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# Introduction

1. This report summarises the findings of Norfolk County Council’s equality and rural impact assessments and public consultation on budget proposals for 2016/17 for Environment, Transport and Development.
2. It also sets out the legal framework for assessments and public consultation.

## **Legal and policy context**

1. Public authorities have a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 to consider the implications of proposals on people with protected characteristics. The Act states that public bodies must pay due regard to the following when planning, changing or commissioning services:

* Advancing equality of opportunity for people with ‘protected characteristics’[[1]](#endnote-1)
* Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct[[2]](#endnote-2)
* Fostering good community relations[[3]](#endnote-3).

1. Good practice in strategic planning also recommends that rural assessments are undertaken on proposals.
2. 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 tax payers, 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.

## **The purpose of equality and rural assessments**

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

## **How the Council assesses the budget proposals for 2016/17**

1. The assessment process comprises the following key steps:

* Public consultation is launched – making sure that residents, service users and stakeholders can highlight issues that must be taken into account.
* We gather evidence on each of the proposals – looking at the people who might be affected, the findings of related assessments and public consultation that has taken place such as the Council’s ‘Big Conversation’ and ‘Putting People First’ strategy and relevant data and research.
* When the Council’s public consultation on the budget proposals for 2016/17 draws to a close, we analysis all the results. We make sure that any impacts highlighted by residents and stakeholders inform the final assessments
* We publish the assessments on the Council’s budget consultation webpages. Committees consider the assessments during the January round of committee meetings. Full Council considers the findings of assessments before meeting on 22 February 2016 to agree the Council’s budget for 2016/17.

## **Human rights implications**

1. Public authorities in the UK are required to act compatibly with the Human Rights Act 1998.  There are limited human rights issues arising from the proposals, but any specific issues are addressed in the individual impact assessments.     
     
   **The details presented in the rest of this document**
2. This document presents in order, for each proposal, the equality and rural impact assessment, and the summary of findings for the public consultation. It also, following these, provides findings for other areas of the consultation relevant to this committee – so any further ideas or questions that were consulted upon – including the findings of questions on council tax.



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of proposal:** | Change our Historic Environment Service so that we only do what we have to by law [EDT026] |
| **Lead Officers:** | David Gurney – Historic Environment Manager, Sarah Rhoden – Business Support & Development Manager, CES  Neil Howard – Equality & Cohesion Officer |

## **Equality and rural assessment**

Analysis of proposal & potential impact

1. This impact assessment looks in more detail at how to redesign the historic environment service to deliver only the statutory service elements (EDT026).
2. Under the National Planning Policy Framework and other legislation we have to make sure that planning applications take account of the historic environment, which includes both historic buildings and archaeology. The Historic Environment Service (HES) provides information and expert advice to all of Norfolk’s local planning authorities (District Councils as well as the County Council).  For example, if a new road scheme or development is being planned HES would determine what archaeological or other heritage work was required and would manage the process on behalf of Norfolk County Council.
3. In addition to this service HES also currently provides other services which include:

* Providing reports on historic buildings;
* Delivering a programme of outreach and community engagement, organising and delivering heritage events and supporting communities;
* Identifying and recording archaeological finds.

1. Under this proposal we would stop providing these additional services in order to focus only on the planning service which we have to provide by law. This proposal would save £172,000 from our revenue budget.
2. If these proposal goes ahead it would mean that:-

* We would no longer offer specialist advice and record findings associated with historic buildings or undertake projects on historic buildings other than those in the care of Norfolk County Council;
* Individuals and organisations needing support for heritage events like open days and surveys would need to get some support from another organisations such as a district council, a national body like Historic England or a local organisation such as the Norfolk Historic Buildings group, and this may not be available for free;
* We would not provide a service to the Coroner for free to help them determine through an informed inquest whether a find is Treasure or not.

1. But, we will continue to:-

* make sure that planning applications take account of the historic environment, which includes both historic buildings and archaeology;
* operate the identification and recording service for archaeological finds through the national Portable Antiquities Scheme, including making information available electronically via the internet and encouraging for self-recording.

**More about the service**

1. The service currently organises around 147 heritage outreach and community events each year, attended around 6,000 people. This includes the following type of events:-

* Heritage open days at historic buildings owned by or leased to Norfolk County Council (e.g. mills, Bawburgh Monuments);
* Talks in Norfolk’s libraries (e.g. on World War One);
* Support to communities wanting to explore their heritage through e.g. test-pitting excavations;
* Royal Norfolk Show;
* Archaeology Day at Gressenhall Museum;
* Supporting Museum events at Norwich Castle Museum and Gressenhall;
* Talks to local history groups; and
* Delivering community heritage events as part of larger projects – e.g. Breaking New Ground (Brecks Landscape Partnership).

1. The events are attended by a wide range of individuals, including those from protected groups. None of the events are specifically targeted at individuals with protected characteristics.

Potential impact

1. At this stage, no significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics is identified.
2. There may be some rural impact. This is because many heritage sites and finds are located in rural areas of the county. However, the main focus of work relating to heritage sites and finds, whether carried out by the County Council or others, is to enhance and protect these assets and history for the benefit of all, and not just those in the immediate local area, be it rural or local. In view of this, no detrimental impact on rural areas is identified.

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

* Relevant legislation - See Appendix A for information on the Legal Framework.
* National Planning Policy Framework and Guidance
* Town and country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995

The protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

## **Consultation findings**

|  |
| --- |
| **Title of proposal** |
| **Change our Historic Environment Service so that we only do what we have to by law** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Respondent Numbers** – Number and percent agree, disagree and don’t know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers |
| * There were 595 responses received for this proposal. * 205 people (34%) agreed with the proposal * 331 people (56%) disagreed with the proposal * 59 people (10%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal |

**Analysis of responses**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation, group or petition responses** | |
| Please describe any petitions received.  Please record any groups or organisations which responded. | We received one petition against this proposal asking Norfolk County Council to “stop proposed cuts to Norfolk’s historical find and identification service”. At the close of the consultation, the petition had 1135 signatures.  48 respondents told us that they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:   * Adult Day Care Limited * All Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group * Archaeological Risk Management * Aylsham Town Council * Break Charity * Broadland District Council * Brundall Local History Group * Caistor Roman Project (3 submissions) * Cromer Town Council * Discovery Tours International * Forestry Commission - East England Forest District * Historic England * Joint submission by Norfolk metal detecting organisations (representing 267 members) * Malcolm Books * Mind * Mums in the Know Norwich * National Council for Metal Detecting. * Norfolk Archaeological Trust * Norfolk Coroner's Service * Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group * Norfolk Record Society * Northrepps Parish Council * Norwich Young Archaeologists Club * Ormesby St Margaret parish council * Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council * Parish Council (unspecified) * Poringland Parish Council * Portable Antiquities Advisory Group, British Museum * Rescue, The British Archaeological Trust (2 responses) * Save Norfolk's History Now - petition * Sheringham Town council * South Norfolk District Council * Swanton Morley Parish Council * Tasburgh Parish Council * Taverham Parish Council * The BUILD Charity * The Council for British Archaeology Eastern Region Committee and Local Heritage Engagement Network (representing 300 members) * The Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society (representing 400 members) * The University of Cambridge (2 responses) * Tilney All Saints Local History Group * Treasure Valuation Committee * Unite social group * University of Nottingham / Caistor Roman Project * Your Own Place CIC |
| Please summarise all petition or group responses. | 34 organisations/groups disagreed, 10 agreed, and 4 said that they didn’t know/didn’t answer.  Of the groups that disagreed with the proposal, the main reasons given were the importance of the service in **preserving the county’s heritage**, the fact that the national Liaison Officers Network funded by the British Museum and the national Portable Antiquities Scheme were inspired by Norfolk’s approach, and the **fundamental value of the Identification and Recording Service** in recording archaeological finds made by the public (24 responses). The Historic Environment Service (HES) is described by groups as “exemplary” and “pioneering”, a “national leader” and “exceptional in terms of the quantity, quality and expertise built up over many years and its Heritage Environment Record is a leader nationally in its field”. Several groups noted that Norfolk pioneered the Portable Antiquities Scheme approach: “Norfolk pioneered the recording of metal detector finds (a system subsequently adopted nationally as the Portable Antiquities Scheme)” and note that Norfolk is a national leader in the number of finds recorded: “It is also important to note that the historic environment of Norfolk is exceptional in terms of the quantity of data it produces (some 20-25% of all recorded finds of portable antiquities in the UK come from Norfolk)”.  Several groups who disagreed described the **important role the service plays in communities** (17 responses), describing “community outreach”, village archaeology projects, work with “schools and other community groups”, and the development of a sense of local pride: “development-led archaeological work provides not only a rare opportunity for commercial developers to reap the benefits of public endorsement, but also engenders a sense of place and local pride that reflects very positively on the County Council and its Historic Environment Record team.”  Several groups who disagreed expressed concern about the **impact the proposed cuts could have on the quality of the service offered** (16 responses). This included concerns about the “quality and success” of community outreach projects and statements that there could be a “steep decline” in the number of new records processed, or a “drastic reduction in production of data on finds”.  Several groups who disagreed described the Historic Environment Service as an **important or key service**, using terms like “excellent and invaluable”, “essential”, “important to the lives of local people” and “an important service” (15 responses).  Several of the groups who disagreed with the proposal also described it as **short sighted** (15 responses), citing the long term damage done to the service and to Norfolk’s ability to find and record objects of note and the fact that once lost the expertise in the service cannot be easily regained: “This is expertise that cannot be replaced once it is lost and this the HES is not something that could be recreated in less straitened times”, “Any proposed cuts will almost certainly be irreversible.”  Several of the groups who disagreed expressed concern about the **impact on partners** (9 responses); this included partner organisations who told us about an impact on themselves (British Museum, Forestry Commission, Historic England, and Norfolk Coroner’s Service) and those who expressed **concern about the impact on local detectorists, field walkers, amateur archaeologists and their clubs.**  **Historic England’s response** included comments that that they would not be able to provide the historic building advice we suggest in the proposal and have no capacity to assist with events such as Heritage Open Days. They also note that some of their services are chargeable. **Norfolk Coroner’s Service’s response** covers in detail the impact on their service if the proposed cuts were to go ahead: “"In conclusion, the Coroner has a legal duty to hold inquests into finds of potential treasure and to make a finding as to whether any item is indeed treasure. The Coroner relies heavily on the expertise presently available in the Historic Environment Service to provide this. If this Service is not available, the Coroner will be required to look elsewhere for this expertise and the provision of evidence. This will result in more time and work for the Coroner's service, placing greater demand on the service and with little if any financial saving, in that the expertise will need to be found outside Norfolk County Council and will still require funding."  The majority of groups who agreed and didn’t know/didn’t answer did not give reasons for their views.  **South Norfolk District Council** said that they “currently contribute towards this service and would like to work with the County council to understand the implications regarding this funding and alternative service provision”. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people’s views in…** | |
| Agreeing with the proposal? | 205 people (34%) agreed with the proposal to change our Historic Environment Service. Most people who agreed with the proposal did not give a reason but of those who did, the main reason given was that the service is not essential, particularly when compared to other services such as social care.  28 respondents said that the reason they agreed with our proposal was because the service was **not essential**, describing it as a “luxury” or “not a priority”. Some people recognised that whilst the service itself is of value, when compared to other services that NCC is responsible for, it is less of a priority: “Whilst a shame, this is a nice to have service. Whilst there will be a lot in the local press about this, it doesn't even compare to challenges the council is facing in areas like Adult Social Care.”, “We must concentrate resources on supporting statutory obligations.”  141 of the 205 people who agreed with this proposal **did not give a reason** for their viewpoint. Some wrote freetext responses such as “support”, “needs must” or “no opinion”, “no choice”, “reluctantly agree” and “seems sensible” but the vast majority wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement. |
| Disagreeing with the proposal? | 331 people (56%) disagreed with the proposal to change our Historic Environment Service. The main reasons given for disagreeing were: the importance of preserving the county’s heritage, concern about the long term impact of making these changes, and descriptions of the service as key or essential.  202 people who disagreed with the proposal gave as their reason the importance of the service in **preserving the county’s heritage.**   * Several respondents noted the **importance of recording our history** through finds: “thousands of items are recorded each year are recorded for the public to see and understand the context of where they come from”, and others noted the importance of the Historic Environment Service in helping us to “understand and protect our heritage”, with one respondent commenting “if we cannot touch our history we lose our identity”. * Others commented on the **significance of Norfolk’s role and reputation in this area**, having a “historically close relationship between its archaeologists and the public. It was precisely this special relationship which fuelled the origin of the highly successful and much lauded Portable Antiquities Scheme”. This sentiment is echoed in the responses received from groups as described above, including the British Museum and All Party Parliamentary Archaeology Group, both of which note that the **Portable Antiquities Scheme** was “largely inspired” by the earlier approach taken in Norfolk. Others described the service as “noteworthy and acclaimed”, having a “superb reputation”, as being “one of the County’s jewels and the finest in the country”, as “the best Historic Environment Record service in the country”, and as a “flagship service”. * Several responses also note that Norfolk continues to be the **richest county in the country in terms of the number of finds reported each year under the scheme**: “we have more archaeological finds than any other county”, “an unrivalled record of such finds”, and describing Norfolk as “the busiest county for finds made by the public”.   127 respondents described the proposal as **short sighted**, including concerns that it will “cost more in the long run”, have “huge effects in future years” and “once destroyed it will take decades to restore”. Impacts on education and research as well as tourism were mentioned by some as a possible consequence of this short sightedness.  120 respondents who disagreed with the proposal described the Historic Environment Service as a **key service**, using terms like “enormously important resource”, “vital”, “invaluable”, “incredibly useful”, and “fundamental to my research”.  Other reasons given for disagreeing with the proposal were: that the quality of the service would be affected (76 responses), that the proposed changes would have an impact on Norfolk’s economy, including tourism (76 responses), that without experienced and specialist staff the service would be compromised (76 comments), comments about the importance for communities of the service, especially the outreach element (66 responses), the important role the service and its staff play in education (58 responses), and the small size of the proposed saving (54 responses).  A number of those who disagreed with the proposal (64 people) specifically mentioned the **important relationships that have been built in Norfolk between detectorists and the Historic Environment Service**. Respondents describe the “good relationship” with metal detectorists, and the work done by the service to promote the recording of amateur finds: “More than just a hobby, metal detecting provides the backbone for learning about the past in the spaces between excavations and for a fraction of the price per year of large excavations. As data sciences for handling large databases like the NHER become more advanced, this data will only gain value. The landmark work carried out by the individuals at the HES must be allowed to continue, as the partnerships they have fostered with metal detecting enthusiasts are unique in the UK. Solely providing statutory services would be an immense disservice to science, to heritage, and to community engagement.” |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?** |
| 59 people (10%) said that they didn’t know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal to change our Historic Environment Service  41 of the 59 respondents who said that they didn’t know/didn’t answer did not give a reason. Of those who did, there was no consensus in the reasons given, but these included: suggestions that we charge for the service (5 respondents), that the service is important or key (5 comments), that protecting our heritage is important (4 comments), and comments that the service is not essential or a luxury/nice to have (3 comments). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Analyst notes** | |
| Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings | 39 people **critiqued** the proposal – comments included that the proposal is not clear, that we should engage more with the public, that we should save money elsewhere first, that we are shifting costs to other organisations, that volunteers cannot fill the gap left by removing experienced professionals, that the cut to this small service are disproportionate, that focusing only on statutory elements distorts the services, that statements in the proposal about historic building reports are misleading or inaccurate, that NCC will only have underperforming services left, and that heritage services are seen as a “soft target”.  20 respondents said that they are concerned about the **legal** implications of the proposed change, this included general comments about NCC’s “statutory duty” to protect the historic environment, or “failing in its remit to protect the historic environment”.   * There were 13 comments relating to NCC’s duties under the **1996 Treasure Act**, including concerns about the impact on the Coroner’s Service who “depends on the Identification and Recording Service for expert advice on the finds of treasure reported to them and that advice would no longer be available if the cuts were to go ahead” and more general concerns about the correct operation of the Treasure Act in Norfolk if the proposal were to go ahead. In their response, Historic England state that: “We are extremely concerned that the proposals depart from the principles and practice required by the Secretary of State’s Code of Practice in force under s.11 Treasure Act 1996." In their response, the Norfolk Coroner’s Service emphasise that it is a requirement of the Coroner’s Act to provide evidence before a declaration of treasure can be made and make reference to the legal duties of the Coroner under the Treasure Act. * There were 5 comments about the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, including comments that the proposal runs counter to NCC’s responsibilities under the NPPF guidance: “runs counter to the NPPF guidance that the historic environment should be conserved and managed by local authorities in an integrated and joined-up way. Indeed, most of our commercial clients expect all aspects of heritage (both above and below ground) to be addressed in formulating planning proposals and environmental assessments”, and a comment that “The National Planning Policy Framework also requires appropriate and professional consideration of these concerns.” Historic England stated in their response that the proposal is “"incompatible with paragraph 141 of the NPPF" and that the Identification and Recording Service is a legal requirement under this paragraph. |

**Summary completed 19/01/16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service**



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of proposal:** | Spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk Consultation proposal: Highway network analysis and safety procurement EDT017 |
| **Lead Officer:** | Dave Stephens – Team Manager (Traffic Analysis), Sarah Rhoden – Business Support & Development Manager, CES  Neil Howard – Equality & Cohesion Officer |

## **Equality and rural assessment**

Analysis of proposal & potential impact

* 1. This impact assessment looks in more detail at the proposal to spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk. We are proposing to reduce the amount we spend on buying in network analysis services from contractors and external providers. This would save £40k in 2016/17.
  2. In 2016/17 our total revenue budget for this will be is £39,280 plus an amount of staff time to support the work as client. If this proposal goes ahead the revenue budget will be zero. Staff resource would be re-directed to other activities for which income in the form of fees is generated.
  3. If this proposal goes ahead it would mean that:-
* The work of the team will focus on projects where we receive funding for the collection and analysis of traffic; we would no longer be able to support parish councils or businesses with traffic counts or speed measurements without making a charge to cover the full costs.
* Stop funding the provision of traffic marshals in Norwich city center during peak times e.g. Christmas.
  1. But, we will continue to:-
* Carry out some data collection and monitoring activities to help assess issues and priorities (this will increasingly be based on automated sites equipped with Intelligent Transport Systems and on-line sources rather than manual counts);
* Provide support and advice to parish councils and businesses;
* Arrange traffic counts or speed measurements for parish councils and businesses, provided they can fund them;
* Carry out safety and network analysis work which is funded through projects (our total budget on these activities in 2016/17 would be £1.254m) and other bids for funding; and
* Monitor road casualties and carry out strategic traffic monitoring to identify safety and congestion issues across the network.
  1. The Traffic Management Act 2004 places duties on the County Council in relation to managing the road network to facilitate and secure expeditious movement of traffic on the network. The County Council also has duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1988 which require us to carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles and take appropriate measures to prevent accidents.
  2. We carry out a range of activities, working with stakeholders and partners, including traffic counts, surveys, feasibility studies, traffic assessments, accident investigation and prevention studies and road safety audits. We also monitor road accident statistics and help develop schemes/actions that can improve safety and prevent accidents.
  3. The full range of work will be continued to be carried out within the new level of budget, but at reduced volumes.

Potential impact

* 1. At this stage, no significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or rural communities is identified.
  2. Traffic counts and speed measurements will no longer be provided to parish councils free of charge. Community Action Norfolk has queried whether this could have a disproportionate impact on rural areas as urban areas are largely unparished. It is correct that some large urban areas in the county are unparished (in Norwich and Great Yarmouth) and so would be unaffected. However, it isn’t just rural areas which are parished - parish councils cover both rural and urban/semi-urban areas and many are sub-urban.
  3. Whilst the volumes of traffic in urban (and surrounding) areas is greater and can present a ‘bigger’ need, road traffic accidents involving death or serious injury primarily happen in rural areas on quieter and faster roads. Work is currently prioritised to the areas of greatest need, irrespective of whether the need is rural or urban. It is worth re-stating that the County Council will continue to carry out its monitoring and investigation of road casualty statistics so there will be no disproportionate impact on road safety from this proposal.
  4. Community Action Norfolk has also queried whether Council has considered empowering communities to undertake traffic counts and speed measurements by providing the technology/training to enable parishes to do this work for themselves along the lines of Speedwatch. The Council is looking to support local delivery of services, including use of volunteers. However our experience is that it is actually very difficult to secure the required commitment from volunteers to ensure that the surveys are successful. Whilst many people are willing to contribute a few hours, the demands of a full 12 hour period of very high concentration, often in adverse weather conditions and with limited time for breaks can be off-putting for all but the most motivated volunteer. Some speed measurement activities need specialist equipment to be installed in the road and this can only be done by those with the relevant qualifications to work on the highway.

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

* Relevant legislation - See Appendix A for information on the Legal Framework.
* The Traffic Management Act 2004
* Traffic Regulation Act 1988

The protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

## **Consultation findings**

|  |
| --- |
| **Title of proposal** |
| **Spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Respondent Numbers** – Number and percent agree, disagree and don’t know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers |
| * There were 462 responses received for this proposal. * 312 people (68%) agreed with the proposal * 106 people (23%) disagreed with the proposal * 44 people (9%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal |

**Analysis of responses**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation, group or petition responses** | |
| Please describe any petitions received.  Please record any groups or organisations which responded. | No petitions were received  26 respondents told us that they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:   * Adult Day Care Limited * Aylsham Town Council * Break Charity * Broadland Older People's Partnership * Diss Town Council * Great Yarmouth Borough Council * Long Stratton Parish Council * Malcolm Books * MAP * Mind * Mums in the Know Norwich * Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group * Norfolk Record Society * North Norfolk District Council * Northrepps Parish Council * Ormesby St Margaret parish council * Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council * Parish Council (unspecified) * Poringland Parish Council * Sloley Parish Council * South Norfolk District Council * Swanton Morley Parish Council * Taverham Parish Council * The BUILD Charity * Unite social group. * Your Own Place CIC |
| Please summarise all petition or group responses. | 15 of the groups agreed with the proposal, 8 groups disagreed and 5 groups said that they didn’t know/didn’t answer the question.  The main reason given by groups for agreeing was that the current service is ineffective: “What is being done already seems to be utterly useless and ineffective, so get rid of it”, and “Yep, go for it. Norwich has such appalling traffic anyway, it's clear that time spent analysing and measuring traffic congestion hasn't worked anyway!”  There was no consensus amongst the groups who disagreed; reasons given included: that the service will deteriorate, that with increasing development and more traffic the service is more needed than ever, and that as a result of this cut traffic will become worse. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 people (68%) agreed with the proposal to spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk. A large number of people who agreed with the proposal did not give a reason, but of those who did the main reasons given were: that other organisations should take responsibility for this service, that we should charge for the service, and that this is not essential/a priority.  28 people who said that they agreed with the proposal **supported the idea of charging for the service**.   * Some respondents said that if businesses and shops want the service they would pay: “Yes, if businesses want this they should pay. “, “If Traffic Marshalls continue they should be paid for by the businesses that benefit. It is their customers that clog up the streets.”. * Others thought that parish councils could pay: “Parish Councils must pay for this service.”, “The Council should be charging for its services, especially to bodies which can afford to pay for them, charging businesses and parish councils for traffic counts and speed measurements seems like a very good idea.” * Whilst others expressed surprise that it wasn’t already a service we charge for: “Should this not be a fee paying service anyway?”   23 respondents told us that they **do not think that this service is a priority**, describing it as “nice to do”, “not needed” or “not priorities”. Some people told us that the service is not effective so it is okay to cut it: “No really useful purpose served by having these services.”, “What is being done already seems to be utterly useless and ineffective, so get rid of it”  20 people said that they agreed that **other organisations should take responsibility for this service** – either paying for it, taking it on themselves, or sharing the role with us. Partners mentioned include: parish councils, city businesses and retailers, and Norfolk Constabulary: “Parish councils and businesses could probably carry out their own surveys relatively cheaply.”, “If it's speeding related surely the police should be involved?”, “This role can be shared with Norfolk Constabulary”  168 of the 312 people who agreed with this proposal **did not give a reason** for their viewpoint.  Some wrote free text responses such as “pointless exercise “and “sensible proposals” but the vast majority wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement. |
| Disagreeing with the proposal? | 106 people (23%) disagreed with the proposal spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk. The main reason given was concern about the impact on traffic.  24 people who disagreed with the proposal expressed concern about **current** **traffic problems** which could be compounded by the proposed cut or possible impact on future traffic if the proposal were to go ahead: “The traffic in Norwich especially around the car parks is now so disruptive to the whole city and the residents living near the city I think it is unacceptable and needs to be marshalled and reviewed”, “the city centre has ground to a halt before due to stupid people trying to get in to car parks. Traffic marshals are needed to keep things moving. Without this there would be a huge commercial loss. I still remember the grid lock”  Other reasons given for disagreeing with the proposal include: that the service is important or essential (12 responses), concerns about safety (9 responses), that the proposal will have a negative impact on partners (7 responses) and that the saving is small (6 responses). |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?** |
| 44 people (9%) said that they didn’t know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal to spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk.  There was no real consensus in the reasons given but reasons included: concern about whether parish councils could support this work (4 responses), concerns about safety (3 comments), comments about the impact on traffic (4 comments), and comments that the saving is relatively small (3 responses). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Analyst notes** | |
| Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings | 59 people **critiqued** the proposal, including comments that the current service is not effective, that traffic is bad anyway, that NCC spends unwisely on large projects such as the NDR and Tombland projects, and that NCC do not use the traffic monitoring data to inform decisions anyway. |

**Summary completed 20/01/16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of proposal:** | Use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance EDT030; Spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting EDT031 |
| **Lead Officers:** | Nick Tupper – Highways Maintenance Manager, CES, Sarah Rhoden – Business Support & Development Manager, CES  Neil Howard – Equality & Cohesion Officer |

## **Equality and rural assessment**

* 1. This impact assessment looks in more detail at the proposal to use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance
  2. We are proposing to spend less on maintaining roads and verges, and bridges. The proposal, if agreed, would mean reviewing the activities that make up this work to determine where we can safely deliver a lower level of service. This would include doing things like less grass cutting, less weed spraying and work on verges, hedges and trees, less work on road drainage, replacing road markings less often, reducing non-essential bridge maintenance, reducing the winter service, including gritting fewer minor roads and no longer filling grit bins provided by town and parish councils. This would save £245k in 2016/17 and a further £735k in 2017/18 from our revenue budget.
  3. We are also proposing to switch the use of £3m from our capital budget to highways maintenance activities so that we can save that money from our revenue budget.

This would save £3m in 2016/17 from our revenue budget.

We have assessed these two proposals together to ensure the full impact of these inter-related proposals can be taken into account.

**More about the proposal**

* 1. In 2015/16 our revenue budget for highways maintenance was £23.6m and our capital budget was £32.7m.
  2. If these proposals go ahead it would mean that:-
  3. Overall, we would be investing less in the highways network;
* We would have less money to build new things (highway schemes) such as roads and crossings.  This would reduce the number of minor improvements and major structural schemes, such as re-surfacing roads;
* We would do fewer improvements, such as new footpaths and road crossings that often come from local community requests;
* We would reduce some of our standards so that we do some things less frequently, for example spraying weeds less often; and
* It is also possible that, in the longer term, the costs of our day-to-day highways maintenance could go up because we will have less capital budget available i.e. we might have to patch some roads and fill potholes whereas before we might have been able to use our capital budget to pay for the roads to be completely resurfaced.
  1. But, we will continue to:-
* Maintain the road network that we currently have;
* Respond to day-to-day maintenance problems that arise, like potholes;
* Carry out any safety critical work; and
* Give local communities an opportunity to influence the maintenance work carried out in their area, through the Highway Rangers service.
  1. We have a legal duty to maintain the highway, making it safe for road users.  We meet this duty through a wide range of activities including pothole repairs, road patching, drain cleaning, grass cutting, sign cleaning, winter maintenance, bridge and culvert repairs and emergency response to incidents on the highway.
  2. We prioritise the work we do by looking at the strategic importance of the road and how severe the problem is, including carrying out regular inspections. This process is set out in Norfolk’s Transport Asset Management Plan.
  3. The condition of the highway network has been deteriorating for some time as we have had less money to spend.
  4. The highways service is universal in that it is used by all residents, visitors and business in Norfolk, whether as drivers, passengers, pedestrians, cyclists or those people who rely on the highway network to enable them to access key services e.g. to receive deliveries or visits.
  5. However, disabled and older people often have a greater reliance on the availability of the highway network to access the things they need day to day.
  6. The remaining budget levels mean that work will continue to protect and improve the highway network, helping to keep it in a safe and reliable condition for all users. Whist the budget available to carry out work is reducing, there are opportunities for parish councils to buy additional services for their local area, through paid-for top-up services and obtaining ‘grants’ through the Parish Partnership scheme. Existing roads, paths and walkways used by disabled people, vulnerable people and others to access local services will continue to be maintained. Improvements funded by the remaining capital budget will continue to be prioritised so that it is spent in those areas with the biggest need/priority.

Potential Impact

* 1. At this stage, no significant detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or rural areas is identified.
  2. This is because highway maintenance and improvement work will continue to be carried out across the whole of Norfolk and investment in highway improvements will continue to be prioritised so that money is spend in the areas with the biggest need/priority. Work will continue to be carried out to ensure the highway continues to be safe and available in both rural and urban areas.

Action to address any negative impact

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Action/s** | **Lead** | **Date** |
| 1. | Identify which highway maintenance standards will be reduced and to what extent | Highways Maintenance Manager | Discuss with EDT Committee as January 2016 meeting |
| 2. | Apportionment of the capital budget between structural maintenance, bridge strengthening and new infrastructure will be considered in a report at the EDT Committee in January 2016 | Capital Programme Manager | Discuss with EDT Committee as January 2016 meeting |

List of evidence used to conduct analysis

* Relevant legislation - See Appendix A for information on the Legal Framework.
* Highways Act 1980
* Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
* County Transport Asset Plan

The protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

## **Consultation findings**

|  |
| --- |
| **Title of proposal** |
| Use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance |

|  |
| --- |
| **Respondent Numbers** – Number and percent agree, disagree and don’t know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers |
| * There were 459 responses received for this proposal. * 278 people (61%) agreed with the proposal * 120 people (26%) disagreed with the proposal * 61 people (13%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal |

**Analysis of responses**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation, group or petition responses** | |
| Please describe any petitions received.  Please record any groups or organisations which responded. | No petitions were received  28 respondents told us that they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:   * Adult Day Care Limited * Aylsham Town Council * Break Charity * Broadland Older People's Partnership * Diss Town Council * Long Stratton Parish Council * Malcolm Books * MAP * Mind * Mums in the Know Norwich * Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group * Norfolk Record Society * Northrepps Parish Council * Ormesby St Margaret parish council * Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council * Parish Council (unspecified) * Poringland Parish Council * Sheringham Town Council * Sloley Parish Council * Smallburgh Parish Council * Snettisham Parish Council * South Norfolk District Council * Swanton Morley Parish Council * Tasburgh Parish Council * Taverham Parish Council * The BUILD Charity * Unite social group. * Your Own Place CIC |
| Please summarise all petition or group responses. | 15 organisations/groups agreed, 7 disagreed, and 6 said that they didn’t know/didn’t answer.  There was no real consensus amongst the groups who agreed; reasons given included: the current poor state of the highways, the importance of the service, concerns about safety, and comments about the importance of infrastructure.  There was no real consensus amongst the groups that disagreed; reasons given included: that the proposal is short-sighted and will cost more in the long run, and that highways are vital and must be maintained.  There were no common themes in the responses from groups who said that they didn’t know if they agreed with the proposal or not, or who didn’t answer. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people’s views in…** | |
| Agreeing with the proposal? | 278 people (61%) agreed with the proposal to use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance. The main reasons given were: the current poor state of the roads, and agreement with the proviso that safety is not compromised.  24 respondents who agreed with the proposal said that the **current state of the roads is poor** and therefore they believe that it is better to use our money to maintain the current highways rather than building more: “no point building new roads if the old ones are falling apart!”, “we should repair our current roads rather than build more”, “It is more important to maintain what we already have properly rather than add more new projects to the list of things which will then need maintaining in the future”  20 people who agreed did so with a **caveat or proviso**, for example that the saving is a one-off and not to be repeated, or that when finances improve the previous level of service is resumed: “This clearly is not a sustainable way to maintain roads but may plug the gap for the time being.” and “stop new schemes until we can afford to do more.”.  19 people said that they agree with the proposal **so long as it does not impact on safety**: “As long as safety is not compromised”, or because they believe the proposal means that the **roads will continue to be kept safe**: “keep the roads in good condition to prevent deaths on the road”.  174 of the 184 people who agreed with this proposal **did not give a reason** for their viewpoint. Some wrote freetext responses such as “sensible suggestion”, “reasonable way of saving money” or “no contest”, “fine with this”, “support”, but the vast majority wrote nothing so we cannot know the reasons for their agreement. |
| Disagreeing with the proposal? | 120 people (26%) disagreed with the proposal to use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance. The main reasons given were: that the proposal is short sighted and will cost more in the long run, and the current poor state of the roads.  For 26 respondents, the reason given for disagreeing with the proposal was because it is **short sighted** – potentially costing more in the longer run, or being a “false economy”: “Very short sighted”, “Looks like it would be short-sighted and cost more in the long run”, “on the whole, lowering investment in this infrastructure seems short-sighted”  22 people said that they disagreed with the proposal because of the **current poor state of the roads**: “Norfolk’s roads are a mess”, “very little maintenance or gritting is done in my areas as it is”, “The condition of the roads that I use is poor when compared to roads in other parts of Europe”  42 of the 120 people who disagreed with this proposal **did not give a reason** for their viewpoint and wrote nothing in the free text box so we cannot know the reasons for their disagreement. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?** |
| 61 people (13%) said that they didn’t know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal to use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance.  8 of these respondents cited concerns about **safety.**  Other reasons given included the view that the proposal is short-sighted and would cost more in the long run (6 responses), and comments about the current poor state of the roads (5 responses). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Analyst notes** | |
| Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings | 53 people **critiqued** the proposal, with 16 of these mentioning the NDR as unnecessary spending. Other criticisms included that: there is too much focus on growth, we should be doing this anyway, roadworks take too long, the saving is not sustainable, current spend is inappropriate, criticism of the Push the Pedalways scheme and Tombland project, that NCC cannot be trusted to make good decisions about highways, and that it does not make sense to spend money on new roads when existing ones need maintaining.  6 respondents said that they are concerned about the **legal** implications of the proposed change, in particular the possibility of increased damage to cars from potholes and subsequent insurance claims: “Day to day maintenance must continue. Could the cost of potential litigation from road users whose vehicles have been damaged by unrepaired roads outweigh the cost of the proposed cuts?“ |

**Summary completed 20/01/16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service**

|  |
| --- |
| **Title of proposal** |
| Spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Respondent Numbers** – Number and percent agree, disagree and don’t know/blank where applicable. If relevant also include numbers of respondents who were service users and carers |
| * There were 477 responses received for this proposal. * 130 people (27%) agreed with the proposal * 299 people (63%) disagreed with the proposal * 48 people (10%) told us that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal |

**Analysis of responses**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation, group or petition responses** | |
| Please describe any petitions received.  Please record any groups or organisations which responded. | No petitions were received  35 respondents told us that they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:   * Adult Day Care Limited * Aylsham Town Council * Break Charity * Broadland Older People's Partnership * Cantley Parish Council * Cromer Town Council * Dereham Town Council * Diss Town Council * Great Yarmouth Borough Council * Long Stratton Parish Council * Malcolm Books * MAP * Mind * Mums in the Know Norwich * Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group * Norfolk Record Society * Northrepps Parish Council * Ormesby St Margaret parish council * Ormesby with Scratby Parish Council * Parish Council (unspecified) * Poringland Parish Council * Sheringham Town council * Sloley Parish Council * Smallburgh Parish Council * Snettisham Parish Council * South Norfolk District Council * Stalham Town Council * Swanton Morley Parish Council * Tasburgh Parish Council * Taverham Parish Council * Tharston and Hapton Parish Council * The BUILD Charity * Unite social group. * University of Cambridge * Your Own Place CIC |
| Please summarise all petition or group responses. | 24 organisations/groups said that they disagreed, 6 said that they agreed and 5 said that they didn’t know/didn’t answer.  9 of the groups who said that they disagreed with the proposal raised concerns about **safety**, describing the proposed cuts as “positively dangerous and life-threatening”, concern that the changes could result in “more accidents/damage to vehicles” and comments expressing concern for elderly residents “who are more vulnerable to falls on un-gritted footpaths”.  Other reasons given by groups for disagreeing included: the importance of winter gritting services, concern about impact on rural areas, comments that the proposal is short-sighted and will cost more in the long run, and comments about the current state of the roads.  One organisation expressed concern that the proposal about filling grit bins would “not be cost savings to the Council Tax payer because the cost will need to be picked up by Parish Councils” and that the economy of scale enjoyed by NCC in filling grit bins would not be so for Parish Councils meaning poorer value for money for the tax payer as a result.  Reasons given by the groups who agreed with the proposal included that communities can step in and do some maintenance themselves, and that the proposed cut “will not have a detrimental effect on society as a whole”. One response suggested that more is made of the partnership between NCC and parish councils, with NCC filling strategically placed grit bins whilst the Parish Council fill others.  There was no consensus in the reasons given by groups who said that they didn’t know if they agreed or disagreed/didn’t answer but comments included: the importance of the winter gritting service, concerns about safety, the essential nature of highways maintenance, including the importance to the economy and rural areas. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Looking at all of the responses, are there any consistent, repeated or notable reasons given for people’s views in…** | |
| Agreeing with the proposal? | 130 people (27%) agreed with the proposal to spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting. The main reasons given were: agreeing with some aspects only, agreeing as long as safety is not compromised, and because of a positive impact on the environment and wildlife.  28 people who said that they agreed with the proposal **did not agree with all aspects** and 13 of these specifically said that they did not agree with any cut to **gritting/winter maintenance**: “Whilst I would agree to cutting down on the majority of the services listed I do not agree with the last point because if anything, more road gritting needs to be done on more roads in the winter not less.”, “It's a wide proposal, so whilst agree with less grass cutting, do not agree with less gritting”  17 people said that they agreed with the proposal **so long as it does not impact on safety**: “Agree however: spending must be available if there is a danger to public safety”, “as long as safety is not compromised”    12 respondents who agreed with the proposal said that stopping cutting grass and verges would have a **positive impact for the environment/wildlife and look attractive**: “Wildlife will benefit from uncut verges”, “Personally I think councils should abandon a lot of the roadside mowing and seek to plant wild flowers along the verges and regard this as a valuable wildlife habitat. I have seen this approach in parks and it is quite lovely in the summer.You can extend the mowing intervals and put flowers in with the grass to make driving a pleasurable experience for visitors.”, “An added benefit might be that if verges are not cut they can provide havens for wild flowers and wildlife.” |
| Disagreeing with the proposal? | 299 people (63%) disagreed with the proposal to spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting. The main reasons given were: concerns about safety, comments about the importance of gritting, comments about the current poor state of the roads, and that the proposal is short sighted/will cost more in the long run.  105 respondents said that they disagreed with the proposal due to **concerns about safety**.   * This included concern that poorly maintained roads could lead to more accidents: “I believe this would cause more accidents on rural roads”, “will cause long term problems, increase accidents and endanger lives”, “These are essential safety issues highly visible to the public and must be maintained.”, “Big cuts here could be positively dangerous and life-threatening. You should be very careful before you put lives at risk.“. * Concerns about safety included lack of gritting and winter maintenance, road markings, drainage work and cutting of verges as well: “Having recently driven in fog visible road markings are an essential safety resource.”, “Doing less verge and grass cutting is dangerous visually for the driver, we live in a rural area. Less road drainage is also a dangerous plan for health and safety. Road markings are there for a reason?”   In addition, 62 people specifically highlighted the need for **gritting/winter maintenance to continue or increase** as a reason for disagreeing with the proposal: “I agree in the main with the proposal but we cannot reduce the already scant gritting service.”, “As previously we need to improve the condition of the roads and to cut gritting in winter would to me be madness.”, “Maintain gritting for safety”.  49 people who said that they disagreed with the proposal mentioned the **current poor state of the highways,** lack of existing gritting services or road markings: “Roads in Norfolk are bad enough as it is.”, “This is a dangerous move given the poor quality of our rural roads”, “I take calls on these services for my job. Do you know how much the public complain about things not being done already? This is really important to members of the public and they won’t be happy if there are cuts.”, “Road markings through so much of North Norfolk are appalling, more needs to be spent on this, not less. Hardly any of the roads in north Norfolk are gritted, including roads to Norwich, which makes winter travel really dangerous.”  For 34 respondents, the reason given for disagreeing with the proposal was because it is **short sighted** – potentially costing more in the longer run, leading to more repairs in the future, or additional work: “A short-term cut that would cause long-term issues that would ultimately cost more”, “would non maintenance lead to more costs long term when unrepairable?”, “will cause long term problems, increase accidents and endanger lives, also have an effect on emergency services (police ambulance and fire) increasing their costs due to attending such incidents”  Other reasons given for disagreeing with the proposal included: the importance of the roads for the economy (20 responses), concerns about impact on rural areas (17 responses), and comments about flooding (11 responses). |

|  |
| --- |
| **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?** |
| 48 people (10%) said that they didn’t know if they agreed or disagreed with the proposal to spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting.  19 respondents said they agreed or disagreed with part of the proposal but not all of it, or gave a proviso or caveat to their agreement such as that safety isn’t compromised. 18 respondents referred specifically to the importance of the winter gritting service, and 13 responses were about safety concerns.  Other reasons given included: suggestions that parish councils could take on more of these responsibilities (7 responses), and comments that highways maintenance is an essential service (5 responses). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Analyst notes** | |
| Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings | 28 people **critiqued** the proposal, including comments questioning if the capital budget can be used for this purpose, questioning the figures quoted, suggestions that staff are overpaid, criticisms about inefficiencies, and criticisms about current services and spend on major projects including the NDR.  6 respondents said that they are concerned about the **legal** implications of the proposed change, in particular increased damage to cars leading to subsequent insurance claims against NCC.  The **winter service/gritting** was singled out for comment by many respondents to this proposal, including those who agreed, disagreed or didn’t know, 102 respondents in total. Of these, 83 said that they did not want to see the winter gritting service changed or reduced. These 83 respondents included people who said that they agreed with the overall proposal but did not agree with any cuts to gritting and people who said that they disagreed with the overall proposal but only disagreed with the gritting element.  A small number of respondents noted that highways maintenance is not just about making improvements for vehicles but needs to take account of improvements for other road and footpath users – in particular **cyclists and pedestrians**. |

**Summary completed 20/01/16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service**

# Our ideas for the future

## **Consultation findings**

|  |
| --- |
| **Title of General Idea or Vision** |
| **ETD – Other savings planned for 16/17 and 17-19**  Other savings planned for 2016-17  We are planning to make savings through redesigning how we work and getting better value from our contracts to ensure we are as efficient as possible.  In addition to the proposals we are consulting on we plan to:   1. Redesign the way we work on activities associated with highways and transport as well as how some activities are funded – this will save us approximately £332k 2. Getting the benefit from savings to existing contracts associated with Norwich Park and Ride bus service and site management at Norwich bus station and contracts associated with Waste management – this will save us £2,350k 3. Remove posts in our Business Support team that are no longer needed – this will save us £133k.   Our ideas for saving money from 2017-19  Our ideas for 2017-19 are to:   1. Work differently to support economic development projects by increasing the use of existing expertise to help identify alternative sources of funding rather than directly funding them ourselves 2. Increase external funding for environment services and expanding the existing volunteer base 3. Move to a locality way of working, combining some teams and functions to reduce duplication and reduce staff numbers 4. Review how much we spend on transport, services, supplies and contracts.   A separate piece of work is being carried out to look at how we can improve Waste management and Recycling in Norfolk.  A separate consultation will be carried out in 2016 to establish our overall Waste Management Strategy.  We are at an early stage of thinking about these ideas and have not yet decided how we will take these forward. When we have developed our ideas further, if they involve changes to services we will consult with people who may be affected by them. However, we are interested to hear any views you may have about our ideas now to help us develop our plans. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Respondent Numbers** |
| 148 responses were received about our ideas for the future. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Organisation, group or petition responses** | |
| Please describe any petitions received.  Please record any groups or organisations which responded. | No petitions were received.  11 respondents told us that they were responding on behalf of a business, organisation or group. These were:   * Your Own Place CIC * Norfolk Record Society * Mums in the Know Norwich * South Norfolk District Council * Malcolm Books * Parish Council (unspecified) * Unite social group * Broadland Older People's Partnership * Thetford Town Council * Norfolk County Council and Stonham Home Group * Broadland District Council |
| Please summarise all petition or group responses. | There was no consensus or common themes in the comments given by groups/organisations |

|  |
| --- |
| **Themes** |
| 48 responses **critiqued our ideas for making savings in future years**. There wasn’t any strong consensus as to the areas that were critiqued, but some themes emerged.   * Some respondents were concerned that the **changes might cost a lot of money to make** – for some this was a concern about **spending money on consultants** in order to implement these changes: “Sounds good in theory but do not spend a fortune on Consultants trying to implement”, “How many paid staff and consultants are being engaged in this work. How much could be saved if excellent, experienced managers were brought in to make the sensible changes without endless reviews, consultations, and committee meetings. Bureaucracy and democracy are not the same thing!”. * Some people criticised this section of the consultation for being **too vague** and said that they would **need more information** before they could give feedback: “So vague there is nothing to be said really”, “I would need more information in order to make a comment”. “It is extremely difficult to comment on just a few lines of early thinking ideas without any real meaning or meat on the bones.” * Some respondents focussed their critique on **perceived current poor services**, **inefficiencies and duplication**: “You've already cut the people who do the important things on bus timetables, etc. You've actually already made it impossible for managers to provide funding for schemes to improve access or service promotion, by going over to your 'commissioning' scheme, yet you are spending large sums of money on schemes like the Norwich NDR that will only make things worse.”, “Why has management not done this in the past - seems a very over managed service”, “This all seems as futile as rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic.”   31 respondents said that they would like to see **improved efficiency** in how we work   * Comments included **about being more commercial, improving commissioning arrangements, and removing duplication**: “Be more commercial like the private sector is.”, “Reducing duplication is positive and somethings that’s happens quite a lot at the Council.”, “Standardise services across Norfolk to enable cost savings through economies of scale when procuring and providing services.” * Opportunities for efficiencies to be achieved through **working better with partners** including other councils were highlighted by respondents, as well as opportunities to **improve contract management** and to get better value and services from contractors.   25 respondents made **comments about staffing** in relation to our ideas for the future.   * Some people supported a **reduction in the number of staff** in this area, with some comments singling out **office jobs** as those that should be cut: “A continued review of management and consultancy provision needs to be made. Significant amount of the budget is sent in these areas which do not produce results that justify the spending. Too many chiefs, not enough Indians!”, “Cut the pen pushers who sit around and shuffle papers all day” whilst others singled out **road workers**: “I am afraid that I think that generally the employees of Norfolk County Council who are out on the roads seem to have a very relaxed attitude to work. The saying goes that they have two work speeds, slow and stopped. I do wonder therefore if more of the work should be carried out by private contractors”. * For others there was concern that this would mean **too much of a reduction in one department**: “This is based on a significant reduction in staff. This doesn't seem to be right when other parts of the council are looking to increase staffing levels, or make very small reductions.”, whilst others noted that the proposed increased use of volunteers to deliver services would require paid staff to lead this: “It should also be noted that any volunteers need to be expertly led by paid staff”   We gave people quite a lot of detail about our planned savings for future years and some respondents told us what they thought about these specific ideas:   * 16 comments about **saving on existing contracts** including Park and Ride, the bus station and waste management. Some respondents felt recycling could be developed further to reduce waste costs and generate more efficiencies in waste management. There was an acceptance that approaches to waste management need to involve our District Council partners. There was no consensus on Park and Ride with some respondents saying buses should run less frequently, whilst others suggested an extended service is needed. * 15 comments about moving to a **locality way of working**. Some people were in favour of locality working, saying that they “strongly agree with the idea” and expressing support because it “would certainly be good to reduce duplication“. Others expressed surprise that we weren’t already doing it: “Move to a "locality way of working"? If the plain English equivalent means combining teams and functions to reduce duplication, my question would be why on EARTH you are not doing this already, rather than hacking around at cutting other services”. Others were less keen on the idea, questioning the efficacy of the approach: “Locality working does not seem realistic somehow”, and some of the obstacles to effective working: “Locality working won't work if you can't agree on localities, someone needs to decide 4, 5 or 7. Formal qualifications will get in the way and cause friction rather than creating a streamlined team with efficient delivery model”. One respondent noted that this approach is used in other authorities and should be explored in Norfolk: “Essex County Council's Highways service is structured in a locality based model with little central function, perhaps Norfolk could look at this as a way of being ready for the future.” * 9 comments about **changes to environment services**, including 7 comments about the use of volunteers. Respondents were keen to emphasise that volunteers need training and supervision by paid staff members and should not be used to replace professional staff. * 6 comments about **reviewing our spend on transport, services, supplies and contracts** * 5 comments about **working differently to support economic development projects** * 3 comments about **redesigning how we work on highways and transport**: * 1 comment about **removing business support posts** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ideas** |
| 23 people suggested ideas. These included:   * **Partnership working**: work better with the Third Sector, provide an open hub service, social enterprise infrastructure development, get rid of district councils and have an enlarged city council. * **Working differently**: make better use of volunteers, reduce the number of councillors, move to regional government, and buy from local companies to support the local economy. * **Waste**: implement a zero waste strategy, build a waste incinerator, make all use of tips free, charge a waste surcharge on takeaways, electronic goods swaps, mid-week closures of tips rather than bank holiday closures to address fly tipping, and develop a waste management social enterprise. * **Revenue raising**: raise revenue through litter fines, charge surcharges on takeaway businesses, use tax differently, sell things recycled by residents, hire out rooms at County Hall, and generate revenue through fines for illegal parking and speeding. * **Public transport**: bring public transport in-house, link up bus and rail timetables for a more seamless service, and reduce the number of Park and Ride buses. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Analyst notes** | |
| Any other things you think report writers should know when presenting findings | A very large majority of people who responded to our ideas for the future did not clearly come down in favour or against them (140 of 148)  1 respondent questioned the **legitimacy of the consultation**: “You shouldn't consult on proposals unless you know the impact. If this kind of woolly proposal is agreed it will not have any legitimacy as it will not have been part of meaningful consultation and councillors will not know what they have or haven't signed up to.” |

**Summary completed 20/01/16, Business Intelligence and Performance Service**

1. The **protected characteristics** are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

   Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity might mean:

   (a) Removing or minimizing disadvantages suffered by people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;

   (b) Taking steps to meet the needs of people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of others;

   (c) Encouraging people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such people is disproportionately low. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. **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. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between people and communities involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)