

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 16 DECEMBER 2010

Item 8

Draft Response to Norfolk County Council's budget reduction proposals – (Version 1: 6 December 2010)

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This document represents Norwich City Council's formal response to Norfolk County Council's 'big conversation' consultation on its proposed budget reductions for the next three financial years.

1.2 It is understood that Norfolk County Council faces significant financial challenges and that it is difficult to make savings of this size and scale. The city council has itself made savings of £10 million in the last two years and is currently implementing a further £3million of savings for 2011/12 and is also progressing additional savings for future years. The savings that have already been developed represent the equivalent of approximately a 25% reduction in controllable spend. So far, the council has achieved these without any significant impact on frontline services. However, it has been a challenging task and it is anticipated that in the future, there will be a need to reduce front line services. It is recognised that Norfolk County Council is now facing difficult choices in attempting to address making savings of a proportionately similar scale.

1.3 To develop the council's consultation response officers have looked at the overall approach taken by Norfolk County Council in developing its budget reduction proposals and have compared this with the approaches of other councils including the city council's savings and efficiency programme. Officers have then assessed each of the different elements and the potential impact on residents of Norwich, including any disproportionate effects and any direct impact on the city council's services. This paper looks at:

- the overall approach being taken by Norfolk County Council
- comments on specific proposals, in particular:
 - comments on reductions that could have a direct impact on Norwich City Council residents
 - reductions that have a disproportionate impact on Norwich residents

1.4 A table at Annex A also sets out brief comments on most of the other proposals.

2.0 Overall approach

2.1 **Information and engagement** - In many cases a very short explanation has been provided which makes it difficult to fully understand the nature of the proposal, its potential impact, or the timescales and method of implementation.

2.2 Unfortunately the county council has not been able to make officers available to attend our scrutiny committee discussion on the proposals as this would have also helped to inform the council's response.

- 2.3 **Vision and strategy** – While some high level principles have been provided, it is not clear what type of organisation the county council will be after the budget reductions have been made. To set out a future vision Norwich City Council developed a 'blueprint for a lean city council' that sets out a framework for the way the council would operate in the future and the principles for organisational redesign . It is also difficult to see what analysis has been carried out on the cumulative impact on client groups of the proposals, in particular vulnerable individuals and families. The differential impact the proposals will have on specific localities and the financial standing of other organisations is also unclear.
- 2.4 **Protecting frontline services** –The county councils desire to protect front line services is mentioned in the consultation document but it is not always evident in the proposals themselves. Some savings have been put forward from back office services. However, the actual amounts of money that the county council is proposing that it will save from these proposals appear very modest when compared to the size and scale of these functions. The figures given for certain back office savings are not that dissimilar to those that the city council realised in a similar exercise. The county council does not appear to have considered proposals to share specialist frontline services with other county and unitary councils to realise savings rather than to cut the level of service.
- 2.5 **Use of reserves** – The county council does not appear to be utilising a proportion of its £75 million of reserves to allow itself more time to develop more transformational savings projects, this could reduce the level of direct reductions to frontline services. The government have advised councils to make use of their reserves to reduce the immediate impact on frontline services. Members will be aware that when the city council was faced with a budget gap created by the recession in 2008; a proportion of our reserves was used to allow us time to develop a savings and efficiency programme in order to protect frontline services.
- 3.0 Specific proposals where there are significant concerns or issues the city council would wish to raise
- 3.1 **Adult social care - proposal to raise the eligibility criteria to 'critical' only (A14)** - The city council understand that the impact of this proposal would be that approximately 1,500 residents in Norwich who currently receive care services would not receive these services in future. Due to the high levels of deprivation in Norwich, this proposal could have a very negative impact on vulnerable people in the city. Those who are unlikely to have the means to pay for their own care requirements could be at risk as a result. This approach could mean that many more residents whose issues could have been addressed early could eventually reach a critical level. This could result in increased costs in the longer term as more expensive interventions will then be needed including hospital stays etc.
- 3.2 This proposal also seems to be at odds with overall prevention approaches which are accepted as best practice in this area. Nationally a preventative approach has shown that by tackling problems early, quality of life is improved, life chances and opportunities are enhanced, health and mental health improves and the much higher costs of dealing with issues when they reach crisis point are avoided. It is understood that, Norfolk County Council is

only one of two councils in the whole country who are proposing such an approach (the other being the Isle of Wight). The city council also understand that this proposal directly contradicts the government vision for adult social care which was recently published by the Department of Health which supports a preventative approach and recommends that council's do not restrict support to only those with the most intensive needs. This would also seem to be in conflict with the work undertaken by the Partnership for Older Peoples Project (POPP's) across the county which has demonstrated that prevention services have provided added value and enhanced outcomes for older people, and has strengthened partnership working across Norfolk.

- 3.3 When combined with the proposed reductions in the Supporting People grant, below, these proposals will have significant implications for people in sheltered housing and even greater implications for those people who need the next level of care.
- 3.4 **Adult social care - proposal to reduce the scale and capacity of mental health services (A18)** – Currently, the prevalence of mental health issues is 40% higher in Norwich than in the rest of Norfolk. The council is concerned that funding reductions in this area are likely to have a disproportionately negative effect on residents of the city.
- 3.5 **Adult social care - proposal to reduce prevention spending (A20)** –Again, there is concern that these proposals appear to contradict the accepted advantages of a preventative approach both from a cost savings and a service user perspective. These proposals could result in increased expenditure in other areas such as the NHS.
- 3.6 **Supporting people programme** - The government has set out a 12% reduction in funding for the supporting people programme. However, because this funding stream is no longer ring fenced the county council are proposing a 25% or 40% reduction.
- 3.7 The government's vision for adult social care highlights the importance of the supporting people programme in ensuring that vulnerable people can continue to live independently, reducing the need for more expensive and intensive care services.
- 3.8 The specific impact of these proposed reductions is likely to be very significant in a range of areas including:
 - reduction in support for older people's services provided jointly with the city council – if the funding reductions that are being proposed are taken forward by the county council this may mean that the city council will have no choice but to seriously consider the form and nature of housing related support provided by the sheltered housing managers to sheltered housing tenants as well as the support provided to vulnerable adults via the community alarm service. The county council's proposals to reduce spending on swift night owls services could place some vulnerable adults at increased risk and could result in significantly increased cost to the NHS. Requests for assistance may need to be dealt with through increased 999 calls, hospital admissions and reduced options for hospital discharge, thus creating additional pressure on secondary care.

- significant reduction in support for homelessness, young people, offenders, mental health and substance misuse services. Which, if they go ahead, will have a disproportionately negative impact on the city. These proposals could result in increased pressure on Norwich City Council's housing options services and increased numbers of vulnerable people with significant needs sleeping rough.
- reduction in support for home improvement agency services - The proposed reductions in funding for home improvement agency services have the potential to put greater pressure on disabled facilities grants funded by district councils. District councils will not be able to bridge this funding shortfall and as a consequence some vulnerable client groups may not get the disabled adaptations they need and may find it more difficult to remain within their own home.

3.10 **Children's services – proposal to re-design and re-shape special education needs service, so that fewer statements of special education need are required (B6)** – Given the much higher levels of deprivation and lower levels of attainment within Norwich compared to the rest of Norfolk this proposal will could result in a disproportionately negative impact on children in the city, meaning that less of them receive the support they need to maximise their educational potential.

3.11 **Children's services – proposal to reduce the scale and capacity of the attendance service (B7)** – Absenteeism is 110% higher in Norwich than in the rest of Norfolk at primary school level and 32% higher at secondary school level, with overall levels in the city having been amongst the worst in the country. There is concern that this proposal will inevitably result in a disproportionately negative impact on the city. Resulting in lower levels of educational achievement and ultimately reduced life chances for young people.

3.12 **Children's services – proposal to reduce the scale and capacity of improvement and intervention services for schools (B8)** – Despite the continued commitment and hard work of teachers in Norwich attainment levels in the city have been consistently below the Norfolk and national averages and a number of schools have suffered difficulties and been subject to intervention. Under the government's new minimum target for secondary school attainment it is understood that four schools in Norfolk would fall below the minimum level and be subject to potential intervention. Three of those schools are in Norwich. Any reductions in school improvement services could have a significantly detrimental effect on future attainment levels in the city.

3.13 **Children's services – proposal to reduce the scale and capacity of services that provide support for looked after children (B15/16)** – The city council understands that currently approximately 30% of the looked after children in Norfolk are in Norwich. These proposed reductions are likely to have a disproportionately negative impact on the city. Appropriate support for looked after children has been shown to be essential in ensuring they maximize their educational and life opportunities.

3.14 **Children's services – proposal to reduce the scale and capacity of family support services (B18)** – Teenage pregnancy conception rates are 39% higher in Norwich in the rest of Norfolk and so any reductions to

prevention services will inevitably have a disproportionate impact on young people in the city. The city council's families unit has successfully worked with a large range of different families resulting in improved outcomes and is seen as an example of best practice and so there are concerns about any reduction in funding to this innovative service.

- 3.15 **Environment and development services – proposal on civil parking enforcement (E6)** – Officers will be requesting further information about this proposal as to whether this relates to civil parking enforcement in the city or in the rest of Norfolk which has yet to be rolled out. Civil parking enforcement in the city is self funding and generates a small surplus for Norfolk County Council which is invested in the transport strategy for the city. There is concern that future surpluses in Norwich could be used to cross subsidise civil parking enforcement in the rest of Norfolk.
- 3.16 **Environment and development services – proposal to e-shape and reduce trading standards activities for consumers and businesses (E17)** – Further information is needed on how this proposal is to be implemented. Of particular concern is that this will result in less work with shop owners to prevent underage alcohol sales in the city.
- 3.17 **Travel and transport services – proposal to carry out a strategic review of environment, transport and development (H7)** – It is understood that 10 work streams are being considered here. As highways agent, the city council would welcome the opportunity to assist constructively with this work. The only area that has so far concluded concerns capital programme prioritisation. The advisory group's recommendation to prioritise maintenance over improvements would garner city council support as road conditions in Norwich are relatively poor. The recommendation to make greater use of low cost treatment such as surface dressing and slurry seal would also garner support because of greater cost effectiveness.
- 3.18 **Travel and transport services - proposed changes to street lighting (H10)** - The city council has already set out its position previously on this issue and remains completely opposed to turning off street lights in the city at night.
- 3.19 **Travel and transport services – proposal to re-shape the public transport network, with a shift towards demand responsive transport services ('dial-a-ride') (H11)** – This proposal could result in increased isolation for those without access to alternative transport limiting access to employment and services.
- 3.20 **Travel and transport services – proposal to reduce subsidy for park and ride in Norwich (H13)** - The council is concerned that the front loading of the removal of subsidy will mean that the cumulative impact of changes to the park and ride service can not be assessed, modified and mitigated if necessary. As a consequence the changes may increase the use of the car for commuting in to the city and result in higher levels of congestion for all road users at peak times. It is not clear how this proposal will impact on the delivery of the NATS and it is important that short term decisions do not preclude the ability of the county council to meet the commitment to deliver a sustainable public transport infrastructure to accommodate growth in the GNDP area over the next 10 to 20 years.
- 3.21 **General shift away from sustainable travel initiatives** – The travel and transport proposals seem to signal an overall shift in policy by the county council away from sustainable travel initiatives. This includes the potential

3.22 **Accommodation** – The county council have a number of proposals to rationalise their office accommodation. The city council would welcome the opportunity to develop a joint approach to the provision and occupation of office accommodation in Norwich.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 The city council recognises the difficulties that the county council faces in making savings of this size and scale. However, perhaps more consideration should be given to protecting front line services by:

- maximising back offices savings
- sharing specialist services
- using reserves to allow more time to think through some of the more complex proposals

4.2 In future, the council would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership with the county to redesign services that both councils are involved in providing.

Annex A: Table setting out our brief comments on each of the different proposals

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----------|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| A. | Adult Social Services | | | | | |
| A1 | Organisational review | Savings arising from Phase 2 of the organisational review undertaken by PwC. | 419 | 0 | 0 | Management costs savings supported although given the size of the directorate they seem quite modest. |
| A2 | Business support review | We aim to make savings of 25% by reviewing levels of business support and administrative processes. | 122 | 0 | 0 | Support savings from support costs. However, again the savings seem quite small. |
| A3 | Reduce scale and capacity of quality assurance service | This would see a reduced budget for quality assurance work, so fewer quality checks on services provided by the independent sector, including residential homes, and homecare. | 0 | 185 | 0 | Savings may result in a lower quality of care and increased safeguarding issues. |
| A4 | Ensuring all those entitled to free personal care receive it | We anticipate that more new users will be entitled to continuing care, which means community services does not pay for their care, since it is NHS funded. | 620 | 620 | 620 | Do not support the deliberate shifting of cost from one public body to another. |
| A5 | Reduce spend on training | This would see a reduction in the scale of training for community services staff. | 300 | 0 | 0 | Given the scale of change proposed across the directorate concern as to whether there is enough resource left to carry out the training needed to support the new ways of working. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| A6 | Limiting inflation uplift to the independent and third sector | There would be no uplift for inflation for 2011/12, and an assumed 1% uplift for 2012/13. This would mean providers would need to make efficiency savings to manage any increased costs. | 3104 | 1563 | 0 | Concerned about the impact this may have to small third sector providers and ultimately result in a contraction of the range of independent and third sector providers operating in the area. |
| A7 | Rationalising office and building costs | We are reviewing our offices and buildings and will make savings by rationalising the number of offices, and introducing modern working practices, including more mobile working and maximising the use of technology. | 748 | 0 | 0 | Support savings from premises costs. Also encourage the county council to work with other public bodies on the potential for the joint use of accommodation. |
| A8 | Re-design the assessment service | We propose to redesign this service over the next three years and see a shift towards a 'self-service' approach. This would be more cost-effective and would prioritise social work time on people in greatest need. | 0 | 0 | 1500 | <p>In principle support for channel shift towards increased self service. However, many of these service users are very vulnerable, and may not have the capacity to use a 'self-service' assessment.</p> <p>Effective safe guards will need to be put in place to ensure that people are using the system correctly and that appropriate assessments of risk of harm, that would otherwise be picked up by a social worker or other professional are being carried out.</p> <p>Request further details on what safeguards are to be put in place and further information on whether this approach will</p> |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | be linked to floating support referrals. |
| A9 | Re-design hospital discharge process | We propose to re-design the hospital discharge service with a reduced budget. | 557 | 0 | 0 | Joint work that has happened between the city council and county council on hospital discharge should continue as part of the re-design given the significant potential impacts on our housing services. |
| A10 | Remove council subsidy for community meals | The Council will continue to meet the care needs of people who currently receive meals on wheels, but propose to no longer contribute to the meal itself. Click here for more information | 1200 | 0 | 0 | This proposal may significantly increase the cost of meals to people who find it difficult to cook for themselves or lack the capacity to provide for themselves. It could affect particularly the old, who may already be on significantly reduced budgets. Given the high levels of deprivation in Norwich there is concern this could have a disproportionately negative effective on vulnerable people in the city. |
| A11 | Re-design of day services provision | We propose that by the end of 2012, the council will not be running in-house day centres. People will have individual budgets and will be helped to choose day services for themselves. We are already working to adapt and re-shape service delivery to meet future need. Click here for more information | 0 | 7700 | 0 | This proposal states that Norfolk County Council will no longer provide services itself, but does not state how it expects these services to be provided, except through personalised budgets. It does say that they have discussed these measures with specific groups but has not shared the results, this makes it difficult to assess impact on individuals. |
| A12 | Savings on transport costs as a result of changes to | With the changed pattern of day services, there will be fewer transport costs. We propose that for | 0 | 6100 | 0 | Potential of reduced service use, as people cannot, or do not wish to, use their personalised budget for transportation. Where money is used for transport costs, this may reduce |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | day services | people who need to travel to services, as part of their assessed care needs, they will use personal budgets to pay for the transport. | | | | the amount of genuine care services people can access. As fewer services are being made available there are concerns that the potential for isolation and poor care choices increase, leaving older and disabled people more vulnerable. |
| A13 | Supporting more people with mental health problems to live independently | We will continue our programme which sees people with mental health problems currently in residential care moving into homes in the community. This is in line with best practice. | 500 | 500 | 500 | Support for the principle of enabling independent living. However, concern that other proposals may affect this work. For example, the proposed changes in SP funding which may reduce the amount of housing support, particularly in the form of floating support services, which enable people to maintain their tenancies could harm the ambition for greater independent living. If people who are not yet able to cope with life in an independent tenancy, and accommodation based services are reduced or removed, these people may become more vulnerable. This could lead to failure of tenancy and potential homelessness. This could put an extra burden to health services, district council housing services and providers in the voluntary sector. |
| A14 | Raising the eligibility criteria | We propose to raise the eligibility criteria for service to 'critical' only. Currently it is 'critical and substantial'. Click here for more information | 1400 | 0 | 0 | Please see section 3.1 of our main response document. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| A15 | Reduce the scale and capacity of the sensory support service | <p>We propose to scale back this service so that it meets only statutory requirements. It would mean the work of the current sensory support team would cease and statutory services commissioned through other providers.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 1100 | 0 | 0 | Without further detail on the replacement service that would be commissioned it is difficult to assess the impact of this proposal. Further information needed on this proposal. |
| A16 | Reduction in specialist advice | This would see some posts removed which currently provide specialist practice advice on disability, direct payments, housing improvements, dementia, supported placements, medicines management. | 333 | 597 | 0 | <p>This may result in service users making poor choices and ultimately result in more expensive interventions in the future.</p> <p>These proposals could result in increased demand for advice from district councils and third sector providers.</p> |
| A17 | End the council's HIV/AIDS service | <p>Most support for people with HIV and AIDS is through the NHS. This proposal would see an end to this discretionary service which offers advice and support to some people newly-diagnosed with HIV and AIDS.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 64 | 0 | 0 | Concern over the impact of these proposals. |
| A18 | Reduce the scale and capacity of mental health | This proposal would see a reduction in the budget for mental health social care for adults. | 1611 | 0 | 0 | Please see section 3.4 of our main response document. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | services | Click here for more information | | | | |
| A19 | Reduce the scale and capacity of some learning difficulty services | <p>We currently give grants through the Learning Difficulties Development Fund to organisations for specialist work relating to learning difficulties. This includes advocacy and advice, and supports some partnership working. We propose that this service will cease.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 410 | 0 | 0 | Concern that this could mean that the needs of adults with learning difficulties are less effectively represented. |
| A20 | Reduced and redesigned management and support arrangements as consequence of service redesigns | The proposals for changes in services represent major impact on management arrangements at all tiers of adult social care services will need to be reviewed and re-scaled as necessary to align with the changes and ensure fit for purpose. | 0 | 535 | 0 | Support for savings from management costs. |
| A21 | Reduce the scale and capacity of the equipment service | The equipment service has been free to all users – not just people who are entitled to social care. This proposed change would limit free equipment to only those who are eligible for social care, and they will have personal budgets to pay for the | 1200 | 0 | 0 | <p>The proposal states that issuing equipment may be used when people are discharged from hospital.</p> <p>Concern that if the criteria only cover those eligible for critical care then there is the risk of people not being able to cope after discharge, which could lead to further falls, injury or re-admittance to hospital.</p> <p>This is a preventative service, and we are concerned the</p> |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | <p>equipment.</p> <p>For people not eligible, we would help sign-post to where they can purchase equipment.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | | | | proposal could lead to increase pressure on disabled facilities grants. |
| A22 | Reduction in spending on prevention services | <p>We propose to review spending on prevention and community support services which are currently provided, including the Supporting People programme, assistive technology, and prevention commissioned through the third sector. We propose to reduce the overall level of spend for these services.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 6000 | 5500 | 6500 | See section 3.5 of our main response document. |
| A23 | Review of charges for social care | <p>We were already proposing a consultation on charges – this will now be included alongside the current budget proposals.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 500 | 0 | 0 | <p>Given the high levels of deprivation in Norwich there is concern that this may have a disproportionately negative impact on vulnerable people in the city.</p> <p>Further detail needed on this proposal and how it will be implemented.</p> |
| B | Children's | | | | | |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Services | | | | | |
| B1 | No new borrowing to supplement government grant for capital projects in school | <p>After we have completed projects in our 2010/11 capital programme we propose to only carry out building projects funded centrally by the Government. An exception to this could be if it can be proven that capital receipts can cover the funding of a project. This would mean less money for general improvement works, works to make buildings DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) compliant, or changes to mobile classroom arrangements to reflect changes in pupil numbers.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 0 | 1011 | 1011 | Concern that this could mean less quality education facilities for Norwich children and impact on the attainment and aspiration levels of children and young people in the city. |
| B2 | Staff reductions as a consequence of the scaling back of capital budget for smaller building projects | A smaller service would not need as many staff. | 633 | 193 | 193 | As above. |
| B3 | End the subsidy for school and college | We propose to end the subsidy for post-16 transport. It will mean that all | 0 | 2500 | 0 | Concern that this could discourage people in deprived areas from accessing education and training and increase the |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | transport for those aged 16 and over | parents and carers will pay an annual cost of transport of £784 per student per year. Click here for more information | | | | number of Not in Employee, Education or Training (NEETs). Given, Norwich has very high levels of deprivation and already has 56% higher NEETs than the rest of Norfolk there could be a disproportionately negative impact on the city. |
| B4 | End subsidy for denominational transport; end the funding of transport in exceptional circumstances and make savings through further efficiencies | We propose to end the subsidy for denominational transport, and funding of transport in exceptional circumstances. Click here for more information | 110 | 160 | 200 | |
| B5 | Review the school crossing patrol service | We propose to review school crossing patrols against a set of safety criteria. This is likely to see patrols retained at most sites, particularly at those where there is most traffic danger. However there may be sites where there is considered to be less danger and pedestrian traffic controls are in place. In such cases, we would consider ceasing council funding, but enable community volunteers to step | 58 | 58 | 0 | Robust risk assessment needed. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | <p>in where there is felt to be a strong local need that patrols should continue.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | | | | |
| B6 | Re-design and re-shape special education needs service, so that fewer statements of special education need are required. | <p>We propose to consider devolving to schools the full budget for special educational needs, to meet their pupils' needs in a more cost-effective way than the current service, continuing our policy aim of reducing the number of statements issued.</p> <p>In the short-term, it is likely that the service would focus on delivering its statutory responsibilities only but we will conduct a full service re-design to re-balance the time that staff spend on statementing and advice and support to schools.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 633 | 633 | 633 | See section 3.10 of our main response. |
| B7 | Reduce the scale and capacity of the attendance service | We propose to re-design the scaled-down service within a smaller budget to be more strongly focused either on working with schools to develop interventions to prevent pupil | 200 | 200 | 200 | See section 3.11 of our main response document. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | absence or focusing on prosecuting parents whose children persistently fail to attend school. Click here for more information | | | | |
| B8 | Reduce the scale and capacity of improvement and intervention services for schools | A smaller, re-shaped service would be refocused and would develop capacity within schools to work collaboratively with others to improve school performance. This would mean fewer staff to intervene early to support schools at risk of failing, and fewer to improve standards in core subjects. This would mean targeting work to where most difference could be made to children's learning. Click here for more information | 867 | 867 | 867 | See section 3.12 of our main response document. |
| B9 | Re-design and re-shape the service that helps plan the supply of school places | We propose to reduce and scale back this service so that it delivers its statutory responsibilities. Click here for more information | 67 | 67 | 67 | Support for a redesign as long as it does not significantly weaken the effectiveness of the planning process. |
| B10 | Reduce the Council's contribution to the | Though these services generate some of their own income, the county council also funds some | 67 | 67 | 67 | Further information needed on how funding reductions will be apportioned across the different disciplines. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | funding of the schools music service and performing arts service, and outdoor education service | <p>aspects of their work. We propose to reduce the level of our funding but re-shape and support these services to become fully self-funding. We would need to determine how to apportion the council funding reductions across the different disciplines.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | | | | |
| B11 | Cease County council funding for youth services | <p>The vast majority of youth activities e.g. sports, brownies, guides, after-school clubs is already provided by a vibrant community sector. In this proposal the county youth service, which currently has about 17,000 to 20,000 users a year, would cease as would council funding for discretionary activity programmes for young people – such as community and assertive outreach work and the Duke of Edinburgh Award programmes carried out in partnership with district councils or the police. We would also look for another provider for the County Council's Whitlingham Activity</p> | 4067 | 733 | 0 | <p>Concern about the negative effect that this may have on young people in deprived areas in the city. Norwich already has 56% higher NEETs than the rest of Norfolk. Concern that these reductions, when considered alongside the reductions in advice services (B12) have the potential to have a very harmful impact on aspirations and outcomes for the city's young people.</p> |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | Centre. Click here for more information | | | | |
| B12 | Efficiencies from a re-shaped connexions service | The re-shaped connexions service will, like many other services, be required to continue working more efficiently to produce savings sufficient to cover cost pressures such as inflation. | 100 | 100 | 100 | As above. |
| B13 | End local authority contribution to study support community learning projects | The Government funds a number of programmes and projects that help support young people with literacy and numeracy outside school. They include 'playing for success' (in partnership with Norwich City Football Club, North Walsham Rugby club and others) and study support. At present, the County council provides money to help with their running and infrastructure costs. Removing this funding may see some of these programmes scaled back. If the Government grant is ended, then the programme will end. | 526 | 0 | 0 | Attainments levels in Norwich remain considerably below both the Norfolk and national averages. As such, concern that these reductions could have a disproportionately negative impact on future attainment levels within the city's deprived areas. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | Click here for more information | | | | |
| B14 | Redesign management and support as a consequence of the redesigning of school-focussed services. | Given the scale of changes within these proposals, and the impact on the work of the schools-focused teams, there would need to be a further review and re-scaling of management arrangements to align them with the changes and ensure they are fit for purpose. | 373 | 200 | 200 | Support savings from management costs. |
| B15 | Procurement savings on placements for looked after children | We propose to improve our commissioning of placements for looked after children that would reduce the unit cost per placement. | 873 | 873 | 873 | |
| B16 | Reduce the scale and capacity of services that provide support for looked after children | This proposal would mean a reduced level of service because of reduced capacity in the social work, reviewing service, leaving care support, adoption and special guardianship service. We will undertake an impact assessment to understand the full implications and avoid being in breach of our statutory duties. Click here for more information | 2367 | 2367 | 2367 | See section 3.13 of our main response document. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| B17 | Smarter, more efficient processes for conducting child death reviews and the work of the Local Children's Safeguarding Board | These are efficiency savings from reviews of process and administration and should not impact on service users. | 50 | 50 | 50 | Support efficiency savings as long as they do not weaken the effectiveness of the LCSB. |
| B18 | Reduce the scale and capacity of family support services | <p>This includes home care, equipment and adaptations, transport, teenage pregnancy reduction work. It would require re-designing how we deliver these services with a reduced budget, and re-prioritising what we do. We will undertake an impact assessment to understand the full implications and avoid being in breach of our statutory duties.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 1733 | 1733 | 1733 | See section 3.14 of our main response document. |
| B19 | Reduced and redesigned management and support arrangements as | The proposals for changes in services would have a major impact on management arrangements at all tiers of children's services. These would need to be reviewed and re- | 3250 | 1583 | 1167 | Support for savings from management costs. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | consequence of service redesigns | scaled as necessary. | | | | |
| B20 | End of clothing grant | We propose to remove the discretionary policy to provide financial support to some families for buying school uniforms. Click here for more information | 41 | 0 | 0 | Given, Norwich has very high levels of deprivation there could be a disproportionately negative impact on the city. |
| C | Cultural Services | | | | | |
| C1 | Increase admission charges for museums | Admission prices would rise above inflation, although there will still be concessions for some users. | 20 | 0 | 0 | Given the high levels of deprivation in Norwich, concern this may have a disproportionate effective on city residents and reduce the accessibility of museums services. |
| C2 | Increase income from retail and catering | We aim to increase the turn-over of catering and retail. | 20 | 10 | 10 | We would support this proposal. |
| C3 | Change to costumes, textiles and regimental collections | This proposal would see the costumes and textiles collections and services moved from Carrow House to the Shirehall. Regimental displays would transfer to the Castle – making them accessible to all Castle Museum visitors. The Regimental enquiry service would | 0 | 110 | 0 | More information needed. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | remain in Shirehall. Click here for more information | | | | |
| C4 | Changes to museums in King's Lynn | Funding for the Town House museum in King's Lynn would no longer be required. | 20 | 15 | 0 | |
| C5 | Review of Museum opening hours. | We propose to review opening hours for all museums with a view to closing at less busy times. | 0 | 15 | 0 | More information needed. |
| C6 | Reduced staffing in museums service | This would be through a combination of reviews and vacancy management. | 99 | 0 | 141 | Further information on the impact of this proposal on service levels needed. |
| C7 | Reduced staffing in record office | This would be through a combination of reviews and vacancy management. | 36 | 17 | 45 | We would support this proposal. |
| C8 | Reduced staffing in libraries | This proposal would include savings from reduced staffing in libraries, and further savings from 'self-serve' ways of working. We would also explore the possible use of volunteers to support the library service. | 451 | 364 | 394 | Support the principle of increased self service. However, further information needed on the impact of the reductions in staffing on service levels. |
| C9 | Reduced staffing in adult education | We propose to review staffing to continue to make efficiencies and | 4 | 85 | 127 | Further information needed on the impact of this proposal on service levels. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | service | keep over-head costs down. | | | | |
| C10 | Changes to mobile library visits | This proposal would change the frequency so that people who have a visit from the mobile library every three weeks would have a visit every 4 weeks instead. Users of the service have already suggested this to us. | 47 | 0 | 0 | |
| C11 | Reductions in the book fund | We propose to reduce spending on the book fund which would mean fewer new books are purchased each year. | 50 | 50 | 50 | |
| C12 | Reduce arts grants | We propose to reduce the grants we give to arts organisations. Click here for more information | 73 | 48 | 49 | Further detail on these proposals needed so that we fully assess the impact on jointly funded organisations. |
| C13 | Review charging for adult education courses | We propose to increase charges for some adult education courses. We would seek to make the level of increase such that these courses would be delivered at no cost to the County council. Click here for more information | 35 | 0 | 0 | Concern as to the effect of this proposal and proposal C14 on the accessibility of adult education opportunities to deprived communities. |
| C14 | Strategic review of | This could mean a ceasing of budget | 65 | 131 | 0 | See above. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Adult Education Service | support for adult education so that it would be fully dependent on external funding. | | | | |
| D | Customer services and communications | | | | | |
| D1 | Reduce the customer service development budget | The Council has completed the main infrastructure elements of its customer access strategy and this element of the budget that helped support major change is no longer required. Customers should not experience any adverse impact. | 100 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |
| D2 | Reduce marketing expenditure | We propose to make greater use of online options for our communications to staff and council residents and exploit more options for shared communication arrangements and for supplementing more marketing expenditure through income. There would be a reduction in the number and frequency of council publications and in the scale of the county council's presence at some county events, such as the | 100 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | Royal Norfolk Show. | | | | |
| D3 | Efficiency saving | Ending of statutory requirement to conduct a Place Survey. | 25 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |
| D4 | Continue to roll out more widely options for residents to contact the authority and access its services through 'council@your' arrangements | We have implemented these arrangements at all council libraries and a number of other locations – we propose that by 2014, all face to face access will be delivered through this route. As a consequence we will close all the Council Information Centres currently owned and managed by the County council, and end our contributions to those managed by others. | 0 | 175 | 11 | Support for this saving although it seems very modest. |
| D5 | Change core opening hours for our Customer Service Centre | We propose to move the centre's core opening hours to 9am-5pm (from 8.00am to 6pm) – this would impact on some residents and may result in a small increase in waiting times, however we would aim to mitigate these through greater marketing and promotion of the online, self-serve options which are available 24 hours a day. | 40 | 0 | 0 | Support this saving. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| D6 | Organisational review | Staffing efficiency through the redesign of its service arrangements. | 0 | 35 | 0 | Support savings from management cost. However, these savings seem small given the size of the service area. |
| D7 | Increased income from advertising and sponsorship | The authority proposes to develop and agree a more robust and targeted approach to its advertising and sponsorship policy that will secure increased income to help support other priorities. | 40 | 10 | 0 | Support for this proposal. |
| E | Environment and Development | | | | | |
| E1 | Reduce closed landfill pollution treatment costs | More efficient management of landfill pollution treatment and monitoring. | 145 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |
| E2 | Business support review | We aim to make savings by reviewing levels of business support and administrative processes. | 50 | 0 | 0 | Support savings from support costs although they seem small. |
| E3 | Organisational review | Savings arising from Phase 2 of the organisational review undertaken by PwC. | 265 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings from management costs, but again they seem modest. |
| E4 | More efficient Environment service | Reducing legal costs by using technical experts instead of barristers at enquiries, reducing | 82 | 25 | 60 | Support for this saving. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | management costs and overheads. | | | | |
| E5 | Improved waste procurement | This would be through better procurement and joint working with district councils on waste services. | 121 | 390 | 565 | Support for improved procurement. |
| E6 | Civil parking enforcement | We propose to make savings in the running costs of this service, and to make it self-funding through maximising income. | 100 | 50 | 200 | Please see section 3.15 of our main response document. |
| E7 | Maintain third party recycling payments at current level and redesign the way we give advice to businesses about recycling | We pay third party organisations, such as voluntary and community groups, for recycling. For 2011/12 we propose to not increase the amounts for inflation. | 47 | 0 | 0 | |
| E8 | Increase income from Trading Standards metrology calibration services | By improved marketing, we propose to increase the use of this service and increase income to the County council. | 20 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |
| E9 | Management savings in public protection services | Through changing the way we work, we will look to make further savings on management costs and general expenditure. | 188 | 0 | 100 | Support for savings from management costs. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| E10 | Streamline public protection through better joint working | Through improved collaboration we aim to cut out duplication between the County council and District Councils. | 87 | 87 | 0 | Welcome enhanced opportunities for joint working e.g. between environmental health and trading standards but this should not result in increased costs for district councils. |
| E11 | Re-focused, more targeted Public Rights of Way service | <p>We propose to re-design access to the Countryside around a core network with a substantial reduction in path cutting, and change how we respond to issues including enforcement, in line with the Big Society. We would carry out limited promotional work and end funding for health walks project.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 332 | 123 | 123 | |
| E12 | Community ownership of nature reserves and areas and end some grant funding | <p>Encourage schools and community groups to take ownership of local nature areas and reserves, reducing landscape work, and withdrawing from the Wash Estuary Management Group, the Norwich Fringe and the Brecks Partnership.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 176 | 10 | 10 | |
| E13 | Re-shaped planning service | We propose to review current and future arrangements, continuing to | 30 | 100 | 300 | Support for a more efficient approach. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | drive out efficiencies and looking at the scope for sharing services. | | | | |
| E14 | Integrate "Your Rubbish Your Choice" into Council magazines | Previously separate Your Rubbish Your Choice magazine would become a part of existing Council magazines including Your Norfolk. | 40 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving although it seems very modest. |
| E15 | Re-shape and reduce trading standards work on farming issues | This proposal would see less preventive and proactive work, while maintaining capacity to deal with emergency incidents. | 129 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| E16 | Re-shape and reduce trading standards activities for consumers and businesses | This proposal would see a shift away from preventive work, to focus on compliance, enforcement and prosecution. | 38 | 225 | 0 | See section of 3.16 our main response document. |
| E17 | More efficient management of Gypsy and Traveller permanent sites | We propose to explore options for managing these sites at less cost in future years. Click here for more information | 0 | 95 | 135 | Support a more efficient approach. |
| E18 | Review historic building work and end some grant funding | As part of a wider review of our work for the historic environment, we propose to reduce the work we do on historic buildings and review grant | 125 | 115 | 0 | Further information on this proposal is needed. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | <p>funding for the Churches Trust and Norfolk Historic Buildings Trust. We also propose to review the arrangements with the Norfolk Windmills Trust.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | | | | |
| E19 | Reduce opening hours at recycling centres | We propose to open recycling centres one hour later, as part of a review of service standards. This would allow the bins to be emptied before public opening time which will help ease congestion. | 120 | 0 | 0 | Concern that this may reduce the accessibility of recycling centres and potentially have a negative impact on recycling levels. |
| E20 | Reduce contributions to economic development projects | <p>We propose to focus on our strategic role and over the three year period to 2013 will cease funding economic development projects or interventions (£570k). This would allow an extended notice period of up to 18 months for those projects externally commissioned from the voluntary and community sector.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 170 | 200 | 200 | More information on these proposals is needed before comment. In particular, given the proposed reductions in funding for economic development projects we would assume that similar savings will be made from management and back office staffing in this service area. |
| E21 | Cease asbestos disposal at waste | People can currently pay to dispose of asbestos. We propose that thus | 28 | 0 | 0 | Increased fly-tipping of asbestos |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | disposal sites | service will no longer be available. | | | | |
| E22 | Cease 'real nappy' payments | We currently give a sum to new parents if they buy 'real nappies' instead of disposable nappies. We propose to cease this programme. | 20 | 0 | 0 | |
| F | Fire and rescue services | | | | | |
| F1 | Reducing use of resources across all parts of the Fire and Rescue Service including energy, losses and breakages, consumables, travel and transport. | Part of a project already underway to make efficiencies across the board. | 50 | 50 | 50 | Support for these savings. |
| F2 | Changing how the service responds more effectively and efficiently to emergencies. | This proposal would involve more proactive screening of calls, including automatic fire alarms - meaning that not all alarms would receive an automatic response. The consultation on this proposal has ended and the Fire Safety Plan is awaiting approval at Full Council on | 117 | 117 | 117 | Consultation already closed. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | 29 November 2010. | | | | |
| F3 | Making changes to how staff work their shift duties | We propose changes be made to shift working arrangements of fire fighters, but with no impact to front line service delivery. | 150 | 150 | 0 | Concern as to whether this could have an impact on frontline service delivery. Further information on how city events such as 'sparks in the park' will be covered in future needed. |
| F4 | Savings from improving the way we buy and use large and small vehicles within the whole fleet | This is a procurement efficiency and would not impact on the service provided. The consultation on this proposal has ended and the Fire Safety Plan is awaiting approval at Full Council on 29 November 2010. | 30 | 30 | 30 | We would support these savings from procurement. |
| F5 | Using fire stations and other resources in ways that ensure they are used to the full and reduce costs to the Fire and Rescue Service | This is part of an ongoing project to achieve efficiencies. | 33 | 33 | 33 | Support for these savings. |
| F6 | Savings from redesigning and transforming the way the service operates. | This will be managed by an established efficiency and policy development programme called 'Fire Ahead'. The areas of focus will include training, staffing structures, operational response, procurement, | 411 | 841 | 841 | More information needed on what the changes to current service levels that are briefly mentioned actually means. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | use of service resources, energy savings, sponsorship, cost reduction and income opportunities. This could mean change to current service levels. | | | | |
| F7 | Implementing the services Safety Plan for 2011/14 | This is an established plan that has been widely consulted upon and has recently received NCC Cabinet approval. The service will be reshaped to provide the right resources to manage the risks that have been assessed within the County. The consultation on this proposal has ended and the Fire Safety Plan is awaiting approval at Full Council on 29 November 2010. | 291 | 291 | 291 | Consultation has ended. |
| G | Resources (support services) | | | | | |
| G1 | Streamlining management structures through Organisational Review project | This relates to the second phase of the Organisational Review project and includes reductions in management costs within Planning, Policy and Performance, Human Resources and Finance. Review work is in progress within teams in | 1137 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings from management costs. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | order to deliver savings by 1 April 2011. | | | | |
| G2 | Reduction in business support within Resources Directorate | The Resources Directorate element of the wider business support rationalisation project. The savings relate to the Democratic Services team, which currently includes a business support function. | 50 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings from support costs. |
| G3 | Reduction in support service posts | Planned changes within the service resulting in reduction in posts required within ICT and Programme Management Office. | 180 | 340 | 340 | As above. |
| G4 | Human Resources - Business Process Reengineering - increased use of self service | This is one element of the HR Shared Services Project, some of which has already been delivered and some of which is included within the Organisational Review figures above. | 200 | 410 | 0 | Support for saving from back office costs. However, given the size and scale of the function these savings seem very modest. |
| G5 | Reduction in cost of Coroners Service | Minor change that will not impact on the service. | 5 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |
| G6 | Planning Performance and Partnerships - service | Savings relate to the next stages of transforming this function and its processes. The service has already been reorganised and further | 0 | 110 | 163 | Support for these savings from back office services. However, the savings seem very modest. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | transformation project | savings are included within the Organisational Review savings above. | | | | |
| G7 | Procurement Shared Services Review and business process reengineering | Initial forecast savings for reviewing opportunities to work with and share services with other organisations. | 220 | 120 | 0 | Support for this approach. |
| G8 | Finance Shared Service Review and business process reengineering (BPR) of service functions | Next stages of the Finance Shared Services Review - this reflects the estimated savings from BPR, staffing review, income generation and developing opportunities to work with/share services with other organisations. | 0 | 650 | 650 | Support for savings from back office services. However, given the size and scale of the area the savings seem modest. |
| G9 | Rationalisation of postroom services | Full year effect of change to single postroom, which are being made in 2010-11. | 68 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving although it seems relatively modest. |
| G10 | Review of Democratic Services staffing structures | Review of structure across the service including removal of posts within Democratic Services that are currently held vacant. | 91 | 80 | 55 | Support for these savings. However given the size of the area they seem relatively modest. |
| G11 | Reduce the frequency of | Change to current policy for desktop computer replacement - reducing the | 250 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings but given the county council has many thousands of computers the size of the savings seem |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | replacing desktop computers | frequency. | | | | extremely small. |
| G12 | Scrutiny Support - Shared service review | Savings from shared service review of scrutiny support. | 12 | 0 | 27 | Support for these savings. However, again they seem quite small. |
| G13 | Reduction in budget to support Private Finance Initiatives | The reduction in support will be in line with the completion of current PFI funded projects. | 400 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G14 | Adjustment to reflect previous one-off cost for Council Chamber public address system | This one-off cost in 2010-11 can be removed in 2011-12. | 38 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G15 | Adjustment to reflect previous one-off cost for outsourcing of management contract for County Farms | The new County Farms Policy required that the management contract for County Farms be outsourced. The one-off costs of tendering this service in 2010-11 can be removed from the budget. | 75 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G16 | Reduction in budget for election | Reduced budget based upon only one by election per year. | 14 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | costs | | | | | |
| G17 | Savings through increased use of electronic publication of committee papers | Reduced spend on committee printing though use of electronic publication. | 15 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. However, the savings look very small. |
| G18 | Efficiency savings within Democratic services | Identified reduction achievable within the training budget and through a reduction in the use of outside venues for appeal panels. | 13 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G19 | Property services efficiency savings | Planned reduction in the cost of managing the Council's property assets. | 157 | 157 | 157 | Support for these savings. However, again given the size and scale of the function the savings look modest. |
| G20 | Removal of shared Director's post and related support costs | Cessation of arrangements for the joint director with Great Yarmouth Borough Council. | 119 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G21 | Rationalisation of printing facilities | Savings from a project to streamline printing facilities across services. | 150 | 50 | 0 | Support for these savings. However, again they look quite modest. |
| G22 | ICT savings | Reduction in spend on ICT projects. | 166 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. However, given the very considerable ICT expenditure of the county council these savings seem very small. |
| G23 | Reduction in | Identified efficiency for providing | 10 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings but they seem very modest. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | Member training costs | member training. | | | | |
| G24 | Reduction in Learning and Development | Reducing the learning and development provision for managers and staff. This will be mitigated as far as possible by the provision of e-learning and self help guides. | 150 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. However, again they seem quite small. |
| G25 | Reduction in Human Resources Shared Services | The shared service will be in place from November 2010 and the impact will be reviewed after the first 6 months of operation. This will assess and identify further opportunities for cost reductions. However, the reduction may impact on the capacity of the service to support organisational priorities. | 163 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings but again they seem modest. |
| G26 | Further review of management structures | Identification of further savings across Resources through review of management structures. | 200 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings from management costs. |
| G27 | Staffing reductions from use of electronic Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checking | Staffing reductions due to implementation of electronic CRB checking system. | 50 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | system | | | | | |
| G28 | Upgrade to Office 10 | This will mean that desktops are updated with Office 10 but then procurement savings can be made. | 600 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings from procurement. |
| G29 | Removal of Long Service Awards for employees | Financial saving of proposal to remove the current practice of giving long service awards to Council employees. | 35 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G30 | Savings on IT and telephone costs through improved procurement | Reduced spend through new contract arrangements. | 70 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings but given the scale of the organisation they seem modest. |
| G31 | Savings on muscular skeletal rehabilitation scheme contract | Savings through changes to the contract. | 37 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings as long as they don't affect the quality of service provided. |
| G32 | Modernisation of Registrar's service | Expected increase in the level of income that could be generated from registration services. | 130 | 0 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| G33 | Additional income from new Norfolk Legal shared services | Net additional income to be received from the new shared legal service. | 200 | 0 | 0 | As a partner in Norfolk Legal the city council supports the approach. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|----------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| G34 | Review of Registrar's service provision | Review of Registrars service including development of other options to access the service and review of existing offices, which could include closure of some offices. | 0 | 50 | 0 | Support for these savings. |
| H | Travel and transport | | | | | |
| H1 | Organisational review | Savings arising from Phase 2 of the organisational review undertaken by PwC. | 400 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings from management costs although these savings look small given the size of the service areas. |
| H2 | Business efficiency and general expenditure savings of 5% | This will be through reducing general spend through the Travel and Transport group by around 5%, cutting back further on temporary staff, travel and tightening up on all purchases and activities that are not core business. | 344 | 0 | 0 | Support for these efficiency savings. |
| H3 | Additional efficiency savings with our private | Through our partnership with Mott McDonald and May Gurney, we will continue to make efficiency savings on top of the £1.7m existing target | 150 | 0 | 0 | As above. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | sector partners | for savings. | | | | |
| H4 | Business support review | We aim to make savings by reviewing levels of business support and administrative processes. | 50 | 0 | 0 | Support for the reduction in support costs but the potential savings seem very modest. |
| H5 | Better procurement of footway surveys | By better procurement we can reduce the cost of surveys we have to undertake. | 20 | 0 | 0 | Support for savings through procurement. |
| H6 | Better procurement of vehicles | We propose to review the specification of our vehicle fleet and make savings through rationalising the number and type of vehicles, and not replacing vehicles so frequently. | 200 | 0 | 0 | As above. |
| H7 | Strategic review of Environment, Transport and Development | The strategic review, led by members of the Strategic Review Board, is undertaking a comprehensive review of the services ETD delivers. The scale and method of delivery are being scrutinised in detail and we anticipate the review will produce savings which are a combination of efficiencies, service redesign, procurement changes and service reductions. | 0 | 4700 | 1080 0 | See section 3.17 of our main response document. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| H8 | Increased income from planning services | We propose to make a small charge for advice to developers seeking to make a planning application. | 5 | 10 | 0 | Whilst supporting this proposal its detailed implementation needs to be considered in the context of the highways agency agreement between the county and city councils. |
| H9 | Rationalisation of highway depots and offices | We are reviewing the depot and office requirements and will make savings by reducing the overall number of buildings and offices. | 0 | 260 | 0 | Support for premises savings. |
| H10 | Changes to street lighting | We have already consulted and agreed a changed approach to street lighting which sees some lights in some locations turned off during the night. These savings are as a result of the implementation of this new approach which is already underway. | 37 | 58 | 31 | See section 3.18 of our main response document. |
| H11 | Re-shaped public transport network, with a shift towards demand responsive transport services ('dial-a-ride') | This proposal would see a reduced core bus network remain, but with much greater reliance on demand responsive transport replacing buses elsewhere. Overall, we would be spending less on subsidising public transport. Click here for more information | 1000 | 1000 | 0 | See section 3.19 of our main response document. |
| H12 | Scaling back of safety camera | The existing government grant which funds the safety camera partnership | 1646 | 0 | 0 | Concern that this may result in increased speeding and hence more accidents. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | partnership work and transfer of responsibility to the police | and a range of community safety work has been withdrawn by government. We propose to redesign the safety-camera work and the community safety camera work to significantly reduce the cost and increase income, to leave a net cost to the County council of no more than £50k. | | | | |
| H13 | Reduce subsidy for Park and Ride in Norwich | <p>We aspire to remove our subsidy to Park and Ride so it is run at no cost to the Council. We will be working to understand the full impact of this which could include closure of the waiting areas, closure of toilet facilities, reduction in frequency, increased fares, and possibly the closure of some sites.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 1475 | 575 | 0 | See section 3.20 of our main response document. |
| H14 | End funding for transport partnerships | We have funded the Wherry and Bittern Line Community Rail Partnerships (£65k) but propose to look to other sources and funders to step in. | 65 | 0 | 0 | Support for this saving. |

| No. | Proposal | Background | 2011 / 12 £000 | 2012 / 13 £000 | 2013 / 14 £000 | Comment from Norwich City Council |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | Click here for more information | | | | |
| H15 | Close the travel information desk at Norwich Bus Station and reduce opening hours of the travel centre | <p>This proposal would see the Bus Station waiting area open during the day only – from 7 am to 6.30 pm. The travel information desk would close.</p> <p>Click here for more information</p> | 250 | 0 | 0 | Concern that this will cause inconvenience to passengers although we recognise that ticket bookings may be able to be provided via alternative means. Also have some concerns over passenger security. |
| H16 | Savings from carrying out fewer transport studies | Government grant cuts mean that we will not be carrying out as many road and transport projects as in previous years, so we will need fewer studies and strategies to support these. This will mean cost savings can be made. | 425 | 125 | 0 | Support for this saving. |