

Adult Social Care Committee

Date: **Monday 12th January 2015**
Time: **10am**
Venue: **Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

SUPPLEMENTARY A g e n d a 2

9. **Service and Budget Planning 2015-18.**
Briefing on the Budget Consultation findings.

(Page **B2**)

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Services
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

Date Supplementary Agenda Published: 9 January 2015



If you need this document 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.



Budget and services consultation 2015 – 2018

Briefing to Adult Social Services Committee on the Findings of the Budget Consultation

1. Background

- 1.1. Between the 29 October and 19 December the County Council undertook a formal consultation about proposals for its 2015/16 budget.
- 1.2. Over 1,650 people responded to the consultation, making over 4,790 individual comments.

2. Key information ahead of the committee meeting

- 2.1. Because of the closing date of the consultation, and the time required to analyse all of the responses, it is not possible to prepare a report that summarises the findings as part of the formal papers for the committee. Instead:
 - a) A short presentation will be made at the committee meeting, as part of the Budget item, summarising the findings.
 - b) Detailed summaries of the analysis of the responses for the proposals relevant to this committee are available in the appendices of this briefing.

3. Findings Summaries

- 3.1. The appendices to this briefing are:

Proposals relating to the Adult Social Services Committee:

- APPENDIX A: Summary of Findings for proposal to reduce the amount we spend on transport for people who use Adult Social Care Transport

Proposals relating to the whole council

- APPENDIX B: Increase council tax by up to 1.99% – summary of responses
- APPENDIX C: Protecting services – summary of responses
- APPENDIX D: Efficiency savings – summary of responses

Officer Contact

Officer Name:
Jeremy Bone

Tel No:
01603 224215

Email address:
jeremy.bone@norfolk.gov.uk

Reduce the amount we spend on transport for people who use Adult Social Care transport

Summary of proposal

We propose to save money on transport for people who use Adult Social Care services users. We will do this by making sure people are using their motability allowance, meeting people's needs locally, and making more use of community transport services and public transport.

Organisation, group or petition responses

Please describe any petitions received.

No petitions were received.

Nine organisation or groups responded:

- Equal Lives
- Norwich Independent Living Group, Dereham Independent Living Group, North Walsham Independent Living Group
- St Francis Church, Norwich
- Swanton Morley Parish Council
- Taverham Parish Council
- Toftwood Infant School
- Mid-Norfolk Mencap
- Learning Disability Provider Forum
- Norwich Swan Swimming Club

Please summarise all petition or group responses.

Of the nine organisation/group responses, five disagreed, two agreed with no reason (except the proposal "seems sensible") and two were 'don't knows' because they wanted more information on which to base a decision. Of those who disagreed, the reasons were around the vulnerability of those affected, the impact of the proposed reduction on people's wellbeing, lack of transport alternatives and the accumulated effect of successive cuts.

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people's views in...

Agreeing with the proposal?

312 (33%) of people who responded to this question agreed with the proposed reduction. **The main reason for agreeing relates to use of Motability vehicles or the Motability allowance.**

81 people said that if someone has a **Motability vehicle or allowance** they should use this before using other services to avoid "what is effectively double funding": "people should use all the other benefits they get before the Council subsidises them" and "if people have transport provided by the taxpayer then they have to use it".

34 people referred to **local services** and noted that if people can use services close to them transport costs could be reduced: "people should use the closest

	<p>available facility that meets their needs we all have to save money”. Additional benefits of using local facilities were also noted: “whilst difficult, this saving would protect other essential services elsewhere. It would also encourage community cohesion and support by supporting those individuals in their communities”.</p> <p>17 people commented on the use and potential growth of community transport schemes: “... proposed greater use of community transport services may also give a welcome boost to the finances of such services which, in hard times, can also be threatened by council cutbacks”.</p> <p>Nine people said paying for, or contributing towards your own transport is the right thing to do: “I enjoy this facility where I go 1 day a week to day care and would have no objections to paying my way” and eight referred to the individual’s personal responsibility for meeting transport costs.</p> <p>Six people agreed on condition that the proposed reduction did not lead to individuals feeling isolated: “so long as it does not prevent any older person using council facilities or increasing their isolation - in my opinion this could be counterproductive and result in the need for increased spending in other areas”. Six people also referred to the vulnerability of people potentially affected by the reduction and the same number said the service is not essential.</p>
Disagreeing with the proposal?	<p>Over half (51% - 478) of those who answered this question disagreed with the proposed reduction. The main reasons for disagreeing are concerns about: people’s wellbeing, potential increased isolation, equality of access, the vulnerability of those affected, affordability, and inability to use alternative or public transport.</p> <p>104 people commented on the negative effects any reduction might have on people’s wellbeing: “this is important to daily lives and mental health of vulnerable people”, or their own: “I disagree reason being if the amount is reduced on transport this will take away my independence and will affect my wellbeing, reasons be I won't be able to shop and socialise in my daily life”. One respondent noted “opportunities and activities for people who use Adult Social Care are limited - so any reduction in access to activities, which are important and provide social contact and a reason to live, need to be preserved”.</p> <p>97 people made comments about the risk of people becoming isolated in their own homes, put bluntly: “because without your service I'd be housebound”. Some people described the effect not being able to travel would have on them: “I have a serious disability that prevents me participating in normal events. Travelling to Headway in King's Lynn and Norwich is the only way I can get help from people who understand my condition. Otherwise I would be totally isolated and alone”. Another respondent with limited mobility explained how being isolated feels: “... when I am too unwell to get about unaided the combination of illness and long term solitary confinement is difficult to endure”.</p> <p>80 people referred to equality of access and these comments are noted in the EQiA comments box below.</p> <p>71 people expressed a belief that the most vulnerable people in society are targeted unfairly by this proposal: “once again you propose to target the elderly and infirmed who cannot defend themselves”, “hits those who are in most need”,</p>

“when you are needing to make cuts you always hit the most vulnerable in society to pay for it”.

58 people said the proposed reduction would be **unaffordable** pointing to existing low income: “I disagree because of the low income people live with now ...” and previous cuts: “my transport budget was cut in half last year meaning a cut in what I can now attend and put a huge financial burden on me”. Some people noted that a reduced budget would curtail their social activities: “if you reduce the amount of money I may not be able to go to the assist trust” and many noted that their illness or disability involves frequent trips to hospital which can be expensive: “it is difficult for people attending multiple hospital appointments. Taxis are very expensive for people on low income but not quite on benefits”.

60 people said they disagree with the proposed reduction as they **cannot use public transport** or had concerns that others would not be able to use public transport. People described the reasons they cannot use public transport, including vulnerability: “I would have lots of problems with changing buses/trains and dealing with unexpected cancellations/delays given my learning difficulty. I would also feel vulnerable travelling alone in this way”, or because of illness or disability: “...travelling on a bus in the City, which is where I would use it, is painful as it stops and starts all the time. I suffer with a bad back”.

Other reasons for disagreeing which were cited multiple times included:

- a possible reduction in service users’ **choice and control** and ability to personalise their options – going against the principle of personalisation (45 people): “I feel that pooling several users budgets would take away any flexibility of the service, making it less appealing to the user if the felt forced to fit in with everybody else”.
- transport is a **key service** and so should not be cut (42 people): “it is an essential life line. I rely on my daughter having a disability car because I cannot get any transport which will take a wheelchair”.
- **lack of appropriate local services** (41 people): “there is no head injury support in the North of Norfolk at all and Cromer”.
- **rurality** (39 people) – also included in the EQiA box below
- impact on **carers** (36 people): some respondents described in detail the difficulties of being a carer and the importance of respite care, made possible with money for transporting the person they care for, on their wellbeing and continued ability to look after the individual.
- the proposal is **shortsighted** (21) and will cost more further down the line.

Don’t know: Of the ‘Don’t Know’ responses (and where explanatory text is provided), what are the main reasons why people are unable to come to a clear decision?

16% (153) ticked the ‘don’t know’ option. There was no overall consensus in the ‘don’t knows’ although 15 people wanted more information or did not understand the content of the proposal. The three most commonly cited reasons given were: that people can’t use public transport (13 people), the proposed reduction may affect people’s ability to makes choices about their lives (11 people), and there is an increased risk of isolation (10 people).

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Describe any information in the responses which relates to EqIA

87 people made comments relevant to our EqIA (including one specific reference to the Act and five to NCC's legal duties) and more general comments such as: "The council should recognise it has a fundamental duty to support the elderly, the disabled and the housebound (of all ages) and this necessitates the provision of transport if necessary access to services is to be possible."

Equality of choice

"Because I thought the idea behind help with transport was to treat people with disabilities as individuals, and allow them to make choices based on their individual needs. Not to lump them all together, and the idea of everyone who is disabled should all pool resources and share transport, not only take the right to choose away, but also assumes that all disabled people are the same, with the same wants and needs. My mobility money does not come anywhere near covering my transport costs, and I am very frugal with it! Without it I would not have and choices or equal rights."

People with disabilities

"I am profoundly deaf and disabled. I need to be with other people at the deaf club in Norwich as I live 30 miles away and cannot drive myself. I need the social interaction of other deaf people."

"People in wheelchairs (for example) I have restricted ability to travel without assistance and need specialist transport such as converted buses with ramps. Without this transport wheelchair bound people are left in their homes often on their own, which can prove lonely and cause depression etc".

Older people

"Over 70 years - usually disabled - mainly only a pension. In my case I must walk with a frame. Some need to visit places which is not on a bus route. ...With my disability and age walking these distances is pain full & dangerous for me. Some mechanical motorised small vehicle would solve these problems".

Younger people

"My son is unable to go on public transport - slowly learning to become more independent he is ref Blind/ASD/Epilepsy by going to the activities he is healthier and beginning to go into the world, these are essential for his wellbeing."

Rurality

46 people referred to the challenges of accessing services in a rural county where transport may be unavailable, intermittent or prohibitively expensive:

"We need a taxi service in our village as there are no buses in Walpole that goes to Wisbech, the Facx bus say we are 1 mile out to pick us up so what choice do we have?"

"This [the proposed reduction] will affect the most vulnerable in a rural county which already has poor transport links."

"In a rural county you cannot function if the transport is not affordable or available."

Analyst notes

Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings

39 people **critiqued the consultation process**. Apart from four comments about lack of consultation events in suitable locations, respondents were either unclear about the content of the letter they had received, or felt they needed further information or clarification of the proposal in order to make a decision.

Responses to this proposal have been described in this summary by those who agree, disagree and don't know. Dividing up responses in this way can obscure wider issues so it is important to note two points about **use of public transport** and **availability of local services** which many people commented on, regardless of whether they agreed or disagreed with the proposal.

51 people described their experience of the availability of '**local**' **services** and explained they were not unwilling to use venues close to their house, but in many cases they had little choice but to travel: "I live in a rural area where there is no reliable public transport closest hospital is 20 miles away and the hospital I have to attend is 40 miles away. It is not that I don't want to use local amenities there aren't any without travelling even my doctors is 10 miles round trip. I need help and travel costs allow me more freedom to enjoy my life". In addition, 22 people made specific reference to the need to travel for medical appointments.

Many respondents noted the reasons why they can't use **public transport** and explained how ill-health or disability prevented them using public transport even when it was available:

"I am unable to take the train and I have a very weak immune system so I am unable to wait in the cold for a bus. I also live in the countryside so transport money is essential."

"I cannot use public transport as I cannot fold my frame up and would have no one to help me. I am in a lot of pain all the time and cannot walk from the bus stop to the shops. I have rods and screws in my back and neck from top to bottom and cannot turn my head so I dare not cross the road on my own I cannot see the traffic coming."

"I also feel I would be very unsafe on public transport as my wheelchair would not be anchored to the floor."

Other Information

943 people responded to this proposal.

312 (33%) agreed, 478 (51%) disagreed, and 153 (16%) said they did not know ('don't knows').

Just under half of respondents were **service users** (437 – 46.3%) compared with non-service users (%). The 326 – 34.6%).

The majority of respondents (549 58.2%) say they have **long term illness, disability or health problems** compared those who do not (307 – 32.6%).

Almost a fifth of people who responded are **carers** (174 – 18.5%) compared with 645 - 68.4%) who have no caring responsibilities.

Summary completed 6.1.15, Business Intelligence and Performance Service.

Council Tax – agree/disagree (up to 1.99%) and reasons why you say this

Summary of question

We asked people “Do you agree or disagree that Norfolk County Council should raise its share of the council tax by up to 1.99% in 2015/16 and use that money to protect key council services in the future?” with the option to select agree, disagree or don’t know. We then asked “why do you say this?”

Organisation, group or petition responses

Please describe any petitions received.

No petitions were received.

Please record any groups or organisations which responded.

Responses were received from the following groups/organisations:

- Toftwood infant school
- Equal Lives
- Swanton Morely Parish Council
- St Francis Church Norwich
- Wells-Next-the-Sea Town Council
- Welbourne Village Hall
- South Norfolk Older People’s Forum
- North Norfolk Older People’s Forum
- Norfolk Older People’s Strategic Partnership
- Norwich Older People’s Forum Working Group
- Norwich Swan Swimming Club

Please summarise all petition or group responses.

Nine of the groups/organisations agreed with the proposal and two disagreed.

Those that **agreed** had reasons in line with those expressed by individuals and described below – the main reason was to **protect** services particularly those for **vulnerable** people and comments that the suggested raise was **small** or **reasonable**.

One group that **disagreed** did not give a reason other than to question the wisdom of raising tax in the run up to a general election. The other said that families are struggling and need support not higher bills.

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people’s views in...

Agreeing with the proposal?

339 people (74%) agreed with the proposal. The main reason given for agreeing with a rise in council tax was because it would **protect services**.

154 people commented that they supported a rise in council tax **because/if it would protect services**. For example: “Protecting services is absolutely essential, as it protects the most vulnerable in society.”, “If necessary, to maintain local services, the [...] council does not object to an increase of the

	<p>council tax by 1.99%.”, “It is important we contribute to protecting services” “I absolutely do not want services cut any further and believe that an increase in tax is a far better option.”, “Council tax has not kept pace with inflation and it would take an immense increase to get back to the income levels of five to seven years ago. I would be happy to pay more council tax in order to stave off the draconian cuts that are facing the Council”.</p> <p>54 people said that they supported the proposal because the rise was small, proportionate or reasonable. For example: “Yes because in real terms it’s only a very small increase. Why do you even need to ask the question? Just do it!!”, “This has been frozen for a number of years. The increase is marginal”, “Council tax is a large payment already but with so many cuts to essential services I think this 1.99% rise is small enough rise for most households to pay.”, “A small increase, largely in line with inflation, will ensure services valued by rate payers can still be delivered.”, “A 1.99% increase is reasonable.”, “A relatively small increase for householders, while producing a small benefit in the first year would produce an greatly increased benefit for the county in general in the future”, “A small increase to protect key services would seem a reasonable solution”.</p> <p>Other reasons given for supporting the proposal included that services had been cut and respondents did not wish to see further cuts made (22 people), or that respondents were concerned about services for vulnerable people (21 people).</p>
<p>Disagreeing with the proposal?</p>	<p>101 people (22%) disagreed with the proposal. The main reason given for disagreeing with the proposal was that the rise would be unaffordable.</p> <p>33 respondents said that they rejected the proposal because the rise would be unaffordable for them or for others. For example: “Incomes continue to reduce for the tax payer so an increase in Council Tax is unaffordable”, “As my wife and I are pensioners on a VERY modest income, we are very pleased and relieved that the Norfolk County Council has held down the Council Tax. We would not support any increase in it whatsoever.”, “Because people cannot afford to pay anymore.”, “We should not be required to pay for everything”, “Any increase in Council Tax is too much for hard working families to cope with at the present time.”, “I cannot afford it”, “My salary hasn't increased by 1.99% why should you increase my council tax?”.</p> <p>13 respondents gave the government grant as their reason for disagreeing – for example saying that it did not make sense to raise council tax because it would mean the loss of the grant: “Does not seem cost effective to lose central grant. I would however support an increase of this amount in 2016/17.”, Because we would lose the grant for a year, so the government is not helping us to help ourselves.”, “We would lose the government grant”, “Would be unwise to lose money generated to a government fine”.</p> <p>15 respondents said that council tax should not be raised because there are inefficiencies within NCC that need to be saved first: “There is still massive waste in local government. Cuts can be achieved without harming service provision”, “Because there are many inefficiencies within the council system and you could save costs easily “, “You need to do some serious housekeeping. I certainly would not agree to a hike in my council tax until such a waste of money is stopped.”, “In the present climate I believe there is still the ability to reduce Council spending.”</p>

	11 respondents said that council tax was already too high : “I already pay too much.”, “The council tax is too high already.”, “I pay too much now!”
--	---

Don't know: Of the 'Don't Know' responses (and where explanatory text is provided), what are the main reasons why people are unable to come to a clear decision?

	<p>17 people (4%) said that they didn't know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal</p> <p>Of these, six respondents critiqued the consultation itself or the process (see analyst notes) and three responses made reference to the government grant.</p>
--	--

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Describe any information in the responses which relates to EQIA	<p>Two people made comments relevant to our EqIA. Both related to the impact on people with disabilities: “I think the time has come that to protect essential frontline services to the poor, the disadvantaged, the disabled and the defenceless that the council tax bill to households needs to rise”, “Because disabled people have taken the brunt of the cuts and they are on limited budgets which sometimes only stretches to essentials like food, heat and rent”</p>
---	---

Analyst notes

Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings	<p>Six respondents critiqued the consultation process, for example saying that we had not provided enough information/detail to make a decision, requesting that more detail be provided as to where extra funds would be spent, or comments that it was not clear if the additional money would negate the need for cuts. One respondent said that the consultation had not been publicised enough and was timed too close to Christmas to get a good response.</p>
--	---

Other Information

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 457 responses received for this proposal. • 101 people (22%) disagreed with the proposal • 339 people (74%) agreed with the proposal • 17 people (4%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal • Respondents were not asked if they were service user question not asked for this proposal <p>Summary completed 6.1.15, Business Intelligence and Performance Service.</p>
--

Protect – if we were to raise council tax in 2015/16 which of these services would you like the income we generate to be spent on? – please tell us why you selected these services.

Summary of question	
<p>We asked people “If we were to increase council tax in 2015/16, which service would you like the income we generate to be spent on?” In answering this question people were given a choice of defined service areas and were asked to nominate their ‘top 5’ services. We also asked people to tell us why they selected the services they had chosen.</p>	

Organisation, group or petition responses	
<p>Please describe any petitions received.</p> <p>Please record any groups or organisations which responded.</p>	<p>No petitions were received.</p> <p>Responses were received from four groups/organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Francis Church • Swanton Morley Parish Council • Toftwood Infant School • Norwich Swan Swimming Club
<p>Please summarise all petition or group responses.</p>	<p>Responses from groups/organisations were in line with individual comments received below with the main focus being on services for vulnerable adults and children.</p>

Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people’s views on:	
<p>Adult care services</p>	<p>78% of respondents who answered this question (293 people) ranked adult social care in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising adult care services were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that it is a service for the most vulnerable people in society and should therefore be protected: “we need to ensure that vulnerable adults and children are cared for and supported” “direct services for vulnerable people are really important” “expenditure should be focused on securing services for vulnerable people and families”. • Comments that it is a key service – essential, a priority, statutory: “significant component of a civilised society”, “these are essential services”, “more important than anything else”, “services that protect lives”. • Comments that adult social care needs investment because of the demographics of the county, growing pressure on services for the elderly: “The demographic time bomb is ticking ever louder and clearly additional resources are required for any authority to adequately provide quality services and care for this very vulnerable section of society”, “Ageing population - more funds will be needed to support people at home with their long term health condition”,

	<p>Other reasons given included support for this area because adult social care is important for personal and social wellbeing, comment that this is an area that has been cut in the past/can't sustain further cuts, and comments about the importance of prevention including that it saves money in the long run.</p>
<p>Children's Social Care</p>	<p>63% of respondents who answered this question (236 people) ranked children's social care in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising children's social care were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that it is a service for the most vulnerable people in society and should therefore be protected: "most at risk groups" "We need to ensure that vulnerable adults and children are cared for and supported." "Vulnerable people should always have continuing support." And "those least able to protect themselves" • Comments that it is a key service – essential, a priority, statutory: "essential service" "necessary to protect life" "Protecting and supporting vulnerable people has to be the highest priority" "Direct services for vulnerable people are really important and should be the mainstay of what the council does." <p>Other reasons given for protecting this service included comments about children being the future so needing investment, comments that children's social care is an important prevention service, comments that the service has been cut and should not be cut further, and comments about the importance of the service for health and wellbeing.</p>
<p>Schools and education</p>	<p>50% of respondents who answered this question (190 people) ranked schools and education in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising schools and education were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that school and education is a key service, priority, essential or more important than other services: "top priority" "important" "essential services" "vital public services" and "Because Norfolk children deserve a better education" • Comments that schools and education are important because children are the future: "to ensure a good future", "good education helps children and young people secure a good future", "children are the future...don't scrimp on their development" and "children are the most important product of a generation" • Comments that schools and education are important because they support or protect the vulnerable: "protect the innocent", "protect services to the most vulnerable", "services for people who need the most assistance from society" • Comments about the role schools play in education, supporting skills development and the economy: "without a well educated population we cannot achieve the required economic growth", "long term they will give Norfolk a more competitive economy" "they support economic growth in the region, via investment in people through education" <p>Other reasons given for protecting this service included comments that schools and education helps to prevent spend in other areas, or that investing in schools builds good foundations for the future, and comments about the role schools play in communities, contributing to personal and social wellbeing.</p>

Libraries	<p>36% of respondents who answered this question (138 people) ranked libraries in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising libraries were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments about the role libraries play in improving personal and social wellbeing and the broader role libraries have in communities e.g. “important for happy healthy communities” “The diverse services libraries provide cater for a range of audiences and purposes. They are a hub from which people can learn, get in touch with other council services, attend groups and sessions that provide social and economic benefits” “Libraries - again, accessible to all sectors and have countywide spread, good for people who need to get out of the house, interact with community, and who are not well off” • Comments that the service is a key service, essential or a priority: “valuable services”, a lifeline to people who have to spend a lot of time at home and people living in rural areas”, “vital to a society’s sense of identity, wellbeing and mental health” “provides a vital service often to vulnerable people” • Comments about the role libraries play in the economy including supporting the development of skills, employability and education: “we are better educated with libraries”, “improve educational attainment”, “education and reading are vital to the economy” “the library service promotes education for all” • Comments that libraries are a universal service, available to all residents: “service all use” “extraordinary service across all sectors of Norfolk’s population” • Comments that the service has already been subject to cuts and cannot sustain further cuts: “already taken enough cuts on what is a very small area of spend to start with” “they have been decimated by cuts” “These are all the services that get cut every time, you can only take so much from them” <p>Other reasons given for wanting to prioritise this service included the impact on vulnerable people who use libraries and their services or as a safe place to go.</p>
Arts recreation and guidance service	<p>34% of respondents who answered this question (129 people) ranked arts recreation and guidance service in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising arts recreation and guidance service were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments about the broader role the arts play in communities for personal and social wellbeing: “Promoting health and happiness of the community has got to be the priority” “Because arts and culture are essential to well-being - they are what makes the difference between just existing and actually enjoying life” “It is also important to ensure that these opportunities to access arts, creativity and culture are open to all in county, as they have a positive impact on people’s health and wellbeing, which can ultimately mean less reliance on other services.” “The Arts grants are tiny but make a real difference to local communities.” • Comments about the impact on the economy – education and skills, employments and tourism are included in this: “moving Norfolk on as a whole and creating opportunities for work and investment and attracting business and visitors bringing more money in” “Arts, creativity and culture is one of the fastest growing sectors in Norfolk, it creates jobs, investment and tourism.” <p>Other reasons given to protect this service included comments that it is a key or</p>

	<p>essential service, comments about the inherent worth or value of culture/the arts, and comments that the service is underfunded/has already been subject to cuts.</p>
Fire and rescue	<p>31% of respondents who answered this question (117 people) ranked fire and rescue in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising fire and rescue were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that it is a key service – essential, a priority, statutory: e.g. “essential service” “necessary to protect lives” “vital services in need of protecting” emergency response is highest priority” “most important area” <p>Other reasons given for protecting this area were that it is about people’s safety, that the service is important for wellbeing, that the service is underfunded/has already been cut, that it is a universal service used by all, and that the service has an important role with the vulnerable.</p>
Environment and waste	<p>31% of respondents who answered this question (116 people) ranked environment and waste in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising environment and waste were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments referring to environment and waste as a key or essential service, top priority, more important than others: “important” “necessary” “vital” “most important areas” and “good environmental services are vital in our modern world” • Comments that environment and waste are important for personal or social wellbeing – creating a nicer environment to live in or making the county an attractive place to live: “better health from a cleaner environment”, “make life in Norwich particularly attractive” or “make Norfolk a good place to live” • Comments that environment and waste is a universal service, used by all residents: “Waste services are universally required and important on a day to day basis.” “Important to everyone” “Environment & Waste as we all have rubbish to dispose of and see the need to improve on recycling. “
Travel and transport	<p>28% of respondents who answered this question (107 people) ranked travel and transport in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising travel and transport were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role transport plays in the economy – getting people to work and school and keeping businesses moving, this includes references to tourism and people accessing other services. For example: “the way to sustain the economy is to keep Norfolk moving” “Highways and transport are key to economic growth, reducing accidents, and accessing services” “public transport to get people to work” “Good transport and travel systems are important to Norfolk’s businesses, employment, education, health and leisure.” • Comments referring to travel and transport as a key or essential service, top priority, more important than others. <p>Other reasons given included support for this area because it has important positive impact on the environment – through public transport, cycling and pedestrian access investment and that it supports people’s wellbeing – both</p>

	personal and social/community.
Public Health	<p>26% of respondents who answered this question (99 people) ranked public health in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising public health were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that public health is a key service, priority, essential or more important than other services: “Education and caring for people are more important than anything else.” Or “Direct services for vulnerable people are really important and should be the mainstay of what the council does.” • Comments that public health helps to prevent spend in other areas and prevent health problems: “public health remains an important function - particularly with regard to the preventative role that it plays.” “Investing in public health I feel will help support other care services so that people are not unnecessarily relying on services when they could be supported in other ways” and “Public health always requires significant investment in preventative measures.” <p>Other reasons given for prioritising this service included the role public health plays in personal and social wellbeing/quality of life, the role it has in supporting the vulnerable, and the contribution made to the economy by keeping people fit and well to work.</p>
Highways	<p>24% of respondents who answered this question (91 people) ranked highways in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising highways were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role highways play in the economy – getting people to work and school and keeping businesses moving. Includes references to tourism and people accessing other services. For example: “Road maintenance has an impact on most areas of the Council's priorities: - Norfolk economy- (access to/for rural businesses for example) environment, health- (why encourage cycling for example if the roads are too dangerous due to disintegration), access for emergency response.”, “Norfolk needs investment and improved infrastructure is essential for attracting external investment. Economic growth of the county is essential for sustainable future. Norfolk is geographically isolated and the council needs to take strategic leadership of generating opportunities for future growth, not focusing inwards.” • Comments that highways is a key service, essential or priority, describing it as “important” “priority services”, or “vital services”. • Comments that highways is a universal service, used by all residents: “used by the majority of people in Norfolk” “Highways is the one universal service used by everyone in the county” “services that all use” or “important to everyone”.
Supporting the Norfolk economy	<p>23% of respondents who answered this question (87 people) ranked supporting the Norfolk economy in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising supporting the Norfolk economy were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of supporting the economy – including the effect on education, employment, tourism and overall keeping Norfolk growing and thriving: “Actions to promote the economy and support in particular young people through apprenticeships is critical to creating a vibrant area and helping people be able to stay and work in the county” “Economic growth is

	<p>crucial for Norfolk if it is to continue to thrive - economic growth will provide additional income to the council.” “we must support businesses to help the economy grow” “investing in Norfolk’s future” “moving Norfolk on as a whole and creating opportunities for work and investment and attracting business and visitors bringing more money in”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that this is a key service – essential or priority: “vital for the county council to provide” “key areas” <p>Other reasons given included support for this area because it enhances personal or social wellbeing.</p>
Early years and childcare	<p>22% of respondents who answered this question (83 people) ranked early years and childcare in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising early years and childcare were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that the service is important because it supports the vulnerable: “the young – particularly the vulnerable is obviously a main priority”, “we should protect the vulnerable”, “the weakest have suffered the most and should receive more support”, “the most vulnerable should be protected first” • Comments that early years is a key service, priority, essential or more important than other services: “Because it is essential for young people to have the very best start in life. Affordable childcare enables more low income families to enter the workforce thereby strengthening the local economy” “the most vital public services” “Education and caring for people are more important than anything else.” “Investing in the next generation is critical” • Comments that services to children should be protected because they are the future: “children and young people are our future and the resources are inadequate” “children are the future and deserve support and encouragement to develop fully” • Comments that early years helps to prevent spend in other areas: “Failing to invest in our young children is a false economy that increases costs in the future, e.g. if young people do not learn the skills and attitudes to fulfil their potential then they are less likely to secure good jobs and are more likely to become dependent on the state for support.” and “I also feel early years is critical”
Museums	<p>16% of respondents who answered this question (61 people) ranked museums in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising museums were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments about the importance of the service for personal and social wellbeing and quality of life: “important to the wellbeing of people in the community” protect services that enrich lives”, “they enhance life”, “museums make a good contribution to the local culture”, museums are important places in these depressing times” • Comments about the economy, education and skills and tourism: “they help generate income and/or tourism” “they provide otherwise unobtainable education”, “Cultural services are undervalued and therefore have never been properly funded yet the benefits are wide ranging and extend far beyond the cultural sector. Tourism, quality of life, health and well-being, education and training are just a sample of the areas on which our cultural offer has a positive impact.” • Comments that museums are a key service, essential or a priority over other

	<p>services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments that this is an area that has been cut in the past and cannot sustain more cuts “Museums – are desperately underfunded”
Public protection	<p>9% of respondents who answered this question (35 people) ranked public protection in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reasons given for prioritising public protection were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments referring to public protection as a key or essential service, top priority, more important than others: “essential services” “very important” “essential services” and “most important” Comments that the service supports and protects vulnerable people: “public protection is essential otherwise the unscrupulous will seek to take advantage” or “there are many scams about now and people who prey on the elderly and vulnerable it is important to protect this work”
Adult education	<p>9% of respondents who answered this question (34 people) ranked adult education in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reason given for prioritising adult education were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments about the economy, education and skills: “We should not penalise...education at a time when the need for highly-skilled youngsters and fresh ideas for the future (not to mention tax revenues) is at a premium” <p>Other reasons given to prioritise this service included that it is an area that is underfunded/has been cut before and comments about the contribution of the service to personal/social wellbeing.</p>
Norfolk record office	<p>5% of respondents who answered this question (17 people) ranked the Norfolk Record Office in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The main reason given for prioritising the Norfolk Record Office were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That NRO is a key/vital service: “the loss of what’s in the record office and the service it provides would be a monumental act of cultural irresponsibility and vandalism” <p>Other reasons given for prioritising this service included its contribution to social and individual wellbeing and the role of the NRO in the local economy including education and skills.</p>
Customer services	<p>2% of respondents who answered this question (7 people) ranked customer services in their top five services to protect with a rise in council tax.</p> <p>The reason given for prioritising customer services were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments that the service is universal or used by most people: “These are the only ones that are used by the majority of people in Norfolk. There is already too much spent on Children, the elderly etc.” or “Putting every single citizen first before particular selected individuals and groups”

Equality Impact Assessment	
Describe any information in	There were no specific comments about our EqIA.

the responses which relates to EQIA	
-------------------------------------	--

Analyst notes

Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings	<p>Nine respondents critiqued the consultation itself/the process.</p> <p>Of these, five people were not happy with the way services were grouped/divided: “Why put Libraries, Museums and Adult Education as separate entities when you do not divide up Environment and Waste?” One respondent was unhappy with the way the question was phrased, saying they would have preferred two questions, one about priority and one about services perceived to be underfunded. Two respondents were unhappy at having to list in order of priority and would have preferred to select five services without having to give a preference order.</p>
--	---

Other Information

<p>377 people responded to this proposal/section</p> <p>78% of people (293) ranked Adult care services in their top five 63% of people (236) ranked Children’s social care in their top five 50% of people (190) ranked Schools and education in their top five 37% of people (138) ranked Libraries in their top five 34% of people (129) ranked Arts recreation and guidance services in their top five 31% of people (117) ranked Fire and rescue in their top five 31% of people (116) ranked Environment and waste in their top five 28% of people (107) ranked Travel and transport in their top five 26% of people (99) ranked Public health in their top five 24% of people (91) ranked Highways in their top five 23% of people (87) ranked Supporting the Norfolk economy in their top five 22% of people (83) ranked Early years and childcare in their top five 16% of people (61) ranked Museums in their top five 9% of people (35) ranked Public protection in their top five 9% of people (34) ranked Adult education in their top five 5% of people (17) ranked Norfolk Record Office in their top five 2% of people (7) ranked Customer services in their top five</p> <p>Summary completed 6.1.15, Business Intelligence and Performance Service.</p>

Efficiency savings

Summary of proposals

Our efficiency savings focus on cutting our own costs and getting even more efficient; many are about our internal processes. Many of the savings will be achieved by using modern technology more efficiently. Our proposed efficiency savings are:

How we buy things:

- (1a) Reducing our costs by retendering contracts and changing the way we buy things (£1.9m)
- (1b) Changing the way that we use our rebates and funding sources (£1.15m)
- (1c) Reduce costs by finding more cost effective IT and business travel options for staff (£0.6m)
- (1d) Reduce the cost of our buildings and make full use of our own facilities (£1.55m)

How we generate income:

- (2a) Make more money and recover more costs from the services we charge for (£0.27m)

How we organise our staff and resources:

- (3a) Review management and staff structures (£0.945m)
- (3b) Develop different ways of working to reduce the cost of delivering our shared services (£0.961m)
- (3c) Redesigning the way we deliver our services to reduce our costs (£0.395)
- (3d) Cutting some budgets (£0.45m)
- (3e) Reduce the costs of delivering services (£1.03m)
- (3f) Manage our investments in a different way (£2.7m)

Organisation, group or petition responses

Please describe any petitions received.

No petitions were received.

Please record any groups or organisations which responded.

12 group or organisation responses were received:

- Break
- Equal Lives
- Swanton Morley Parish Council
- St Francis Church Norwich
- Welbourne Village Hall
- South Norfolk Older People's Forum
- Blakeney Parish Council
- Healthwatch Norfolk
- Norwich Swan Swimming Club
- Norfolk Rural Community Council
- Spergy - online community for people on the autistic spectrum
- South Norfolk District Council

Please summarise all petition or group responses.

One organisation contrasted direct payments to directly commissioned services and provided figures to show savings: "we have calculated that over the last three years £6,378,053.57 has been returned to NCC from those using personal budgets. This works out roughly as over £177,000 per month. As far as we know, no home care or private sector provider returns money to NCC". The

	<p>organisation concluded: “there is also clear evidence that people who are in control of their own money through direct payments are extremely prudent”.</p> <p>Potential savings in children’s residential care were highlighted by another group: “I am fairly sure that if those services were outsourced considerable savings could still be made – primarily because NCC pay higher salaries. There are a number of proven voluntary and private providers in Norfolk who could take on this work and deliver the same quality of service – if not better”.</p> <p>One group considered that older and vulnerable people are already suffering hardship from previous cuts and should not have to bear a reduction in quality of service.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of (previous and future) cuts was also commented on by another organisation who observed that a broader view of the whole service offer across Norfolk may be a more productive way of handling change than focusing on individual proposals for relatively small savings. The organisation welcomed NCC’s focus on prevention but pointed out a “need for greater investment and support in developing resilience within our communities if the prevention shift is to be successful”.</p> <p>One local organisation wanted more information on which to base their decision and also asked that NCC considers the value added by the third sector to local residents.</p>
--	---

General comments about efficiency savings	
--	--

	<p>68 people expressed their agreement with the overall efficiency saving proposal saying it was “sensible”, “all make perfect sense” and “wouldn’t argue with any of them”.</p> <p>Six people disagreed with the proposal: the reasons given were not wanting to make further cuts, not thinking that anymore can be saved through efficiencies, and the negative effects of further cuts on staff and services.</p> <p>24 people commented on inefficient practices or a perception of inefficiency within the Council. Some expressed surprise or disappointment that such efficiency savings had not already been implemented: “I would have thought that internal policies such as business travel, efficient procurement and effective use of your own building spaces would have already been maximised to reduce costs as far as possible!”</p> <p>12 people warned against making short term savings which end up costing more in the longer run: “can look like savings on paper but cost of implementation can sometimes negate the savings” and “be careful not to make changes that cost as much or more than the potential savings, this has invariably been the outcome in my experience, albeit in private commerce”.</p>
--	---

Responses to specific proposals	
--	--

1a - Reducing our costs by	29 respondents commented on proposal 1a to reduce our costs by retendering contracts and change the way we buy things. People gave
----------------------------	---

retendering contracts and changing the way we buy things.

examples of current poor practice and expressed concern about quality of services and value for money. They also cautioned against making decisions rashly or without evidence and showed concern about the potential for shifting costs or service burdens onto the third sector.

Inefficient or bureaucratic tendering/procurement processes

“The costs of tendering are not made public nor the impact on service delivery – only contract savings. Recent re-tendering has created other problems in the system as the commissioners do not sufficiently understand what they are changing – the specification is flawed and unintended consequences have arisen.”

“I am certain that savings could be made on the hugely complicated system of tendering made at the Council.”

“Procurement is always a difficult one, but the procurement team need to engage more with staff – FIMS provides all the data (well if you can extract it) to enable analysis of who buys what and if anything can be achieved. Be open not secretive and it’ll save them time. Process that are there to make one team’s life easy is creating inefficiencies. ... Failure to make staff accountable is [also] a major issue, especially with expenditure.”

“I’m a little sceptical about putting resource into new tendering as the tendering process itself seems to create a large, slow and expensive bureaucracy of its own. I would like to see tendering processes, simplified so that good staff can move lightly, take their own decisions and build on constructive relations with suppliers.”

Perceived relationship between current contractors and NCC

“Current contract bidding is wide open to commercial manipulation - you must stop telling them what they can get away with.”

“The retendering of contracts will be a waste of time as the same companies will still get in as the preferred option even though they are no good.”

Value for money

“Procurement in particular needs to be reviewed. Most public bodies seem to pay more for goods and services through business accounts than members of the public might pay for the same things.”

Quality of services

“Also by retendering services increase the risk that the cheaper option might be chosen to the detriment of the quality of service. We have seen it with some of the domiciliary care providers.”

Short-sightedness

“In redesigning contracts and the way things are bought it will be very important to ensure a good quality of service and not buying on the cheap which would cost more in the longer term.”

Rationale for retendering

“What evidence do the County Council have that over a reasonable period that re-tendering has realised efficiencies and quality services?”

Cost-shifting

	I fully support recommissioning as long as it isn't a ploy to get the same services for cheaper therefore placing burden on charities and third sector orgs.
1b – Changing the way that we use our rebates and funding sources.	Two people commented on proposal 1b and both were concerned that suppliers would be 'squeezed' or penalised.
1c - Reduce costs by finding more cost effective IT and business travel options for staff.	<p>22 respondents commented on proposal 1c: there was general agreement with the proposal to reduce costs by finding more cost effective IT and business travel options for staff.</p> <p>Cost effective IT "Nobody ever saved real money through IT - do better with what you have." "Better ICT would allow staff to make far more of their time, as would reducing unnecessary bureaucracy." "IT efficiency needs to be a top priority."</p> <p>Travel options "Stop leasing cars and pay people a mileage, surely? I appreciate that there will still be a need for some instances of leasing though." "I know sometimes travel is necessary (for your staff) but I think it should be reduced to virtually never. I work from home for Oxford University. I work closely with my boss and yet have only seen him in person, rather than on Skype, once in the last four years." One person said NCC should be more commercially minded and another gave an example of a recently introduced IT system in libraries which has proven to be time-consuming rather than time-saving.</p>
1d - Reduce the costs of our buildings and make full use of our own facilities.	<p>14 people commented on proposal 1d: there was overall agreement with the proposal to reduce the costs of our buildings and make full use of our own facilities.</p> <p>Suggestions included installing solar panels on schools, selling off land or properties, and offering IT facilities in schools to the public after hours. One respondent, whilst in agreement with the proposal expressed concern with the practicalities: "I cannot see how a fire station could be used as an external venue, surely they don't have conference rooms to let...that is not their purpose".</p>
2a – Make more money and recover more costs from the services we charge for.	<p>Seven people commented on proposal 2a: there was overall agreement with the proposal to make more money and recover more costs from the services we charge for.</p> <p>One person suggested making money from cafes in libraries and charging for internet use; another that revenue from recycling should be increased and costs of land-fill reduced by offering discounted garden composting and charging for black bins. Two people commented that NCC should draw inspiration from the private sector and "be more ambitious and commercial to raise more income".</p>

<p>3a – Review management and staff structures</p>	<p>44 people commented on proposal 3a to review management and staff structures: opinions were divided about the benefits of this proposal.</p> <p>Some respondents said that the number of managers and Members in NCC is excessive and their salaries are too high. Others contrasted previous cuts to front line services with general staff restructuring: “as front line services have been cut in previous years it is now time to look at the higher levels to see if any jobs overlap and could be put together to save cost”.</p> <p>Respondents also focused on the possible effects of reducing levels of staff on different groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users: “when reviewing staffing levels it must be recognised that good service to customers is dependent on motivated and valued staff”. • NCC - “sometimes means paying more to hire in contractors to do the work that still needs to be done”. • Staff – “Frontline staff in particular should not have workloads continually increased so they feel unable to provide an effective service.” <p>The cost of continued reorganisation was also commented upon: “making people redundant and then hiring them back on higher wages as contractors makes no sense and effects staff morale”.</p>
<p>3b – Develop different ways of working to reduce the cost of delivering shared services.</p>	<p>Five people commented on proposal 3b to develop different ways of working to reduce the cost of delivering our shared services. Two people suggested we make better use of technology and one stated that technology cannot replace people.</p>
<p>3c – Redesigning the way we deliver our services to reduce our costs</p>	<p>Two people responded on proposal 3c to redesign some services and reduce costs. One person highlighted the need to consult with services users about potential change and the other referred to the possibility of working more closely with health partners.</p>
<p>3d – Cutting some budgets.</p>	<p>Five people commented on proposal 3d to cut some budgets; two people made reference to reducing retirements costs, one to the need to continue consultation and another to the cost of producing the newsletter.</p>
<p>3e – Reduce the cost of delivering services.</p>	<p>Eight people commented on proposal 3e to reduce the cost of delivering services. Four respondents were in favour of reducing street lighting.</p>
<p>3f – Manage our investments in a different way.</p>	<p>Two people commented on proposal 3f to manage our investments in a different way. One respondent was in favour of the proposal on the grounds that it: “relates to the financial efficiency of the council, generates large savings and does not appear directly to impact on core services” and the other wanted more information.</p>

Ideas	
	<p>Some respondents made suggestions to improve efficiency but there were many more general comments about how we work and what we do: some were based on factually incorrect information (for example, that staff receive subsidised meals in the County Hall canteen) but are reported here to give a flavour of the breadth of people’s concerns and current thinking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff: challenge staff who appear to lack accountability or are resistant to innovation, make it easier for staff to be innovative and challenge bad practice, use community development workers differently for whole community support, ask staff for their suggestions, create new posts to review efficiency. • Members: reduce number of Members or their allowances. • County Hall: charge for car parking and reduce subsidies in canteen, improve electronic systems such as Oracle, cap mileage claims. • Ways of working: align everything to outcomes, make people [service users] aware of costs and charge more for expensive services, create an efficiency working group in NCC to review working practices. • Partnership working: work with private sector, merge or work with other councils, work alongside local businesses. • Schools and early years: review small school policy, ensure all lights are turned off in schools out of hours, ask grandparents to volunteer in nurseries, cut nursery provision, add solar panels to each school. • Travel and transport: improve pavements and road signage, invest more in cycling and public transport, stop the NDR, defer the NDR Western section. • Revenue raising: sell compost from recycled materials, put café in Park and Ride bases and libraries, sell off land and property, charge for waste collection, charge for internet use in libraries. • Economy: attract more businesses, charge tourists a small fee towards the services they use while in the county.

Equality Impact Assessment	
Describe any information in the responses which relates to EqIA	In their response to this proposal, one group highlighted a potential legal challenge as a result of previous cuts and proposed reductions: “furthermore, we are aware that an independent report to NCC as part of the peer review process has shown that the last round of cuts to adult social care were too deep to keep people safe and meet statutory duties”.

Analyst notes

Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings

16 people **critiqued** the consultation process on the grounds of lack of clarity or format. One respondent wanted to know the cost of making the proposed savings: making staff redundant, the cost of major retendering exercises, the impact on society if care is not provided, and the costs of not investing in education.

Other Information

- 311 people responded to this proposal.

Summary completed 6.1.15, Business Intelligence and Performance Service.