model has been broadly applied, it is primarily applicable to new projects and projects requiring the use of borrowing and/or capital receipts to provide funding.

Scoring Criteria				
	Heading	Reason	SCORE	Scoring guide - Enhanced
1	Stat or Regulatory duty	Is there a clearly identifiable requirement to meet statutory or regulatory obligations?	5	Specific and immediate statutory duty
			4	Statutory duty – but flexibility in its application
			3	Implied / indirect duty
			2	Project may enhance statutory provision
			1	Non NCC statutory duty
			0	No statutory duty addressed
2	CC Priorities (Strategic Fit)	Does the scheme directly contribute to the Council's vision, principles and corporate priorities?	5	Fundamental to the delivery of one or more Council Priorities, delivers revenue savings and promotes sustainability objectives
			4	Supports one or more Council Priorities
			3	Direct contributes to 1 Council Priority
			2	Indirect contribution to more than one priority
			1	Indirect contribution to one priority
			0	No contribution to priorities
3	Cross-service working (Ecological Priorities)	Will the scheme fulfil the objectives of more than one departmental service plan?	5	Delivers a reduction in carbon footprint for Norfolk
			4	Delivers a carbon neutral outcome for Norfolk
			3	Supports the delivery of carbon neutrality over the long term (3-5 years)
			2	Indirectly contributes toward reduction in carbon footprint
			1	No impact on carbon footprint
			0	Increases in carbon footprint in the short term
4	Deliverability / Methodology	Is the project realistically deliverable? Is there appropriate rationale for the chosen methodology?	5	Project is deliverable within stated timeframes using the identified methodology. A detailed and clear explanation has been given for why this methodology is being used.
			4	Project is deliverable within the timeframe and has provided adequate information for the use of the methodology
			3	Project is deliverable with minimal changes to the methodology
			2	Project is deliverable using a methodology different to the one proposed, but already identified by the applicant
			1	Project is deliverable but requires major changes to the methodology
			0	Project is not deliverable or the applicant has not provided enough information to make a judgement
5	Rationale / Need	What evidence has been submitted to confirm that this project is required?	5	Applicant has provided significant detail to confirm that the project is required. They have identified multiple sources of evidence.
			4	Applicant has provided considerable evidence of need
			3	Applicant has provided a good amount of evidence to suggest the project is needed
			2	Applicant has provided some evidence of need
			1	Applicant has provided inconsequential or arbitrary evidence of need
			0	Applicant has provided no evidence of need

Scoring Criteria				
	Heading	Reason	SCORE	Scoring guide - Enhanced
6	Impact on Council borrowing	What is the impact of this investment on NCC's borrowing Is prudential borrowing / capital receipt required (assume for this purpose that non-ring-fenced grants are applied to the natural recipient)?	5	Project has little or no impact on NCC's borrowing (net neutral)
			4	-
			3	Project has some effect of NCC's borrowing
			2	-
			1	Project has significant / excessive impact on NCC's borrowing
			0	Project has not provided enough information to make a judgement on the impact of borrowing
7	Value for Money	Does the project represent good value for money? Is there a significant return on NCC's investment? Does the project provide match funding?	5	Project has a significant return on investment and contributes towards recurrent revenue savings and is fully funded by external funding
			4	Project enables a modest return on investment contributes towards recurrent revenue savings with some recourse to NCC Borrowing but also utilises external match funding
			3	Project enables a modest return on investment contributes towards recurrent revenue savings with some recourse to NCC Borrowing but also utilises external match funding
			2	Project enables some process efficiencies, no savings in revenue budget but is funded by external match funding with minimal recourse to NCC borrowing
			1	Project enables some process efficiencies and is fully funded by NCC Borrowing
			0	Project is a must do with no return on investment and fully funded by NCC borrowing
9	Outputs/ Outcomes	What will be delivered using the funding? Is it achievable?	5	Applicant has provided well explained and detailed SMART outputs and outcomes that correlate with the delivery of the project and are realistic when compared with the budget.
			4	-
			3	Applicant has provided SMART outputs and outcomes with minimal information
			2	-
			1	Applicant has provided some detail on outputs/outcomes
			0	Applicant has not detailed outputs and outcomes
10	Mitigation of risk to service delivery	Does the project represent a mitigation of risks to Council's strategies and services? Are the risks to the project clearly articulated with mitigation plans in place?	5	Applicant has provided significant detail and shows clear and detailed contingency plans in place to manage risks, including roles and responsibilities
			4	Risk register and mitigation plans are complete
			3	Risk register and mitigation plans complete, but missing a maximum of one key risk
			2	Risk register and mitigation plans complete, but missing key risks identified by appraiser
			1	Applicant has identified some risk and mitigation but lacks sufficient detail
			0	Applicant has not provided any information relating to the risks of the project

Annex 2: Capital programme 2022-27 – prioritisation scores

The prioritisation scores below are based on scoring mechanism in Capital Annex 1. Schemes in Appendix D relate to one or more of the schemes below and exceed the minimum (dummy) reference bid of 50 points.

APPENDIX D			Stat or Regulatory duty	CC Priorities (Strategic Fit)	Cross-service working (Ecological Priorities)	Deliverability / Methodology	Rationale / Need	Impact on Council borrowing	Value for Money	Outputs/ Outcomes	Mitigation of risk to service delivery	Total Score
		Weighting	10	15	10	10	10	15	15	10	5	100
Scheme Title	Directorate	Question	5	5, 19, 20, 21	24	3, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16	4	10	11, 12, 13	6, 7	17, 18	
1 Million Trees for Norfolk	CES	Score	4	4	3	4	4	1	1	5	4	62
Installation of Breathing Apparatus (BA) set washer and dryer at Scottow	CES	Score	3	3	1	3	4	3	1	3	3	52
NFRS Welfare Provision	CES	Score	3	3	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	50
Replacement Operational Support Van	CES	Score	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	52
Sheringham and Wymondham Recycling Equipment	CES	Score	4	4	5	4	5	3	3	3	5	77
Wymondham Recycling Centre	CES	Score	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	79
Landfill Boreholes	CES	Score	4	3	3	4	4	3	1	5	2	63
Bracondale/King St Signalled Junction	Highways	Score	5	3	1	4	3	1	2	5	1	55
Ketteringham depot - Strategic Salt Store	Highways	Score	5	3	1	4	3	1	2	5	1	55
Norwich Bus Station - roof replacement	Highways	Score	5	3	2	4	3	3	2	5	1	63
Parish Partnership scheme -oversubscribed	Highways	Score	5	3	1	4	3	3	2	5	1	61
Weather stations - move Cromer's and 3 new stations	Highways	Score	5	3	1	4	3	3	2	5	1	61

APPENDIX D			Slat or Regulatory duty	CC Priorities (Strategic Fit)	Cross-service working (Ecological Priorities)	Deliverability / Methodology	Rationale / Need	Impact on Council borrowing	Value for Money	Outputs/ Outcomes	Mitigation of risk to service delivery	Total Score
		Weighting	10	15	10	10	10	15	15	10	5	100
Scheme Title	Directorate	Question	5	5, 19, 20, 21	24	3, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16	4	10	11, 12, 13	6, 7	17, 18	
CFAT Case Management System	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	4	0	3	4	3	3	3	5	61
County Farms Creek Farm Bridge Replacement	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	3	1	5	4	3	1	5	5	64
County Farms Estate – Access Roads Reconstructions	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	2	3	4	4	1	3	3	5	57
County Farms Estate – Agricultural Building Construction	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	2	4	5	4	1	3	3	5	61
County Farms Estate – Estate Developments	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	2	2	3	3	4	1	3	1	5	49
County Farms Estate – Farmhouse Refurbishments	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	2	3	4	4	1	2	3	5	54
County Farms Estate – Replacement Fossil Fuel Heating Systems	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	4	5	2	4	1	2	1	5	58
County Farms Estate – Statutory Protected Asset Maintenance	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	2	1	4	4	3	2	1	5	52
County Farms Estate – Yard Concreting Works	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	3	3	5	4	1	3	3	5	62
Estate Buildings Decarbonisation 23-24	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	5	4	5	3	4	1	1	3	5	63
Gressenhall Museum Fabric Maintenance	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	3	3	4	5	1	2	1	5	57
NFRS - Introduction of Local Exhaust Ventilation (LEV) Systems	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	5	4	1	3	5	1	2	3	5	60
NFRS - Mobile Phones for Fire Engines	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	4	0	5	4	1	3	4	5	63
NFRS – Station Accessibility Improvements	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	5	3	1	4	4	3	1	3	4	59
Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service Station End Equipment Refresh	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	3	1	3	3	1	2	5	2	52
Norfolk Records Office Heating System Replacement	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	4	4	3	4	3	1	3	5	65
Provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure on NCC Estate	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	3	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	71
Scottow Park	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	4	3	3	4	4	1	4	5	2	66
Technology Improvement Programme 2025/26	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	4	3	3	3	1	2	3	1	52
Technology Transformation Programme 25/2	Finance and Commercial Services	Score	3	4	3	3	3	1	2	3	1	52

Appendix C: Capital programme 2022-27 – new and existing schemes £m

Services/Projects	22-23 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	22-23 Grants and Contributions	22-23 Revenue Contributions	23-24 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	23-24 Grants and Contributions	24-25 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	24-25 Grants and Contributions	25-26 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	25-26 Grants and Contributions	26-27 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	26-27 Grants and Contributions	TOTAL
Adult Social Care	4.83	9.30	0.00	11.03	1.44	21.15	1.33	14.96	0.44	13.20	0.00	77.69
Community - Equipment and Assistive Technology	3.18	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.20	0.00	3.20	0.00	3.20	0.00	15.78
Disabled Facilities Grant	0.00	9.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.17
Living Well - Homes for Norfolk	1.37	0.14	0.00	7.02	1.23	17.95	1.33	11.76	0.44	10.00	0.00	51.25
Social Care Information System	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48
Social Care unallocated	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.01
Children's Services	8.69	30.24	0.05	35.44	82.86	41.06	20.27	21.32	0.00	25.09	11.20	276.21
Children's Homes/Residential Premises	0.12	0.00	0.00	1.87	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	4.99
Children's Services	0.12	0.86	0.00	0.90	16.29	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.27
Schools Basic Needs	2.38	17.76	0.05	4.56	56.83	2.06	20.03	0.32	0.00	0.00	11.20	115.20
Schools Capital Maintenance	2.84	2.84	0.00	0.10	8.85	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.76
SEND Transformation and Provision	3.23	8.78	0.00	28.01	0.88	38.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	24.09	0.00	122.99
Finance & Commercial Services	49.91	0.24	0.00	50.58	0.00	15.99	0.00	9.79	0.00	1.48	0.00	127.99
Children's Homes/Residential Premises	1.61	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.07
Corporate Office Maintenance	10.82	0.00	0.00	10.25	0.00	3.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.72
County Farms	6.32	0.00	0.00	4.42	0.00	1.36	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.49
County Hall Refurbishment	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.21
CPT Minor Works	0.76	0.00	0.00	1.66	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.25
Electric Pool Cars	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06
Finance and HR systems	6.95	0.00	0.00	1.30	0.00	0.99	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.59	0.00	10.43
Fire Property Maintenance	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50
ICT Refresh and System Upgrades	11.20	0.24	0.00	7.46	0.00	8.63	0.00	8.32	0.00	0.50	0.00	36.36
Libraries Community Hub	1.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.85
Licensing and ICT Capital Improvements	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.30	0.00	1.50
Museums and Historic Building Maintenance	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.08	0.00	1.41
Norse and other NCC subsidiaries loan facilities	6.25	0.00	0.00	18.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.82
Offices Carbon Reduction Initiatives	0.35	0.00	0.00	4.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
Social Infrastructure & Environment Policy	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.31
Strategy and Governance	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43
Licensing and ICT Capital Improvements	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.43

Appendix C (cont)

Services/Projects	22-23 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	22-23 Grants and Contributions	22-23 Revenue Contributions	23-24 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	23-24 Grants and Contributions	24-25 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	24-25 Grants and Contributions	25-26 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	25-26 Grants and Contributions	26-27 NCC Borrowing and Capital Receipts	26-27 Grants and Contributions	TOTAL
Community & Environmental Services	41.51	138.23	0.15	101.08	68.62	47.80	85.35	24.86	139.83	8.45	102.37	758.24
Better Broadband	0.01	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.63
Capital Loans- Scottow Enterprise Park				1.07		2.50		0.00		0.00		3.57
Environment & Greenways	3.37	0.00	0.00	1.14	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.01
Environment and Greenways	0.12			0.18		0.19						0.49
Fire Appliances and Equipment	0.53	0.01	0.00	1.15	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.71
Fire Property Maintenance	1.22	0.00	0.00	2.18	0.00	1.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.65
Fire Vehicle Replacements	4.69	0.00	0.00	11.10	0.00	12.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.13
Great Yarmouth O&M Campus	2.02	0.00	0.00	8.94	8.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.82
GRT - Site Improvements	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRT- Site Improvements	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	2.58
Highways Capital Improvements	0.19	0.53	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.18
Highways DfT Grant Funded Works	8.05	81.31	0.12	11.55	48.16	3.95	68.12	10.64	139.83	4.05	102.36	478.13
Highways Structural Maintenance	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20
HLP Castle Keep	2.66	2.36	0.00	0.00	3.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.06
ICT Refresh and System Upgrades								8.22				8.22
LED replacement	2.12	0.00	0.00	3.60	0.00	7.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.22
Libraries Community Hub	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.00	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00
Library Replacement Schemes	1.41	0.33	0.00	3.82	0.75	0.70	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.70	0.02	8.43
Licensing and ICT Capital Improvements	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03
Local Safety Schemes & Resurfacing	5.16	5.56	0.02	13.70	0.00	6.07	0.00	2.63	0.00	0.35	0.00	33.50
Major Highways Schemes	0.00	47.11	0.00	21.80	7.79	2.03	17.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	95.96
Museums and Historic Building Maintenance	0.90	0.30	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.68
Norfolk Infrastructure Projects	0.44	0.00	0.00	2.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.23
Offices Carbon Reduction Initiatives	0.08			0.26		0.27						0.61
Replacement HWRC	2.20	0.10	0.00	8.89	0.00	4.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.37
Road Drainage	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.28
Social Infrastructure & Environment Policy	2.53	0.00	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.38
Wensum Lodge Development	0.06	0.00	0.00	2.15	0.00	3.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.71
Scottow Enterprise Park - NCC Contribution	2.35	0.00	0.00	2.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.18	0.00	2.85	0.00	9.48
Grand Total	105.37	178.01	0.20	198.14	152.92	125.99	106.94	70.93	140.27	48.21	113.58	1,240.55

Appendix D: New and extended capital schemes

Proposed new schemes added to the capital programme are listed below:

Scheme Title	Directorate	FINANCIAL YEARS						TOTAL
		2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	
NFRS Welfare Provision	CES	0.050						0.050
Replacement Operational Support Van	CES		0.040					0.040
Installation of Breathing Apparatus (BA) set washer and dryer at Scottow	CES	0.046						0.046
1 Million Trees for Norfolk	CES	0.123	0.182	0.185				0.490
Wymondham Recycling Centre	CES		0.300					0.300
Sheringham and Wymondham Recycling Equipment	CES		0.189					0.189
Landfill Boreholes	CES		0.020					0.020
Library Stock Replenishment	CES			0.700	0.700	0.700		2.100
Ash Die Back	CES			0.500				0.500
Provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure on NCC Estate	Finance and Commercial Services	0.079	0.122					0.201
County Farms Estate – Yard Concreting Works	Finance and Commercial Services		0.457					0.457
County Farms Estate – Agricultural Building Construction	Finance and Commercial Services		1.040					1.040
County Farms Estate – Access Roads Reconstructions	Finance and Commercial Services		0.425					0.425
County Farms Estate – Farmhouse Refurbishments	Finance and Commercial Services		0.532					0.532
County Farms Estate – Replacement Fossil Fuel Heating Systems	Finance and Commercial Services		0.372	0.383	0.394			1.149
County Farms Estate – Statutory Protected Asset Maintenance	Finance and Commercial Services	0.216						0.216
County Farms Estate – Estate Developments	Finance and Commercial Services		1.035	0.820				1.855
NFRS - Introduction of Local Exhaust Ventilation (LEV) Systems	Finance and Commercial Services		0.736	1.234				1.970
County Farms Creek Farm Bridge Replacement	Finance and Commercial Services		0.398					0.398
Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service Station End Equipment Refresh	Finance and Commercial Services		0.850					0.850

Appendix D (cont)

Scheme Title	Directorate	FINANCIAL YEARS						TOTAL
		2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	
Technology Improvement Programme 2025/26	Finance and Commercial Services				5.936			5.936
Technology Transformation Programme 25/2	Finance and Commercial Services				2.280			2.280
Norfolk Records Office Heating System Replacement	Finance and Commercial Services		0.141	0.272				0.412
Gressenhall Museum Fabric Maintenance	Finance and Commercial Services		0.275	0.232	0.185	0.083		0.775
NFRS – Station Accessibility Improvements	Finance and Commercial Services		0.150					0.150
CFAT Case Management System	Finance and Commercial Services	0.041		0.003	0.013			0.057
Estate Buildings Decarbonisation 23-24	Finance and Commercial Services		4.000					4.000
NFRS - Mobile Phones for Fire Engines	Finance and Commercial Services	0.080						0.080
Scottow Park	Finance and Commercial Services		1.072	2.498	2.175	2.845		8.590
HR and Finance Replacement Systems - Phase 2	Finance and Commercial Services	2.511	0.835	0.532	0.132	0.132		4.143
Capital Management recharges	Finance and Commercial Services		0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300		1.200
Parish Partnership scheme - oversubscribed	Highways		0.450					0.450
Weather stations - move Cromer's and 3 new stations	Highways		0.100					0.100
Bracondale/King St Signalled Junction	Highways		0.500	0.500				1.000
Norwich Bus Station - roof replacement	Highways		0.250					0.250
Ketteringham depot - Strategic Salt Store	Highways		0.050	0.700				0.750
Local Members Schemes	Highways		0.084	0.084	0.084	0.084		0.336
		3.145	14.904	8.943	12.200	4.144	0.000	43.336

Report to Cabinet

Item No.5 Annexe 3

Report Title: Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24

Date of Meeting: 30 January 2023

Responsible Cabinet Member: Cllr Andrew Jamieson (Cabinet Member for Finance)

Responsible Director: Simon George (Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services)

Is this a Key Decision? Yes

If this is a Key Decision, date added to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions: 31 March 2022

Introduction from Cabinet Member

It is a regulatory requirement for local authorities to produce an Investment and Treasury Strategy for the year ahead. The Strategy forms an important part of the overall management of the Council's finances; setting out the criteria for choosing investment counterparties and managing the authority's underlying need to borrow for capital purposes.

Executive Summary

In accordance with regulatory requirements, this report presents the Council's borrowing and investment strategies for 2023-24

Recommendations:

Cabinet is asked to endorse and recommend to County Council the Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy for 2023-24 as set out in Annex 1, including:

- The Capital Prudential Indicators included in the body of the report
- The Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2023-24 in Appendix 1
- The list of approved counterparties at Appendix 4
- The Treasury Management Prudential Indicators detailed in Appendix 5

For inclusion within the policy framework

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. This Treasury Management Report forms an important part of the overall management of the Council's financial affairs. The regulatory environment places responsibility on Member for the review and scrutiny of treasury management policy and activity.

2. Proposals

- 2.1. The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA's) Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services (the Code) requires local authorities to produce a treasury management strategy for the year ahead. The County Council is required to comply with the Code through regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 and has adopted specific clauses and policy statements from the Code as part of its Financial Regulations.
- 2.2. Complementary to the CIPFA Code is the Department of Levelling Up Housing and Communities' (DLUHC's) Investment Guidance, which requires local authorities to produce an Annual Investment Strategy and an annual Capital Strategy.
- 2.3. This report combines the reporting requirements of both the CIPFA Code and the DLUHC's Investment Guidance.

3. Impact of the Proposal

- 3.1. This report presents the Council's borrowing and investment strategies for 2023-24 providing the framework for managing the capital borrowing requirement within prudential and financially sustainable limits.
- 3.2. Given the upward trend in the Bank of England base interest rates, coupled with economic uncertainties, borrowing rates are forecast to increase in 2023-24. A flexible approach to borrowing for capital purposes will be maintained which avoids the "cost of carrying debt" in the short term, whilst taking advantage of dips in borrowing rates, where possible, to secure long-term savings on the cost of borrowing.
- 3.3. The proposed investment strategy retains a diversified pool of high-quality counterparties with a maximum deposit duration of three years apart from property funds which, if used would be part of a longer-term investment strategy. No new counterparties have been added to the list.

4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision

- 4.1. The primary objectives of the Council's Investment and Treasury Strategy are to safeguard the timely repayment of principal and interest, whilst ensuring adequate liquidity for cashflow and the generation of investment yield. A flexible approach to borrowing for capital purposes will be maintained both in terms of timing, and in terms of possible sources of borrowing including the Public Work Loans Board (PWLb) and the UK Municipal Bonds Agency (UKMBA). This strategy is prudent while

investment returns are low and the investment environment remains challenging.

The Investment and Treasury Strategy summarises:

- The Council's capital plans (including prudential indicators);
- A Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy (how residual capital expenditure is charged to revenue over time);
- The Treasury Management Strategy (how the investments and borrowings are organised) including treasury indicators; and
- An Investment Strategy (including parameters on how investments are to be managed).

5. Alternative Options

- 5.1. In order to achieve sound treasury management in accordance with the statutory and other guidance, no viable alternative options have been identified to the recommendation in this report.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1. Long term borrowing rates have steadily risen throughout 2022 as the Bank of England's Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) voted to increase the Bank Rate from 0.75% in March 2022 to 3.5% at the recent MPC meeting on 15 December 2022. This consistent rise in interest rates signals the MPC's commitment to using interest rates to counteract the inflationary pressures in the economy and bring inflation back down to its 2% target. Whilst inflation rates remain in double digits, the expectation is for interest rates to continue to rise in 2023-24.
- 6.2. To fund future capital expenditure, officers will continue to work with the Council's treasury advisors to identify the most advantageous timing and sources of borrowing.
- 6.3. At 31 December 2022, the Council's external debt was £852.0m, having borrowed £10m to date since April 2022, securing long term borrowing at fixed rates of 3.56% interest rate trigger point and securing £0.386m savings on the cost of carrying debt. The Council is looking to borrow a further £40m this year to meet the capital financing requirements of the capital programme.
- 6.4. The MRP policy remains unchanged and is designed to ensure sufficient money is set aside to repay the Council's debt.

7. Resource Implications

- 7.1. There are no direct staff, property or IT implications arising from this report.

8. Other Implications

- 8.1. **Legal Implications**

In order to fulfil obligations placed on chief finance officers by section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services continually monitors financial forecasts and outcomes to ensure resources (including sums borrowed) are available to meet annual expenditure.

8.2. Human Rights implications

None identified.

8.3. Equality Impact Assessment

Treasury management activities take place to manage the cashflows relating to the Council's revenue and capital budgets. In setting the 2023-24 budget, the council has undertaken public consultation. This public consultation process has informed an equality impact assessment in respect of both the 2023-24 Budget proposals and the Council's Budget as a whole. In addition, councillors have considered the impact of proposals on rural areas.

8.4 Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA)

DPIA is not required as the data reported in this paper does not drill down to the personal data level.

9. Risk Implications/Assessment

- 9.1. The Investment and Borrowing Strategy presented in this report for approval, forms an important part of the overall financial management of the Council's affairs. The strategy has been produced in accordance with best practice and guidance and in consultation with the Council's external treasury advisors.

The Council's Treasury Management Strategy sets parameters for the selection and placing of cash balances, taking in account counterparty risk and liquidity. The strategy also sets out how the Council manages interest rate risks.

10. Select Committee comments

- 10.1. None

11. Recommendation

- 11.1. Recommendations are set out in the introduction to this report.

12. Background Papers

- 12.1. Capital Strategy and Programme 2022-23 on this agenda.

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: **Joanne Fernandez
Graham**

Tel No.: **01603 306228**

Email address: j.fernandezgraham@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Treasury Management Strategy

including

Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement and
Annual Investment Strategy

2023-24

Note: the tables in this report will be amended to reflect any changes to the capital programme between this meeting and February County Council

INDEX

1	Introduction	8
1.1	Background.....	8
1.2	Reporting requirements.....	8
1.3	Treasury Management Strategy for 2023-24	11
1.4	Training	11
1.5	Treasury management consultants	12
2	The Capital Prudential Indicators 2023-24 – 2025-26.....	13
2.1	Capital expenditure.....	13
2.2	The Council's borrowing need (the Capital Financing Requirement).....	14
2.3	Liability Benchmark.....	15
2.4	Core funds and expected investment balances	15
2.5	Minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy statement.....	16
3	Borrowing	18
3.1	Current portfolio position.....	18
3.2	Treasury Indicators: limits to borrowing activity	20
3.3	Prospects for interest rates.....	21
3.4	Borrowing strategy.....	23
3.5	Policy on borrowing in advance of need	24
3.6	Debt rescheduling.....	24
3.7	New Financial Institutions as a Source of Borrowing and Types of Borrowing	24
3.8	Approved Sources of Long and Short-term Borrowing	25
4	Annual investment strategy.....	26
4.1	Investment policy – management of risk	26
4.2	Creditworthiness policy.....	28
4.3	Other limits	31
4.4	Investment strategy	31
4.5	Investment risk benchmarking	32
4.6	Non-treasury investments	33
4.7	End of year investment report	33
5	Appendices.....	34
	Appendix 1 - Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2023-24	35
	Appendix 2 - Ratings comparative analysis	36
	Appendix 3 - Indicative List of Approved Counterparties for Lending	37
	Appendix 4: Time and monetary limits applying to investments	38
	Appendix 5: The Capital and Treasury Prudential Indicators	40
	Appendix 6: Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) - Credit and counterparty risk management	44
	Appendix 7: Approved Countries for Investments (as at 2 December 2022)	47
	Appendix 8: Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation	48
	Appendix 9: The Treasury Management Role of the Section 151 Officer	49
	Appendix 10: Non-treasury investments	51

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Council is required to operate a balanced budget, which broadly means that cash raised during the year will meet cash expenditure. Part of the treasury management operation is to ensure that this cash flow is adequately planned, with cash being available when it is needed. Surplus monies are invested in low risk counterparties or instruments commensurate with the Council's low risk appetite, providing adequate liquidity initially before considering investment return.

The second main function of the treasury management service is the funding of the Council's capital plans. These capital plans provide a guide to the borrowing need of the Council, essentially the longer-term cash flow planning, to ensure that the Council can meet its capital spending obligations. This management of longer-term cash may involve arranging long or short-term loans or using longer-term cash flow surpluses. On occasion, when it is prudent and economic, any debt previously drawn may be restructured to meet Council risk or cost objectives.

The contribution the treasury management function makes to the authority is critical, as the balance of debt and investment operations ensure liquidity or the ability to meet spending commitments as they fall due, either on day-to-day revenue or for larger capital projects. The treasury operations will see a balance of the interest costs of debt and the investment income arising from cash deposits affecting the available budget. Since cash balances generally result from reserves and balances, it is paramount to ensure adequate security of the sums invested, as a loss of principal will in effect result in a loss to the General Fund Balance.

CIPFA defines treasury management as:

"The management of the local authority's borrowing, investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks."

Whilst any commercial initiatives or loans to third parties will impact on the treasury function, these activities are generally classed as non-treasury activities, (arising usually from capital expenditure), and are separate from the day to day treasury management activities.

1.2 Reporting requirements

1.2.1 Capital Strategy

The CIPFA 2021 Prudential and Treasury Management Codes require all local authorities to prepare a Capital Strategy report which will provide the following:

- a high-level long-term overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contribute to the provision of services
- an overview of how the associated risk is managed
- the implications for future financial sustainability.

The aim of the Capital Strategy is to ensure that all elected members understand the overall long-term policy objectives and resulting capital strategy requirements, governance procedures and risk appetite.

The Capital Strategy is reported separately from this Treasury Management Strategy Statement. Non-treasury investments including loans to companies are reported through the Capital Strategy and Finance Monitoring Report, with summary information included in Treasury Management reports. This is to ensure separation of the core treasury function under security, liquidity and yield principles, and other investments, including loans to subsidiary and other companies which are usually driven by expenditure on assets for service delivery and related purposes.

Depending on the nature of any particular project, the capital strategy will cover:

- Strategic context
- Corporate priorities
- Capital investment ambition
- Available resources
- Affordability
- Capacity to deliver
- Risk appetite
- Risk management; and
- Determining the appropriate split between non-financial and treasury management investment, in the context of ensuring the long-term financial sustainability of the authority

Where a physical asset is being bought, details of market research, advisers used, (and their monitoring), ongoing costs and investment requirements and any credit information will be disclosed, including the ability to sell the asset and realise the investment cash.

Where the Council has borrowed to fund any non-treasury investment, there should also be an explanation of why borrowing was required and why the DLUHC Investment Guidance and CIPFA Prudential Code have not been adhered to.

Norfolk County Council does not hold any non-treasury and/or non-financial investments which are designed purely to generate a financial return: all non-treasury investments, for, example loans to subsidiaries and companies for Norfolk based projects and/or to support subsidiary companies fund their capital investment plans, and all have been approved as part of the capital strategy and programme.

To demonstrate the proportionality between the treasury operations and the non-treasury operation, high-level comparators are shown in this report.

1.2.2 Treasury Management reporting

The Council is currently required to receive and approve, as a minimum, three main treasury reports each year, which incorporate a variety of policies, estimates and actuals:

- a. **Prudential and treasury indicators and treasury strategy** (this report) - The first, and most important report is forward looking and covers:
 - the capital plans (including prudential indicators);
 - a minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy, (how residual capital expenditure is charged to revenue over time);
 - the Treasury Management Strategy, (how the investments and borrowings are to be organised), including treasury indicators; and
 - an Annual Investment Strategy, (the parameters on how investments are to be managed).
- b. **A mid-year treasury management report** – This is primarily a progress report and will update members on the capital position, amending prudential indicators as necessary, and whether any policies require revision. In addition the Council will receive quarterly update reports.
- c. **An annual treasury report** – This is a backward-looking review document and provides details of a selection of actual prudential and treasury indicators and actual treasury operations compared to the estimates within the strategy.

Scrutiny

The above reports are required to be adequately scrutinised before being recommended to the Council. This role is undertaken by the Council's Treasury Management Panel and Cabinet.

Quarterly reports – In addition to the three major reports detailed above, from 2023/24 quarterly reporting (end of June/end of December) is also required. However, these additional reports do not have to be reported to Full Council/Board but do require to be adequately scrutinised. This role is undertaken by the Cabinet.

Scheme of Delegation

A summary of the Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation is at Appendix 8, with the Treasury Management role of the Section 151 Officer at Appendix 9.

1.3 Treasury Management Strategy for 2023-24

The strategy covers two main areas:

Capital issues

- capital expenditure plans and the associated prudential indicators;
- minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy (paragraph 2.4 and Appendix 1).

Treasury management issues

- the current treasury position;
- treasury indicators which limit the treasury risk and activities of the Council;
- prospects for interest rates;
- the borrowing strategy;
- policy on borrowing in advance of need;
- debt rescheduling;
- the investment strategy;
- creditworthiness policy; and
- the policy on use of external service providers.

These elements cover the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, DLUHC Investment Guidance, DLUHC MRP Guidance, the CIPFA Prudential Code and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code.

1.4 Training

The CIPFA Code requires the responsible officer to ensure that members with responsibility for treasury management receive adequate training in treasury management. This especially applies to members responsible for scrutiny. Training has been provided to members at the December 2022 Treasury Management Panel, and further training will be arranged as required.

In accordance with the CIPFA Code, the Council

- records and monitors attendance at Link training webinars
- prepares tailored learning plans for treasury management officers and board/council members where necessary.
- requires treasury management officers and board/council members to undertake self-assessment against the required competencies using the CIPFA “Assessment of Effective Scrutiny” self assessment tool 2022
- has regular communication with officers and board/council members through the Treasury Management Panel, encouraging them to highlight training needs on an ongoing basis.

The training needs of treasury management officers are periodically reviewed.

A formal record of the training received by officers central to the Treasury function and members of the Treasury Management Panel will be maintained by the Treasury and Banking Accountant.

1.5 Treasury management consultants

The Council uses Link Group, Treasury solutions as its external treasury management advisors.

The Council recognises that responsibility for treasury management decisions remains with the organisation at all times and will ensure that undue reliance is not placed upon the services of our external service providers. All decisions will be undertaken with regards to all available information, including, but not solely, our treasury advisers.

It also recognises that there is value in employing external providers of treasury management services in order to acquire access to specialist skills and resources. Through a competitive tender in 2019, the Council has ensured that the terms of their appointment and the methods by which their value will be assessed are properly agreed and documented and subject to regular review.

2 The Capital Prudential Indicators 2023-24 – 2025-26

The Council's capital expenditure plans are the key driver of treasury management activity. The output of the capital expenditure plans is reflected in the prudential indicators, which are designed to assist members' overview and confirm capital expenditure plans.

2.1 Capital expenditure

This prudential indicator is a summary of the Council's capital expenditure plans, both those agreed previously, and those forming part of this budget cycle.

Members are asked to approve the capital expenditure forecasts:

Capital expenditure £m	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Services	241.536	249.139	342.254	231.134	211.196
Capital loans to group and other companies	11.178	4.000	8.800	1.800	0.000
Infrastructure loans to third parties	2.155	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	254.869	253.139	351.054	232.934	211.196

Other long-term liabilities - The above financing need excludes other long-term liabilities, such as PFI and leasing arrangements that already include borrowing instruments.

The table below summarises the above capital expenditure plans and how these plans are being financed by capital or revenue resources. Any shortfall of resources results in a funding/borrowing need.

Financing of capital expenditure £m	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Capital grants	131.832	178.013	153.217	106.943	140.268
Revenue and reserves	2.840	0.199			
Capital receipts	8.993	24.000	20.000	10.000	10.000
Prudential borrowing	111.204	50.927	177.837	115.991	60.928
Capital programme	254.869	253.139	351.054	232.934	211.196
Estimated slippage			(100.000)	(55.000)	(30.000)
Cumulative slippage	0.000	0.000	(100.000)	(155.000)	(185.000)
New borrowing requirement after slippage	111.204	50.927	77.837	60.991	30.928
Net financing need for the year	254.869	253.139	251.054	177.934	181.196

Slippage has been incorporated into the calculations in line with historic patterns of capital spend and the Q3 Capital Programme Review undertaken by the Capital Review Board. Although members approve capital programmes based on annual expenditure, it is not uncommon for projects to be delayed due to, for example, planning issues. In addition, where grants become available, these will be used ahead of borrowing to fund projects.

To better reflect actual likely expenditure, and to help avoid the risk of borrowing in advance of need, an adjustment for slippage has been incorporated into the calculations shown in this strategy.

2.2 The Council's borrowing need (the Capital Financing Requirement)

The second prudential indicator is the Council's Capital Financing Requirement (CFR). The CFR is simply the total historic outstanding capital expenditure which has not yet been paid for from either revenue or capital resources. It is essentially a measure of the Council's indebtedness and so its underlying borrowing need. Any capital expenditure shown in paragraph 2.1 above, which has not immediately been paid for through a revenue or capital resource, will increase the CFR.

The CFR does not increase indefinitely, as the minimum revenue provision (MRP) is a statutory annual revenue charge which broadly reduces the indebtedness in line with each asset's life, and so charges the economic consumption of capital assets as they are used.

The CFR includes any other long-term liabilities (e.g. PFI schemes, finance leases). Whilst these increase the CFR, and therefore the Council's borrowing requirement, these types of scheme include a borrowing facility by the PFI, PPP lease provider and so the Council is not required to separately borrow for these schemes. The Council currently has £43.6m of such schemes within the CFR.

The Council is asked to approve the CFR projections below:

£m	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Opening CFR	887.047	969.763	987.695	1,029.268	1,051.161
Other Financing Adjustments	(0.042)				
Net financing need for the year (above)	111.204	50.927	77.837	60.991	30.928
Less MRP and other financing movements	(28.446)	(32.995)	(36.264)	(39.098)	(40.677)
Movement in CFR	82.716	17.932	41.573	21.893	(9.749)
Closing CFR	969.763	987.695	1,029.268	1,051.161	1,041.412

A key aspect of the regulatory and professional guidance is that elected members are aware of the size and scope of any commercial activity in relation to the authority's overall financial position.


The capital expenditure figures shown in 2.1 and the details above demonstrate the scope of this activity and, by approving these figures, consider the scale proportionate to the Authority's remaining activity.

In line with the Capital Strategy, the external borrowing requirement planned in conformance with the new DLUHC requirements for applying for certainty rate borrowing from the PWLB is:

External borrowing £m	2021/22 Actual	2022/23 Estimate	2023/24 Estimate	2024/25 Estimate	2025/26 Estimate
Service spend	97.871	46.927	69.037	59.191	30.928
Housing	11.178	4.000	8.800	1.800	0.000
Regeneration	2.155	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Preventative action					
Treasury Management					
TOTAL	111.204	50.927	77.837	60.991	30.928

2.3 Liability Benchmark

A third and new prudential indicator for 2023/24 is the Liability Benchmark (LB). The Authority is required to estimate and measure the LB for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years, as a minimum.



There are four components to the LB: -

1. **Existing loan debt outstanding:** the Authority's existing loans that are still outstanding in future years.
2. **Loans CFR:** this is calculated in accordance with the loans CFR definition in the Prudential Code and projected into the future based on approved prudential borrowing and planned MRP.
3. **Net loans requirement:** this will show the Authority's gross loan debt less treasury management investments at the last financial year-end, projected into the future and based on its approved prudential borrowing, planned MRP and any other major cash flows forecast.
4. **Liability benchmark** (or gross loans requirement): this equals net loans requirement plus short-term liquidity allowance.

2.4 Core funds and expected investment balances

The application of resources (capital receipts, reserves etc.) to either finance capital expenditure or other budget decisions to support the revenue budget will have an ongoing impact on investments unless resources are supplemented each year from new sources (asset sales etc.). Detailed below are estimates of the

year-end balances for each resource and anticipated day-to-day cash flow balances.

Year End Resources £m	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Opening investments	210.940	267.973	241.039	218.203	202.212
Net (use) of reserves, capital grants, working capital etc.	58.237	(26.007)	(10.000)	(5.000)	(5.000)
Capital expenditure funded through prudential borrowing	(111.204)	(50.927)	(77.837)	(60.991)	(30.928)
New Borrowing	110.000	50.000	65.000	50.000	20.000
Closing investments	267.973	241.039	218.203	202.212	186.283

2.5 Minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy statement

Under Regulation 27 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003, The Council is required to pay off an element of the accumulated General Fund capital spend each year (the CFR) through a revenue charge (the minimum revenue provision - MRP). It is also allowed to undertake additional voluntary payments if required (voluntary revenue provision - VRP).

DLUHC regulations have been issued which require the full Council to approve **an MRP Statement** in advance of each year. A variety of options are provided to councils, so long as there is a prudent provision.

For expenditure incurred before 1 April 2008 which forms part of supported capital expenditure, the MRP policy will be:

- **4% reducing balance (CFR method)** – MRP will be calculated as 4% of the opening GF CFR balance;

From 1 April 2008 for all unsupported borrowing the MRP policy will be:

- **Asset life method (straight line)** – MRP will be based on the estimated life of the assets;

Capital expenditure incurred during 2022/23 will not be subject to an MRP charge until 2023/24, or in the year after the asset becomes operational

The Authority will apply the asset life method for any expenditure capitalised under a Capitalisation Direction.

There is no requirement on the HRA to make a minimum revenue provision but there is a requirement for a charge for depreciation to be made.

MRP in respect of assets acquired under Finance Leases or PFI will be charged at an amount equal to the principal element of the annual repayment;

For capital expenditure on loans to third parties where the principal element of the loan is being repaid in annual instalments, the capital receipts arising from the principal loan repayments will be used to reduce the CFR instead of MRP.

Where no principal repayment is made in a given year, MRP will be charged at a rate in line with the life of the assets funded by the loan.

MRP Overpayments - Under the MRP guidance, any charges made in excess of the statutory MRP can be made, known as voluntary revenue provision (VRP).

VRP can be reclaimed in later years if deemed necessary or prudent. In order for these amounts to be reclaimed for use in the budget, this policy must disclose the cumulative overpayment made each year.


Cumulative VRP overpayments made to date are £1.173m.

The Council's MRP Statement has been updated after having regard to the MRP Guidance and takes into account the addition of right-of-use assets which will result from the impact of IFRS16 which will affect the Council's accounts in 2023-24.

3 Borrowing

The capital expenditure plans set out in Section 2 provide details of the service activity of the Council. The treasury management function ensures that the Council's cash is organised in accordance with the relevant professional codes, so that sufficient cash is available to meet this service activity and the Council's capital strategy. This will involve both the organisation of the cash flow and, where capital plans require, the organisation of appropriate borrowing facilities. The strategy covers the relevant treasury / prudential indicators, the current and projected debt positions and the annual investment strategy.

The table below summarises the Council's historic capital financing requirement and borrowing:



3.1 Current portfolio position

The overall treasury management portfolio as at 31 March 2022 and for 30 November 2022 is shown below for both borrowing and investments.

	31 March 2022	30 November 2022
Treasury Investments		
Banks	230.0	205.0
Local authorities	0.1	0.2
Money Market funds	37.5	94.1
	267.6	299.3
Treasury external borrowing		
PWLB	811.9	804.2
Commercial (including LOBOs)	42.3	42.3
	854.2	846.5
Net-treasury borrowing	586.6	547.2

Note: the 31 March column above is reconciled to the Council's Statement of Accounts by adjusting for uncleared BACS payments on balances, and accrued interest on loans.

At the end of November 2022 the bank deposits were with Barclays, Natwest, Close

Brothers, Goldmans Sachs, Australia New Zealand Bank, Toronto-Dominion Bank, DBS Bank and Landesbank Baden-Wuerttemberg and the Money Market Funds with Aberdeen, Federated and Aviva. At 30 November there is £120m invested in non-uk banks.

The Council's forward projections for borrowing are summarised below. The table shows the actual external debt, against the underlying capital borrowing need, (the Capital Financing Requirement - CFR), highlighting any over or under borrowing.

£m	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Debt at 1 April	749.274	854.243	888.917	935.045	961.626
Expected change in Debt - repayments	(5.031)	(15.326)	(18.872)	(23.419)	(23.466)
Expected change in Debt – new borrowing	110.000	50.000	65.000	50.000	20.000
Debt at 31 March	854.243	888.917	935.045	961.626	958.160
Other long-term liabilities (OLTL) 1 April	48.170	46.962	43.601	40.073	36.212
Expected change in OLTL	(1.208)	(3.361)	(3.528)	(3.861)	(4.181)
OLTL forecast	46.962	43.601	40.073	36.212	32.031
Gross debt at 31 March	901.205	932.518	975.118	997.838	990.191
The Capital Financing Requirement	969.763	987.695	1,029.268	1,051.161	1,041.412
Under / (over) borrowing	68.558	55.177	54.150	53.323	51.221

Within the range of prudential indicators there are a number of key indicators to ensure that the Council operates its activities within well-defined limits. One of these is that the Council needs to ensure that its gross debt does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of the CFR in the preceding year plus the estimates of any additional CFR for 2022-23 and the following two financial years. This allows some flexibility for limited early borrowing for future years but ensures that borrowing is not undertaken for revenue or speculative purposes.

The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services reports that the Council complied with this prudential indicator in the current year and does not envisage difficulties for the future. This view takes into account current commitments, existing plans, and the proposals in this budget report.

3.2 Treasury Indicators: limits to borrowing activity


The operational boundary. This is the limit beyond which external debt is not normally expected to exceed. In most cases, this would be a similar figure to the CFR, but may be lower or higher depending on the levels of actual debt and the ability to fund under-borrowing by other cash resources.

Operational boundary £m	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Debt	905.340	964.195	989.195	1,014.949	1,009.381
Other long-term liabilities	45.965	44.476	40.073	36.212	32.031
Total CFR	951.305	1008.671	1,029.268	1,051.161	1,041.412

The authorised limit for external debt. This is a key prudential indicator and represents a control on the maximum level of borrowing. This represents a legal limit beyond which external debt is prohibited, and this limit needs to be set or revised by the full Council. It reflects the level of external debt which reflects the total approved capital expenditure, plus an allowance for schemes which may be approved in-year:

1. This is the statutory limit determined under section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003. The Government retains an option to control either the total of all councils' plans, or those of a specific council, although this power has not yet been exercised.
2. The Council is asked to approve the following authorised limit:

Authorised limit £m	2021-22 Target	2022-23 Target	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Debt	950.607	1012.405	1,038.654	1,065.696	1,059.850
Other long-term liabilities	48.263	48.923	44.080	39.833	35.234
Total	998.870	1,061.328	1,082.735	1,105.529	1,095.084



3.3 Prospects for interest rates

The Council has appointed Link Group as its treasury advisor and part of their service is to assist the Council to formulate a view on interest rates. Link provided the following forecasts on 8th November 2022. These are forecasts for certainty rates, gilt yields plus 80 bps:

Link Group Interest Rate View	08.11.22												
	Dec-22	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	Mar-24	Jun-24	Sep-24	Dec-24	Mar-25	Jun-25	Sep-25	Dec-25
BANK RATE	3.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.25	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.50
3 month ave earnings	3.60	4.30	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.80	3.30	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.50	2.50
6 month ave earnings	4.20	4.50	4.60	4.50	4.20	4.10	3.90	3.40	3.10	3.00	2.90	2.60	2.60
12 month ave earnings	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.50	4.30	4.20	4.00	3.50	3.20	3.10	3.00	2.70	2.70
5 yr PWLB	4.30	4.30	4.20	4.10	4.00	3.90	3.80	3.60	3.50	3.40	3.30	3.20	3.10
10 yr PWLB	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.20	4.00	3.90	3.70	3.60	3.50	3.40	3.30	3.20
25 yr PWLB	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.10	4.00	3.90	3.70	3.60	3.50	3.50
50 yr PWLB	4.30	4.40	4.30	4.20	4.10	4.00	3.80	3.70	3.60	3.40	3.30	3.20	3.20

Additional notes by Link on this forecast table: -

- The Link forecast reflects a view that the MPC will be keen to demonstrate its anti-inflation credentials by delivering a succession of rate increases. This has happened throughout 2022, but the new Government's policy of emphasising fiscal rectitude will probably mean Bank Rate does not now need to increase to further than 4.5%.
- Further down the road, we anticipate the Bank of England will be keen to loosen monetary policy when the worst of the inflationary pressures have lessened – but that timing will be one of fine judgment: cut too soon, and inflationary pressures may well build up further; cut too late and any downturn or recession may be prolonged.
- The CPI measure of inflation will peak at close to 11% in Q4 2022. Despite the cost-of-living squeeze that is still taking shape, the Bank will want to see evidence that wages are not spiralling upwards in what is evidently a very tight labour market. Wage increases, excluding bonuses, are currently running at 5.7%.
- Regarding the plan to sell £10bn of gilts back into the market each quarter (Quantitative Tightening), this has started but will focus on the short to medium end of the curve for the present. This approach will prevent any further disruption to the longer end of the curve following on from the short-lived effects of the Truss/Kwarteng unfunded dash for growth policy.

In the upcoming months, Link's forecasts will be guided not only by economic data releases and clarifications from the MPC over its monetary policies and the Government over its fiscal policies, but the on-going conflict between Russia and Ukraine and the heightened tensions between China/Taiwan/US also have the potential to have a wider and negative economic impact.)

On the positive side, consumers are still estimated to be sitting on over £160bn of excess savings left over from the pandemic so that will cushion some of the impact of the above challenges. However, most of those are held by more affluent people whereas lower income families already spend nearly all their income on essentials such as food, energy and rent/mortgage payments.

PWLB RATES

Yield curve movements have become less volatile under the Sunak/Hunt government. PWLB 5 to 50 years Certainty Rates are, generally, in the range of 3.75% to 4.50%. The medium to longer part of the yield curve is currently inverted (yields are lower at the longer end of the yield curve compared to the short to medium end).

Link views the markets as having built in, already, nearly all the effects on gilt yields of the likely increases in Bank Rate and the poor inflation outlook but markets are volatile and further whipsawing of gilt yields across the whole spectrum of the curve is possible.

The balance of risks to the UK economy: -

- The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is to the downside. Indeed, the Bank of England projected two years of negative growth in their November Quarterly Monetary Policy Report.

Downside risks to current forecasts for UK gilt yields and PWLB rates include: -

- **Labour and supply shortages** prove more enduring and disruptive and depress economic activity (accepting that in the near-term this is also an upside risk to inflation and, thus, rising gilt yields).
- **The Bank of England** acts too quickly, or too far, over the next two years to raise Bank Rate and causes UK economic growth, and increases in inflation, to be weaker than we currently anticipate.
- **UK / EU trade arrangements** – if there was a major impact on trade flows and financial services due to complications or lack of co-operation in sorting out significant remaining issues.
- **Geopolitical risks**, for example in Ukraine/Russia, China/Taiwan/US, Iran, North Korea and Middle Eastern countries, which could lead to increasing safe-haven flows.

Upside risks to current forecasts for UK gilt yields and PWLB rates: -

- The **Bank of England is too slow** in its pace and strength of increases in Bank Rate and, therefore, allows inflationary pressures to build up too strongly and for a longer period within the UK economy, which then necessitates an even more rapid series of increases in Bank Rate faster than we currently expect.
- **The Government** acts too slowly to increase taxes and/or cut expenditure to balance the public finances, in the light of the cost-of-living squeeze.
- **The pound weakens** because of a lack of confidence in the UK Government's fiscal policies, resulting in investors pricing in a risk premium for holding UK sovereign debt.
- Longer term **US treasury yields** rise strongly, if inflation numbers disappoint on the upside, and pull gilt yields up higher than currently forecast.

Borrowing advice: Link's long-term (beyond 10 years) forecast for Bank Rate stands at 2.5%. As all PWLB certainty rates are now above this level, borrowing strategies will need to be reviewed in that context. Better value can generally be obtained at the shorter end of the curve and short-dated fixed LA to LA monies should be considered. Temporary borrowing rates are likely, however, to remain near Bank Rate and may also prove attractive whilst the market waits for inflation, and therein gilt yields, to drop back later in 2023.

Link suggested budgeted earnings rates for investments up to about three months' duration in each financial year are as follows: -

Average earnings in each year	
2022/23 (remainder)	3.95%
2023/24	4.40%
2024/25	3.30%
2025/26	2.60%
2026/27	2.50%
Years 6 to 10	2.80%
Years 10+	2.80%

As there are so many variables at this time, caution must be exercised in respect of all interest rate forecasts.

Our interest rate forecast for Bank Rate is in steps of 25 bps, whereas PWLB forecasts have been rounded to the nearest 10 bps and are central forecasts within bands of + / - 25 bps. Naturally, we continue to monitor events and will update our forecasts as and when appropriate.

3.4 Borrowing strategy

The Council is currently maintaining an under-borrowed position. This means that the capital borrowing need, (the Capital Financing Requirement), has not been fully funded with loan debt as cash supporting the Authority's reserves, balances and cash flow has been used as a temporary measure. This strategy is prudent as medium and longer dated borrowing rates are expected to fall from their current levels once prevailing inflation concerns are addressed by tighter near-term monetary policy. That is, Bank Rate increases over the remainder of 2022 and the first half of 2023.

Against this background and the risks within the economic forecast, caution will be adopted with the 2023/24 treasury operations. The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services will monitor interest rates in financial markets and adopt a pragmatic approach to changing circumstances:

- *if it was felt that there was a significant risk of a sharp FALL in borrowing rates, then borrowing will be postponed.*
- *if it was felt that there was a significant risk of a much sharper RISE in borrowing rates than that currently forecast, fixed rate funding will be drawn whilst interest rates are lower than they are projected to be in the next few years.*

Any decisions will be reported to the appropriate decision-making body at the next available opportunity.

3.5 Policy on borrowing in advance of need

The Council will not borrow more than or in advance of its needs purely in order to profit from the investment of the extra sums borrowed. Any decision to borrow in advance will be within forward approved Capital Financing Requirement estimates and will be considered carefully to ensure that value for money can be demonstrated and that the Council can ensure the security of such funds.

Risks associated with any borrowing in advance activity will be subject to prior appraisal and subsequent reporting through the mid-year or annual reporting mechanism.

3.6 Debt rescheduling

Rescheduling of current borrowing in our debt portfolio is unlikely to occur as there is still a very large difference between premature redemption rates and new borrowing rates.

If rescheduling is to be undertaken, it will be reported to the Cabinet at the earliest meeting following its action.

The portfolio will continue to be kept under review for opportunities and if circumstances change, any rescheduling will be reported to Cabinet at the earliest opportunity.

3.7 New Financial Institutions as a Source of Borrowing and Types of Borrowing

Currently the PWLB Certainty Rate is set at gilts + 80 basis points. However, consideration may still need to be given to sourcing funding from the following sources for the following reasons:

- Local authorities (primarily shorter dated maturities out to 3 years or so – generally still cheaper than the Certainty Rate).
- Financial institutions (primarily insurance companies and pension funds but also some banks, out of forward dates where the objective is to avoid a “cost of carry” or to achieve refinancing certainty over the next few years).

Our advisors will keep us informed as to the relative merits of each of these alternative funding sources.

3.8 Approved Sources of Long and Short-term Borrowing

On Balance Sheet	Fixed	Variable
PWLB	●	●
UK Municipal Bond Agency	●	●
Local Authorities	●	●
Banks	●	●
Pension Funds	●	●
Insurance Companies	●	●
UK Infrastructure Bank	●	●
Market (long-term)	●	●
Market (temporary)	●	●
Market (LOBOs)	●	●
Stock Issues	●	●
Local Temporary	●	●
Local Bonds	●	
Local Authority Bills	●	●
Overdraft		●
Negotiable Bonds	●	●
Internal (capital receipts & revenue balances)	●	●
Commercial Paper	●	
Medium Term Notes	●	
Finance Leases	●	●

4 Annual investment strategy

4.1 Investment policy – management of risk

The Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC - this was formerly the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)) and CIPFA have extended the meaning of 'investments' to include both financial and non-financial investments. This section deals solely with treasury (financial) investments as managed by the treasury management team. Non-financial investments, essentially loans made for capital purposes, are covered in the Capital Strategy.

The Council's investment policy has regard to the following: -

- DLUHC's Guidance on Local Government Investments ("the Guidance")
- CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes 2021 ("the Code")
- CIPFA Treasury Management Guidance Notes 2021

The Council's investment priorities will be security first, portfolio liquidity second and then yield (return). The Council will aim to achieve the optimum return on its investments commensurate with proper levels of security and liquidity and with the Council's risk appetite.

In the current economic climate, it is considered appropriate to keep investments short term to cover cash flow needs. However, where appropriate (from an internal as well as external perspective), the Council will also consider the value available in periods up to 12 months with high credit rated financial institutions.

The above guidance from the DLUHC and CIPFA place a high priority on the management of risk. This authority has adopted a prudent approach to managing risk and defines its risk appetite by the following means:

1. Minimum acceptable **credit criteria** are applied in order to generate a list of highly creditworthy counterparties. This also enables diversification and thus avoidance of concentration risk. The key ratings used to monitor counterparties are the short term and long-term ratings. A comparative analysis of ratings from different agencies is shown as Appendix 2, and an indicative list of approved counterparties as Appendix 3.
2. **Other information:** ratings will not be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution; it is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. To achieve this consideration the Council will engage with its advisors to maintain a monitor on market pricing such as "**credit default swaps**" and overlay that information on top of the credit ratings.
3. **Other information sources** used will include the financial press, share price and other such information pertaining to the banking sector in order to establish the most robust scrutiny process on the suitability of potential investment counterparties.

4. This authority has defined the list of **types of investment instruments** that the treasury management team are authorised to use including 'specified' and 'non-specified' investments.
 - **Specified investments** are those with a high level of credit quality and subject to a maturity limit of one year or have less than a year left to run to maturity if originally, they were classified as being non-specified investments solely due to the maturity period exceeding one year.
 - **Non-specified investments** are those with less high credit quality, may be for periods in excess of one year, and/or are more complex instruments which require greater consideration by members and officers before being authorised for use.
5. **Lending limits**, (amounts and maturity), for each counterparty will be set through applying the matrix table in Appendix 4.
6. **Transaction limits** are set for each type of investment in 4.2.
7. This authority will set a limit for its investments which are invested for **longer than 365 days**, (see paragraph 4.4).
8. The Council will only use non-UK banks from countries with a minimum sovereign rating of AA+ (Appendix 7). The **sovereign rating of AA+** must be assigned by one of the three credit rating agencies. No more than £30m will be placed with any individual non-UK country at any time.
9. This authority has engaged **external consultants**, (see paragraph 1.5), to provide expert advice on how to optimise an appropriate balance of security, liquidity and yield, given the risk appetite of this authority in the context of the expected level of cash balances and need for liquidity throughout the year.
10. All cash invested by the County Council will be either Sterling or Euro deposits (including Sterling certificates of deposit) or Sterling Treasury Bills invested with banks and other institutions in accordance with the Approved Authorised Counterparty List. The inclusion of Euro deposits enables the County Council to effectively manage (subject to European Central Bank deposit rates) Euro cash balances held for schemes such as the France-Channel-England Project.
11. As a result of the change in accounting standards for 2022-23 under IFRS 9, this authority will consider the implications of investment instruments which could result in an adverse movement in the value of the amount invested and resultant charges at the end of the year to the General Fund.
12. In November 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government ("MHCLG"), concluded a consultation for a temporary IFRS9 override to allow English local authorities time to adjust their portfolio of all pooled investments by announcing a statutory override to delay implementation of IFRS 9 for five years to 31 March 2023. At the time of writing the Council has no pooled investments of this kind.

This authority will pursue value for money in treasury management and will monitor the yield from investment income against appropriate benchmarks for investment performance, (see paragraph 4.5). Regular monitoring of investment performance will be carried out during the year.

Changes in risk management policy from last year.

The above criteria are *unchanged* from last year.

4.2 Creditworthiness policy

The primary principle governing the Council's investment criteria is the security of its investments, although the yield or return on the investment is also a key consideration. After this main principle, the Council will ensure that:

- It maintains a policy covering both the categories of investment types it will invest in, criteria for choosing investment counterparties with adequate security, and monitoring their security. This is set out in the specified and non-specified investment sections below; and
- It has sufficient liquidity in its investments. For this purpose, it will set out procedures for determining the maximum periods for which funds may prudently be committed. These procedures also apply to the Council's prudential indicators covering the maximum principal sums invested.

The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services will maintain a counterparty list in compliance with the following criteria and will revise the criteria and submit them to Council for approval as necessary. These criteria are separate to that which determines which types of investment instrument are either specified or non-specified as it provides an overall pool of counterparties considered high quality which the Council may use, rather than defining what types of investment instruments are to be used.

Credit rating information is supplied by Link Group, our treasury advisors, on all active counterparties that comply with the criteria below. Any counterparty failing to meet the criteria would be omitted from the counterparty (dealing) list. Any rating changes, rating Watches (notification of a likely change), rating Outlooks (notification of the longer-term bias outside the central rating view) are provided to officers almost immediately after they occur, and this information is considered before dealing. For instance, a negative rating Watch applying to counterparty at the minimum Council criteria will be suspended from use, with all others being reviewed in light of market conditions.

The criteria for providing a pool of high-quality investment counterparties, (both specified and non-specified investments) is:

- **Banks:**
 - (i) **UK Banks** requires both the short and long-term ratings issued by at least one of the three rating agencies (Fitch, S&P or Moody's) to remain at or above the minimum credit rating criteria.

UK Banks	Fitch	Standard & Poors	Moody's
Short Term Ratings	F1	A-1	P-1
Long Term Ratings	A-	A-	A3

- (ii) **Non-UK Banks** requires both the short and long term ratings issued by at least one of the three rating agencies (Fitch, S&P or Moody's) to remain at or above the minimum credit rating criteria and a sovereign rating of AA+ assigned by one of the three credit rating agencies.

Non-UK Banks	Fitch	Standard & Poors	Moody's
Short Term Ratings	F1+	A-1+	P-1
Long Term Ratings	AA-	AA-	Aa3

- **Part Nationalised UK Bank:** Royal Bank of Scotland Group. This bank is included while it continues to be part nationalised or it meets the ratings for UK Banks above.
- **The County Council's Corporate Banker:** if the rating for the Council's corporate banker (currently Barclays) falls below the above criteria, sufficient balances will be retained to fulfil transactional requirements. Other than this, balances will be minimised in both monetary size and time invested.
- **Building Societies:** The County Council will use Building Societies which meet the ratings for UK Banks outlined above.
- **Money Market Funds (MMFs):** which are rated AAA by at least two of the three major rating agencies. MMF's are 'pooled funds' investing in high-quality, high-liquidity, short-term securities such as treasury bills, repurchase agreements and certificate of deposits. Funds offer a high degree of counterparty diversification that include both UK and Overseas Banks. Following money market reforms, MMFs will be allocated to sub-categories (CNAV, LNAV and VNAV) to meet more stringent liquidity regulations. However, the Council will continue to apply the same minimum rating criteria.
- **UK Government:** including the Debt Management Account Deposit Facility & Sterling Treasury Bills. Sterling Treasury Bills are short-term (up to six months) 'paper' issued by the UK Government. In the same way that the Government issues Gilts to meet long term funding requirements, Treasury Bills are used by Government to meet short term revenue obligations. They have the security of being issued by the UK Government.
- **Local Authorities, Parish Councils etc.:** Includes those in England and Wales (as defined in Section 23 of the Local Government Act 2003) or a similar body in Scotland or Northern Ireland.

- **Wholly owned companies: The Norse Group, Hethel Innovation Limited and Repton Property Developments Limited, Independence Matters CIC:** short-term loan arrangements made in accordance with approved service level agreements and the monetary and duration limits detailed below in Appendix 4.
- **Property funds (where not classed as capital expenditure):** these are long term, and relatively illiquid funds, expected to yield both rental income and capital gains. The use of certain property funds can be deemed capital expenditure, and as such would be an application (spending) of capital resources. This Authority will seek guidance on the status of any fund it may consider using. Appropriate due diligence will also be undertaken before investment of this type is undertaken.
- **Ultra-Short Dated Bond Funds** will use funds that are AAA rated and only after due diligence has been undertaken.
- **Corporate Bonds:** These are bonds issued by companies to raise long term funding other than via issuing equity. Investing in corporate bonds offers a fixed stream of income, paid at half yearly intervals. Appropriate due diligence will also be undertaken before investment of this type is undertaken.
- **Corporate bond funds:** Pooled funds investing in a diversified portfolio of corporate bonds, so provide an alternative to investing directly in individual corporate bonds. Minimum long-term rating of A- to be used consistent with criteria for UK banks. Appropriate due diligence will also be undertaken before investment of this type is undertaken.
- **UK Government Gilt funds:** A gilt is a UK Government liability in sterling, issued by HM Treasury and listed on the London Stock Exchange. They can be either “conventional” or index linked. Using a fund can mitigate some of the risk of potential large movements in value.

Use of additional information other than credit ratings. Additional requirements under the Code require the Council to supplement credit rating information. Whilst the above criteria rely primarily on the application of credit ratings to provide a pool of appropriate counterparties for officers to use, additional operational market information will be applied before making any specific investment decision from the agreed pool of counterparties. This additional market information (for example Credit Default Swaps, negative rating Watches/Outlooks) will be applied to compare the relative security of differing investment opportunities.

Time and monetary limits applying to investments. The time and monetary limits for institutions on the Council's counterparty list are set out in Appendix 4. The proposed criteria for specified and non-specified investments are shown in Appendix 6.

Creditworthiness

Significant levels of downgrades to short- and long-term credit ratings have not materialised since the crisis in March 2020. In the main, where they did change, any alterations were limited to Outlooks. However, more recently the UK sovereign debt rating has been placed on Negative Outlook by the three major rating agencies in the

wake of the Truss/Kwarteng unfunded tax-cuts policy. Although the Sunak/Hunt government has calmed markets, the outcome of the rating agency reviews is unknown at present, but it is possible the UK sovereign debt rating will be downgraded. Accordingly, when setting minimum sovereign debt ratings, this Authority will not set a minimum rating for the UK.

CDS prices

Although bank CDS prices, (these are market indicators of credit risk), spiked upwards during the days of the Truss/Kwarteng government, they have returned to more average levels since then. However, sentiment can easily shift, so it will remain important to undertake continual monitoring of all aspects of risk and return in the current circumstances. Link monitor CDS prices as part of their creditworthiness service to local authorities and the Authority has access to this information via its Link-provided Passport portal..

4.3 Other limits

Due care will be taken to consider the exposure of the Council's total investment portfolio to non-specified investments, countries, groups and sectors.

- a) **Non-specified investment limit.** The Council has set limits for non-specified investments in accordance with the criteria set out in Appendix 6. For example, they are bound by the limits for investments set out in Appendix 4 and the upper limit for principal sums invested for longer than 365 days shown in paragraph 4.4. This ensures that non-specified investments are only made within appropriate quality and monetary limits.
- b) **Country limit.** The Council has determined that it will only use approved counterparties from the UK and from countries with a minimum sovereign credit rating of AA+.
- c) **Other limits.** In addition:
 - no more than £30m will be placed with any non-UK country at any time;
 - limits in place above will apply to a group of companies.

4.4 Investment strategy

In-house funds. Investments will be made with reference to the core balance and cash flow requirements and the outlook for short-term interest rates (i.e. rates for investments up to 12 months). Greater returns are usually obtainable by investing for longer periods. The current shape of the yield curve suggests that is the case at present, but there is the prospect of Bank Rate peaking in the first half of 2023 and possibly reducing as early as the latter part of 2023 so an agile investment strategy would be appropriate to optimise returns.

Accordingly, while most cash balances are required in order to manage the ups and downs of cash flow, where cash sums can be identified that could be invested for longer periods, the value to be obtained from longer-term investments will be carefully assessed.

Investment returns expectations.

The current forecast shown in paragraph 3.3 includes a forecast for Bank Rate to reach 4.5% in Q2 2023.

The suggested budgeted investment earnings rates for returns on investments placed for periods up to about three months during each financial year are as follows:

Average earnings in each year	Previously	Now
2022/23	0.50%	3.95%
2023/24	0.75%	4.40%
2024/25	1.00%	3.30%
2025/26	1.25%	2.60%
2026/27	2.00%	2.50%
Years 6 to 10	2.00%	2.80%
Years 10+	2.00%	2.80%

As there are so many variables at this time, caution must be exercised in respect of all interest rate forecasts

For its cash flow generated balances, the Council will seek to utilise its business reserve instant access and notice accounts, money market funds and short-dated deposits, (overnight to 100 days), in order to benefit from the compounding of interest.

Investment treasury indicator and limit - total principal funds invested for greater than 365 days. These limits are set with regard to the Council's liquidity requirements and to reduce the need for early sale of an investment and are based on the availability of funds after each year-end.

The Council is asked to approve the following treasury indicator and limit:

Upper limit for principal sums invested for longer than 365 days			
£m	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Principal sums invested for longer than 365 days	£100m	£100m	£100m
Current investments >365 days as at 31 December 2022	£0m	£0m	-

4.5 Investment risk benchmarking

This Authority will use an investment benchmark to assess the investment performance of its investment portfolio of overnight, 7 day, 1, 3, 6 or 12 month compounded / SONIA.

4.6 Non-treasury investments

Although this section of the report does not specifically cover non-treasury investments, a summary of non-treasury loans is included at Appendix 10. This appendix shows that the impact of these loans on the Council's revenue budget is not material in comparison to its turnover.

4.7 End of year investment report

At the end of the financial year, the Council will report on its investment activity as part of its Annual Treasury Outturn Report.

5 Appendices

Appendix 1 - Minimum Revenue Provision Statement

Appendix 2 - Ratings comparative analysis

Appendix 3 - Indicative List of Approved Counterparties for Lending

Appendix 4: Time and monetary limits applying to investments

Appendix 5: The Capital and Treasury Prudential Indicators

Appendix 6: Credit and counterparty risk management

Appendix 7: Approved Countries for Investments

Appendix 8: Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation

Appendix 9: The Treasury Management Role of the Section 151 Officer

Appendix 10: Non-treasury investments

Appendix 1 - Minimum Revenue Provision Statement 2023-24

- A1 Regulations issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government in 2008 require the Council to approve a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement in advance of each year.
- A2 Members are asked to approve the MRP statement annually to confirm that the means by which the Council plans to provide for repayment of debt are satisfactory. Any revisions to the original statement must also be issued. Proposals to vary the terms of the original statement during the year should also be approved.
- A3 MRP is the provision made in the Council's revenue budget for the repayment of borrowing used to fund capital expenditure - the Council has a statutory duty to determine an amount of MRP which it considers to be prudent, having regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
- A4 In 2023-24:
- For capital expenditure incurred before 1 April 2007 which is supported by Formula Grant (supported borrowing), the MRP policy will be to provide the amount to set aside calculated in equal instalments over 50 years.
 - For all capital expenditure since that date which is supported by Formula Grant (supported borrowing), the MRP policy will be to provide the amount to set aside calculated in equal instalments over 50 years from the year set aside is first due.
 - In calculating the amounts on which set aside is to be made pre 1 April 2007 Adjustment A will be applied.
 - Any charges made over the statutory minimum revenue provision, voluntary revenue provision or overpayments can, if needed, be reclaimed in future years if deemed necessary or prudent, and cumulative overpayments disclosed. At 31 March 2021 the cumulative amount over-provided was £3.26m. The over-provision was fully released in 2021-22.
 - For expenditure since 1 April 2008, the MRP policy for schemes funded through borrowing will be to base the minimum provision on the estimated life of the assets in accordance with the guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
 - Re-payments included in annual PFI and finance lease/right of use asset arrangements are applied as MRP.
 - Having identified the total amount to be set aside for previously unfunded capital expenditure the Council will then decide how much of that to fund from capital receipts with the residual amount being the MRP for that year.
- A5 Where loans are made to third parties for capital purposes, the capital receipt received as a result of each repayment of principal, under the terms of the loan, will be set aside in order to re-pay NCC borrowing and to reduce the Capital Financing Requirement accordingly. MRP will only be accounted for if an accounting provision has been made for non-repayment of the loan or if there is a high degree of uncertainty regarding the repayment. This arrangement will also be applied where a third party has committed to underwrite the debt costs of a specific project through amounts reserved for capital purposes.
- A6 The Council will continue to make provision at least equal to the amount required to ensure that each debt maturity is met.

Appendix 2 - Ratings comparative analysis

Moody's		S&P		Fitch		
Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	Long-term	Short-term	
Aaa	P-1	AAA	A-1+	AAA	F1+	Prime
Aa1		AA+		AA+		High grade
Aa2		AA		AA		
Aa3		AA-		AA-		
A1		A+	A-1	A+	F1	Upper medium grade
A2		A		A		
A3	P-2	A-	A-2	A-	F2	
Baa1		BBB+		BBB+		
Baa2	P-3	BBB	A-3	BBB	F3	
Baa3		BBB-		BBB-		
Ba1	Not prime	BB+	B	BB+	B	Non-investment grade speculative
Ba2		BB		BB		
Ba3		BB-		BB-		
B1		B+		B+		Highly speculative
B2		B		B		
B3		B-		B-		
Caa1		CCC+	C	CCC	C	Substantial risks
Caa2		CCC				Extremely speculative
Caa3		CCC-				In default with little prospect for recovery
Ca		CC				
		C				
C		D	/	DDD	/	In default
/				DD		
/				D		
/						

Appendix 3 - Indicative List of Approved Counterparties for Lending

UK Banks

Barclays Bank	Santander UK
Bank of Scotland Plc (*)	Lloyds Bank (*)
Close Brothers	HSBC Bank Group
Goldman Sachs	

Non-UK Banks

Australia:

Australia & New Zealand Banking Group
Commonwealth Bank of Australia
National Australia Bank Limited

Canada:

Bank of Montreal
National Bank of Canada
Toronto-Dominion Bank

Germany:

DZ Bank AG
Landesbank Baden-Wuerttemberg
Landesbank Hessen-Thueringen Girozentrale

Singapore:

DBS Bank Ltd
Oversea-Chinese Banking Corp
United Overseas Bank Limited

Sweden:

Svenska Handelsbanken

Part Nationalised UK Banks

Royal Bank of Scotland(#)	National Westminster(#)
---------------------------	-------------------------

UK Building Societies

Coventry BS	Nationwide BS
Leeds BS	Yorkshire BS

Money Market Funds

Aberdeen Investments	Aviva
Federated Investors	Northern Trust

UK Government

Debt Management Account Deposit Facility
Sterling Treasury Bills
Local Authorities, Parish Councils

Other – Group companies (non-capital)

The Norse Group	Independence Matters CIC
Hethel Innovation Limited	
Repton Property Developments	

Note: (*) (#) A 'Group Limit is operated whereby the collective investment exposure of individual banks within the same banking group is restricted to a group total.

Appendix 4: Time and monetary limits applying to investments

The time and monetary limits for institutions on the Council's counterparty list are as follows (these will cover both specified and non-specified investments):

COUNTERPARTY	NCC LENDING LIMIT (£m)	OTHER BODIES LENDING LIMIT (£m)	TIME LIMIT
UK Banks	£60m	£30m	Up to 3 Years (see notes below)
Non-UK Banks	£30m	£20m	1 Year
Royal Bank of Scotland / Nat. West. Group	£60m	£30m	2 Years
Building Societies	£30m	£20m	1 Year
MMFs – CNAV	£60m (per Fund)	£30m (per Fund)	Instant Access
MMFs – LNAV			Instant Access
MMFs – VNAV			Instant Access
Debt Management Account Deposit Facility	Unlimited	Unlimited	6 Months (being max period available)
Sterling Treasury Bills	Unlimited	Unlimited	6 Months (being max period available)
Local Authorities	Unlimited (individual authority limit £20m)	Unlimited (individual authority limit £10m)	3 Years
The Norse Group	£15m	Nil	1 Year
Hethel Innovation Limited	£1.25m	Nil	1 Year
Repton Property Developments Limited	£1.0m	Nil	1 Year
Independence Matters CIC	£1.0m	Nil	1 Year
Property Funds	£10m in total	Nil	Not fixed
Ultra short dated bond funds	£5m in total	Nil	3 years
Corporate bonds	£5m in total	Nil	3 years
Corporate bond funds	£5m in total	Nil	3 years
UK Government Gilts / Gilt Funds	£5m in total	Nil	3 years

Notes:

- In addition to individual institutional lending limits, 'Group Limits' are used whereby the collective investment exposure of individual banks within the same banking group is restricted to a group total lending limit. For example, in the case of Lloyds Bank and Bank of Scotland, the group lending limit for the Lloyds Banking Group is £60M.
- The maximum deposit period for UK Banks is based on the following tiered credit rating structure:

Long Term Credit Rating (Fitch or equivalent) assigned by at least one of the three credit rating agencies	Maximum Duration
AA-	Up to 3 years
A	Up to 2 years
A-	Up to 1 year

Deposits may be placed with the Royal Bank of Scotland as a UK Part Nationalised Bank and Local Authorities may be made for periods of 2 and 3 years respectively.

- The Council will only use non-UK banks from countries with a minimum sovereign rating of AA+. The sovereign rating of AA+ must be assigned by one of the three credit rating agencies. No more than £30m will be placed with any individual non-UK country at any time. Approved countries for investments are shown at Appendix 7.
- For monies invested on behalf of the Norse Group, Independence Matters and Norfolk Pension Fund there is a maximum monetary limit of £10m per counterparty. Operationally funds are diversified further as agreed with the individual bodies.
- Long-term loans to the Norse Group and other subsidiary companies are approved as part of the Council's capital programme.
- The use of property funds, bonds and bond funds, gilts and gilt funds will be subject to appropriate due diligence.
- Certain property funds may be classed as a capital investment. If this is the case then they will be approved via the capital programme. If the fund is classed as revenue, then the IFRS 9 implications will be fully considered: unless the DCLG specifies otherwise, any surpluses or losses will become chargeable to the Council's general fund on an annual basis.

Appendix 5: The Capital and Treasury Prudential Indicators

The Council's capital expenditure plans are the key driver of treasury management activity. The output of the capital expenditure plans is reflected in the prudential indicators, which are designed to assist members' overview and confirm capital expenditure plans.

5.1 Capital Expenditure

Capital expenditure £m	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Adult Social Care	14.817	14.196	12.473	22.482	15.401
Children's Services	52.379	29.707	118.296	61.323	21.325
CES Highways	103.564	153.172	107.926	105.658	153.090
CES Other	22.901	23.825	58.706	23.483	1.200
Finance and Comm. Servs	61.208	32.156	53.654	19.989	20.180
Strategy and Governance	0.000	0.083	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	254.869	253.139	351.054	232.934	211.196
Loans to companies included in Finance and Comm Servs above	11.178	4.000	8.800	1.800	0.000
GNGB supported borrowing to developers	2.155	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
<i>Loans as a percentage</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>2%</i>	<i>3%</i>	<i>1%</i>	<i>0%</i>

Non-treasury investments – proportionality

The table above demonstrates that loans to companies and developers, as a percentage of all capital expenditure, are a relatively low proportion and therefore do not present undue risk in the context of the programme overall.

5.2 Affordability prudential indicators

The previous sections cover the overall capital and control of borrowing prudential indicators, but within this framework prudential indicators are required to assess the affordability of the capital investment plans. These provide an indication of the impact of the capital investment plans on the Council's overall finances. The Council is asked to approve the following indicators:

Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream

This indicator identifies the trend in the cost of capital, (borrowing and other long-term obligation costs net of investment income), against the net revenue stream.

%	2021-22 Actual	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	2025-26 Estimate
Financing costs (net)	59.351	64.599	71.851	75.162	79.685
Net revenue costs	733.818	784.689	788.209	808.189	828.301
Percentage	8.09%	8.23%	9.12%	9.30%	9.62%

The estimates of financing costs include current commitments and budget proposals.

The Prudential Code 2013 acknowledged that the "Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream" indicator may be more problematic for some authorities regarding the level of government support for capital spends. In these instances, it is suggested that a narrative explaining the indicator may be helpful. At this stage, it is considered that the table above can provide useful information.

5.3 Maturity structure of borrowing

Maturity structure of borrowing. These gross limits are set to reduce the Council's exposure to large fixed rate sums falling due for refinancing, and are required for upper and lower limits. The Council is asked to approve the following treasury indicators and limits:

Maturity structure of fixed & variable interest rate borrowing 2022-23		
	Lower	Upper
Under 12 months	0%	10%
12 months to 2 years	0%	10%
2 years to 5 years	0%	10%
5 years to 10 years	0%	20%
10 years to 20 years	0%	30%
20 years to 30 years	10%	30%
30 years to 40 years	10%	30%
40 years to 50 years	10%	40%

The percentages shown in the table above are proportions of total borrowing.

5.4 Control of interest rate exposure:

The table above indicates how the authority manages its interest rate exposure to ensure a degree of alignment between asset lives and appropriate interest rates and spreading the time over which any debt re-financing may need to happen.

Only £42.250m out of total borrowing of over £849m (less than 5% of total borrowing) is potentially variable, and the rate will only vary if borrowing rates rise to above 4.75%. Forecast borrowing rates suggest that that this threshold will not be exceeded in the foreseeable future. Planned borrowing is expected to be at fixed rates to take advantage of low interest rates as they arise, and to limit long term exposure to variable rates.

With positive cash balances, the Council has maintained an under-borrowed position which avoids short term exposure to interest rate movements on investments. The Council will continue to balance the risks of borrowing while cash balances are available, against the long-term benefits of locking into low borrowing rates

5.5 Interest Rate Forecasts 2022-2025

Link Group Interest Rate View 08.11.22													
	Dec-22	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	Mar-24	Jun-24	Sep-24	Dec-24	Mar-25	Jun-25	Sep-25	Dec-25
BANK RATE	3.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.25	3.00	2.75	2.50	2.50
3 month ave earnings	3.60	4.30	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.80	3.30	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.50	2.50
6 month ave earnings	4.20	4.50	4.60	4.50	4.20	4.10	3.90	3.40	3.10	3.00	2.90	2.60	2.60
12 month ave earnings	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.50	4.30	4.20	4.00	3.50	3.20	3.10	3.00	2.70	2.70
5 yr PWLB	4.30	4.30	4.20	4.10	4.00	3.90	3.80	3.60	3.50	3.40	3.30	3.20	3.10
10 yr PWLB	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.20	4.00	3.90	3.70	3.60	3.50	3.40	3.30	3.20
25 yr PWLB	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.50	4.40	4.30	4.10	4.00	3.90	3.70	3.60	3.50	3.50
50 yr PWLB	4.30	4.40	4.30	4.20	4.10	4.00	3.80	3.70	3.60	3.40	3.30	3.20	3.20

PWLB forecasts are based on PWLB certainty rates.

5.6 ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Against a backdrop of stubborn inflationary pressures, the easing of Covid restrictions in most developed economies, the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and a range of different UK Government policies, it is no surprise that UK interest rates have been volatile right across the curve, from Bank Rate through to 50-year gilt yields, for all of 2022.

Market commentators' misplaced optimism around inflation has been the root cause of the rout in the bond markets with, for example, UK, EZ and US 10-year yields all rising by over 200bps since the turn of the year. The table below provides a snapshot of the conundrum facing central banks: inflation is elevated but labour markets are extra-ordinarily tight, making it an issue of fine judgment as to how far monetary policy needs to tighten.

	UK	Eurozone	US
Bank Rate	3.0%	1.5%	3.75%-4.00%
GDP	-0.2%q/q Q3 (2.4%y/y)	+0.2%q/q Q3 (2.1%y/y)	2.6% Q3 Annualised
Inflation	11.1%y/y (Oct)	10.0%y/y (Nov)	7.7%y/y (Oct)
Unemployment Rate	3.6% (Sep)	6.6% (Sep)	3.7% (Aug)

Q2 of 2022 saw UK GDP revised upwards to +0.2% q/q, but this was quickly reversed in the third quarter, albeit some of the fall in GDP can be placed at the foot of the extra Bank Holiday in the wake of the Queen's passing. Nevertheless, CPI inflation has picked up to what should be a peak reading of 11.1% in October, although with further increases in the gas and electricity price caps pencilled in for April 2023, and the cap potentially rising from an average of £2,500 to £3,000 per household, there is still a possibility that inflation will spike higher again before dropping back slowly through 2023.

The UK unemployment rate fell to a 48-year low of 3.6%, and this despite a net migration increase of c500k. The fact is that with many economic participants registered as long-term sick, the UK labour force actually shrunk by c500k in the year to June. Without an increase in the labour force participation rate, it is hard to see how the UK economy will be able to grow its way to prosperity, and with average wage increases running at 5.5% - 6% the MPC will be concerned that wage inflation will prove just as sticky as major supply-side shocks to food and energy that have endured since Russia's invasion of Ukraine on 22nd February 2022.


Throughout Q3 Bank Rate increased, finishing the quarter at 2.25% (an increase of 1%). Q4 has seen rates rise to 3% in November and the market expects Bank Rate to hit 4.5% by May 2023.

Following a Conservative Party leadership contest, Liz Truss became Prime Minister for a tumultuous seven weeks that ran through September and December. Put simply, the markets did not like the unfunded tax-cutting and heavy spending policies put forward by her Chancellor, Kwasi Kwarteng, and their reign lasted barely seven weeks before being replaced by Prime Minister Rishi Sunak and Chancellor Jeremy Hunt. Their Autumn Statement of 17th November gave rise to a net £55bn fiscal tightening, although much of the "heavy lifting" has been left for the next Parliament to deliver. However, the markets liked what they heard, and UK gilt yields have completely reversed the increases seen under the previous tenants of No10/11 Downing Street.

Globally, though, all the major economies are expected to struggle in the near term. The fall below 50 in the composite Purchasing Manager Indices for the UK, US, EZ and China all point to at least one if not more quarters of GDP contraction. In November, the MPC projected eight quarters of negative growth for the UK lasting throughout 2023 and 2024, but with Bank Rate set to peak at lower levels than previously priced in by the markets and the fiscal tightening deferred to some extent, it is not clear that things will be as bad as first anticipated by the Bank.

The £ has strengthened of late, recovering from a record low of \$1.035, on the Monday following the Truss government's "fiscal event", to \$1.20. Notwithstanding the £'s better run of late, 2023 is likely to see a housing correction of some magnitude as fixed-rate mortgages have moved above 5% and affordability has been squeezed despite proposed Stamp Duty cuts remaining in place.

In the table below, the rise in gilt yields, and therein PWLB rates, through the first half of 2022/23 is clear to see.



However, the peak in rates on 28th September as illustrated in the table covering April to September 2022 below, has been followed by the whole curve shifting ever lower. PWLB rates at the front end of the curve are generally over 1% lower now whilst the 50 years is over 1.75% lower.

	1 Year	5 Year	10 Year	25 Year	50 Year
Low	1.95%	2.18%	2.36%	2.52%	2.25%
Date	01/04/2022	13/05/2022	04/04/2022	04/04/2022	04/04/2022
High	5.11%	5.44%	5.35%	5.80%	5.51%
Date	28/09/2022	28/09/2022	28/09/2022	28/09/2022	28/09/2022
Average	2.81%	2.92%	3.13%	3.44%	3.17%
Spread	3.16%	3.26%	2.99%	3.28%	3.26%

After a shaky start to the year, the S&P 500 and FTSE 100 have climbed in recent weeks, albeit the former is still 17% down and the FTSE 2% up. The German DAX is 9% down for the year.

CENTRAL BANK CONCERNS – NOVEMBER 2022

At the start of November, the Fed decided to push up US rates by 0.75% to a range of 3.75% - 4%, whilst the MPC followed a day later by raising Bank Rate from 2.25% to 3%, in line with market expectations. EZ rates have also increased to 1.5% with further tightening in the pipeline.

Having said that, the press conferences in the US and the UK were very different. In the US, Fed Chair, Jerome Powell, stated that rates will be elevated and stay higher for longer than markets had expected. Governor Bailey, here in the UK, said the opposite and explained that the two economies are positioned very differently so you should not, therefore, expect the same policy or messaging.

Regarding UK market expectations, although they now expect Bank Rate to peak within a lower range of 4.5% - 4.75%, caution is advised as the Bank of England Quarterly Monetary Policy Reports have carried a dovish message over the course of the last year, only for the Bank to have to play catch-up as the inflationary data has proven stronger than expected.

In addition, the Bank's central message that GDP will fall for eight quarters starting with Q3 2022 may prove to be a little pessimistic. Will the £160bn excess savings accumulated by households through the Covid lockdowns provide a spending buffer for the economy – at least to a degree? Ultimately, however, it will not only be inflation data but also employment data that will mostly impact the decision-making process, although any softening in the interest rate outlook in the US may also have an effect (just as, conversely, greater tightening may also).

Appendix 6: Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) - Credit and counterparty risk management

The DLUHC issued Investment Guidance in 2018, and this forms the structure of the Council's policy below. These guidelines do not apply to either trust funds or pension funds which operate under a different regulatory regime.

The key intention of the Guidance is to maintain the current requirement for councils to invest prudently, and that priority is given to security and liquidity before yield. In order to facilitate this objective the guidance requires this Council to have regard to the CIPFA publication Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice and Cross-Sectoral Guidance Notes. This Council has adopted the Code and will apply its principles to all investment activity. In accordance with the Code, the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services has produced its treasury management practices (TMPs). This part, covering investment counterparty policy requires approval each year.

Annual investment strategy - The key requirements of both the Code and the investment guidance are to set an annual investment strategy, as part of its annual treasury strategy for the following year, covering the identification and approval of following:

- The strategy guidelines for choosing and placing investments, particularly non-specified investments.
- The principles to be used to determine the maximum periods for which funds can be committed.
- Specified investments that the Council will use. These are high security and high liquidity investments in sterling and with a maturity of no more than a year.
- Non-specified investments, clarifying the greater risk implications, identifying the general types of investment that may be used and a limit to the overall amount of various categories that can be held at any time.

The investment policy proposed for the Council is:

Strategy guidelines – The main strategy guidelines are contained in the body of the treasury strategy statement.

Specified investments – These investments are sterling investments of not more than one-year maturity, or those which could be for a longer period but where the Council has the right to be repaid within 12 months if it wishes. They also include investments which were originally classed as being non-specified investments, but which would have been classified as specified investments apart from originally being for a period longer than 12 months, once the remaining period to maturity falls to under twelve months.

These are considered low risk assets where the possibility of loss of principal or investment income is small. These would include sterling investments which would not be defined as capital expenditure with:

1. The UK Government (such as the Debt Management Account deposit facility, UK treasury bills or a gilt with less than one year to maturity).
2. Supranational bonds of less than one year's duration.
3. A local authority, housing association, parish council or community council.
4. Pooled investment vehicles (such as money market funds) that have been awarded a high credit rating by a credit rating agency e.g., Standard and Poor's, Moody's and/or Fitch rating agencies.
5. A body that is considered of a high credit quality (such as a bank or building society). This category covers bodies with a minimum Short-Term rating of AAA (or the equivalent) as rated by Standard and Poor's, Moody's and Fitch rating agencies.

In accordance with the Code, the Council has set additional criteria to set the time and amount of monies which will be invested in these bodies. These criteria are shown in detail in Appendix 4.

Non-specified investments –are any other type of investment (i.e. not defined as specified above). The identification and rationale supporting the selection of these other investments and the maximum limits to be applied are set out below. Non specified investments would include any sterling investments with:

	Non Specified Investment Category	Limit (£ or %)
a.	<p>Supranational bonds greater than 1 year to maturity</p> <p>(a) Multilateral development bank bonds - These are bonds defined as an international financial institution having as one of its objects economic development, either generally or in any region of the world (e.g. European Reconstruction and Development Bank etc.).</p> <p>(b) A financial institution that is guaranteed by the United Kingdom Government (e.g. National Rail, the Guaranteed Export Finance Company {GEFCO})</p> <p>The security of interest and principal on maturity is on a par with the Government and so very secure. These bonds usually provide returns above equivalent gilt edged securities. However the value of the bond may rise or fall before maturity and losses may accrue if the bond is sold before maturity.</p>	Not currently included as approved investment
b.	<p>Gilt edged securities with a maturity of greater than one year. These are Government bonds and so provide the highest security of interest and the repayment of principal on maturity. Similar to category (a) above, the value of the bond may rise or fall before maturity and losses may accrue if the bond is sold before maturity.</p>	Ref Appendix 4
c.	<p>The Council's own banker if it fails to meet the basic credit criteria. In this instance balances will be minimised as far as is possible.</p>	Ref Appendix 4
d.	<p>Building societies not meeting the basic security requirements under the specified investments. The operation of some building societies does not require a credit rating, although in every other respect the security of the society would match similarly sized societies with ratings.</p>	Not currently included as approved investment
e.	<p>Any bank or building society that meets minimum long-term credit ratings, for deposits with a maturity of greater than one year (including forward deals in excess of one year from inception to repayment).</p>	Ref Appendix 4
f.	<p>Share capital in a body corporate – The use of these instruments will be deemed to be capital expenditure, and as such will be an application (spending) of capital resources. Revenue resources will not be invested in corporate bodies. This Authority would seek further advice on the appropriateness and associated risks with investments in these categories.</p>	Not currently included as approved treasury investment.
g.	<p>Loan capital in a body corporate. The use of these loans to subsidiaries and other companies will normally be deemed to be capital expenditure. However, working capital loans are dealt with under Treasury Management arrangements. This Authority would seek further advice on the appropriateness and associated risks with investments in these categories.</p>	Ref Appendix 4
h.	<p>Bond funds. These are specialist products, and the Authority will seek guidance on the status of any fund it may consider using.</p>	Ref Appendix 4

i.	Property funds – The use of these instruments can be deemed to be capital expenditure, and as such will be an application (spending) of capital resources. This Authority will seek guidance on the status of any fund it may consider using.	Ref Appendix 4
----	--	----------------

The monitoring of investment counterparties - The credit rating of counterparties will be monitored regularly. The Council receives credit rating information (changes, rating watches and rating outlooks) from Link Group as and when ratings change, and counterparties are checked promptly. On occasion ratings may be downgraded when an investment has already been made. The criteria used are such that a minor downgrading should not affect the full receipt of the principal and interest. Any counterparty failing to meet the criteria will be removed from the list immediately by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services, and if required new counterparties which meet the criteria will be added to the list.

Use of external fund managers – at the time of writing the Council does not use or plan to use external fund managers.

Appendix 7: Approved Countries for Investments (as at 2 December 2022)

This list is based on those countries which have sovereign ratings of AA- or higher, (we show the lowest rating from Fitch, Moody's and S&P) and also, (except - at the time of writing - for Hong Kong and Luxembourg), have banks operating in sterling markets which have credit ratings of green or above in the Link creditworthiness service.

Based on lowest available rating

AAA

- Australia
- Denmark
- Germany
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Singapore
- Sweden
- Switzerland

AA+

- Canada
- Finland
- U.S.A.

AA

- Abu Dhabi (UAE)
- France

AA-

- Belgium
- Qatar
- U.K.

Appendix 8: Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation

(i) Full Council

- approve the Policy Framework and the strategies and policies that sit within it (Source: Council constitution);
- Note: the Policy Framework includes “Annual investment and treasury management strategy”.

(ii) Cabinet terms of reference

- to prepare, for adoption by the Council, the budget and the plans which fall within the policy framework).

(iii) Audit and Governance Committee

- Consider the effectiveness of the governance, control and risk management arrangements for Treasury Management and ensure that they meet best practice. (Source: Audit Committee Terms of Reference)

(iv) Treasury Management Panel

The Panel’s terms of reference are to:

- consider and comment on the draft Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy prior to its submission to Cabinet and full Council
- receive detailed reports on the Council’s treasury management activity, including reports on any proposed changes to the criteria for “high” credit rated institutions in which investments are made and the lending limits assigned to different counterparties
- receive presentations and reports from the Council’s Treasury Management advisers, Link Asset Services
- consider the draft Treasury Management Annual Report prior to its submission to Cabinet and full Council.

(v) Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services

- “responsible for the proper administration of the financial affairs of the Council including ... investments, bonds, loans, guarantees, leasing, borrowing (including methods of borrowing)...”

(Source: Scheme of delegated powers to officers)

See Appendix 9 for detailed responsibilities.

Appendix 9: The Treasury Management Role of the Section 151 Officer

The S151 (responsible) officer is the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services. Responsibilities include:

Constitution – officer roles

- Have responsibility for the administration of the financial affairs of the Council and be the Section 151 Officer.
- Statutory responsibilities of the Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 officer) Budgeting and Financial Management, Exchequer Services, Pensions, Investment and Treasury Management, Risk & Insurance, Property, Audit, ICT and Procurement and Transactional Services.

Financial Regulations

- execution and administration of treasury management decisions, including decisions on borrowing, investment, financing (including leasing) and maintenance of the counter party list.
- prepare for County Council an annual strategy and plan in advance of the year, a mid-year review and an annual report.
- regularly report to the Treasury Management Panel and the Cabinet on treasury management policies, practices, activities and performance monitoring information.
- monitoring performance against prudential indicators, including reporting significant deviations to the Cabinet and County Council as appropriate.
- ensuring all borrowing and investment decisions, both long and short term, are based on cash flow monitoring and projections.
- ensuring that any leasing financing decisions are based on full options appraisal and represent best value for the County Council, in accordance with the County Council's leasing guidance.
- the provision and management of all banking services and facilities to the County Council.
- recommending clauses, treasury management policy/practices for approval, reviewing the same regularly, and monitoring compliance;
- reviewing the performance of the treasury management function;
- ensuring the adequacy of treasury management resources and skills, and the effective division of responsibilities within the treasury management function;
- ensuring the adequacy of internal audit, and liaising with external audit;
- recommending the appointment of external service providers.
- preparation of a capital strategy to include capital expenditure, capital financing, non-financial investments and treasury management, with a long-term timeframe
- ensuring that the capital strategy is prudent, sustainable, affordable and prudent in the long term and provides value for money
- ensuring that due diligence has been carried out on all treasury and non-financial investments and is in accordance with the risk appetite of the authority
- ensure that the authority has appropriate legal powers to undertake expenditure on non-financial assets and their financing
- ensuring the proportionality of all investments so that the authority does not undertake a level of investing which exposes the authority to an excessive level of risk compared to its financial resources
- ensuring that an adequate governance process is in place for the approval, monitoring and ongoing risk management of all non-financial investments and long term liabilities

- provision to members of a schedule of all non-treasury investments including material investments in subsidiaries, joint ventures, loans and financial guarantees
- ensuring that members are adequately informed and understand the risk exposures taken on by an authority
- ensuring that the authority has adequate expertise, either in house or externally provided, to carry out the above
- creation of Treasury Management Practices which specifically deal with how non treasury investments will be carried out and managed, to include the following (*TM Code p54*): -
 - *Risk management (TMP1 and schedules), including investment and risk management criteria for any material non-treasury investment portfolios;*
 - *Performance measurement and management (TMP2 and schedules), including methodology and criteria for assessing the performance and success of non-treasury investments;*
 - *Decision making, governance and organisation (TMP5 and schedules), including a statement of the governance requirements for decision making in relation to non-treasury investments; and arrangements to ensure that appropriate professional due diligence is carried out to support decision making;*
 - *Reporting and management information (TMP6 and schedules), including where and how often monitoring reports are taken;*
 - *Training and qualifications (TMP10 and schedules), including how the relevant knowledge and skills in relation to non-treasury investments will be arranged.*

Appendix 10: Non-treasury investments

Existing non- treasury investments (loans) at 31 March 2022

Loans	£m
NORSE Energy (capital investment)	10.000
Norse Group (capital investment)	2.687
Norse Group (Aviation Academy)	5.867
NEWS	0.318
NorseCare	2.844
Hethel Innovation Ltd (Hethel Engineering Centre)	7.011
Norwich Airport Radar (relocation due to NDR)	2.194
Repton Property Developments Limited	12.550
LIF loans to developers in Norfolk	6.766
Total loans to companies	50.238
NDR Loan – underwritten by CIL receipts	34.501
Total long-term debtors in balance sheet	84.739

In addition to the loans listed above, equity of £3.5m has been invested in Repton Property Developments Limited, a wholly owned housing development company.

A more detailed schedule of the above loans, showing objectives and explanations of each investment are detailed in Appendix 3 to the Mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2022-23 presented to 5 December 2022 Cabinet.

Potential future non-treasury capital investments

Non-treasury investments: The following schemes if approved will result in loans to wholly owned companies or third parties. These loans will be for capital purposes, are Norfolk based, and are designed to further the Council's objectives. None of the loans listed are purely for the purpose of income generation.

Scheme	Background	Approximate value
Capital equity in, and loans to wholly owned companies	<p>Repton Property Developments The company is developing land north of Norwich Road Acle surplus to County Council, as well as other appropriate surplus land holdings.</p> <p>Other projects From time to time the Council's wholly owned companies further the Council's objectives through capital investments. This facility is included in the capital programme.</p>	£23m included in capital programme

Proportionality of non-treasury investments:

The total value of loans (including CIL supported debt) is not likely to exceed £100m. At an indicative interest rate of 4.2% (giving a margin of approximately 1% over current PWLB borrowing rate) this would mean interest of £4.2m pa. This approximates to less than 20% of the Council's general reserves, 2% of the Council's net expenditure, and 0.5% of departmental gross expenditure. As a result, reliance on income from non-treasury is therefore considered to be proportionate and manageable.

