

Report for Resolution

Report to Cabinet
5 January 2011

Report of Acting head of strategy and programme management

Subject Response to Norfolk County Council's budget reduction proposals

5

Purpose

To consider the recommendations of Scrutiny Committee on the draft response to Norfolk County Council's budget reduction proposals and agree the council's final response.

Recommendation

- To consider the recommendations of Scrutiny Committee on the draft response
- To agree the final makeup of the council's response to the consultation.

Financial Consequences

The financial consequences of this report are that the County Council's proposals, if implemented, are likely to result in direct reductions in funding for the City Council's sheltered housing and community alarms services. The size of these reductions is not yet certain. In addition there are also likely to be a number of indirect impacts on the City Council's resources in regards to increased pressures on other council services.

Risk Assessment

None

Strategic Priority and Outcome/Service Priorities

The report helps to meet the strategic priority "Aiming for excellence – ensuring the Council is efficient in its use of resources, is effective in delivering its plans, is a good employer and communicates effectively with its customers, staff and partners"

Executive Member: Councillor Waters - Corporate Resources and Governance

Ward: All Wards

Contact Officers

Russell O'Keefe

01603 212908

Report

Introduction

1. On the 26 October 2010 Norfolk County Council commenced a budget consultation entitled the 'big conversation' on a large range of budget reductions for the next three financial years. The consultation is due to finish on the 10 January 2011.
2. As part of this the County Council have put forward proposals that cover all of their different service areas to differing degrees. This includes some very significant proposed reductions to a range of frontline services.
3. Relevant City Council officers have been working through the different proposals and attempting to assess their potential impact on the residents of Norwich, including any disproportionate effects, and the impact on the City Council's services.

Scrutiny Consideration

4. Based on the work carried out by officers a draft response was put together that was considered by Scrutiny Committee on the 16 December. This can be found at Annex A.
5. Scrutiny Committee made a number of recommendations to Cabinet in regards to changes to the draft response. These were as follows:
 - That the council strengthens the wording of its response in regards to:
 - The lack of overall information provided by the County Council on its proposals
 - The opportunity for the County Council to make use of their reserves to buy themselves time to work up other proposals that would not affect frontline services
 - The County Council's proposal to increase the eligibility criteria for adult social care to critical only
 - The County Council's proposal to reduce spending on prevention services
 - The County Council's proposal to end the HIV/AIDS service
 - The County Council's proposal to end the subsidy for college transport.
 - The County Council's proposal to close the travel information desk at Norwich Bus Station.
 - In addition, that the council adds into the response the following elements:
 - That the County Council looks at making efficiency savings from bringing the looked after children service 'in house' and not using out of county placements.
 - That the council supports the proposed changes to the meals on wheels service as it is likely to provide better value for money for

- That the council sets out its opposition to the proposed reduction in support for the Wherry and Bitten Line Railway Line.
- That the County Council should explore developing a shared service with other council for sensory support services.
- That the County Council maximises all opportunities to find savings from renewable energy
- That the County Council stops planning work on the NDR to save money.

Final response

6. Cabinet are asked to consider the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee and to agree the final makeup of the council's response.

Annex A: Draft Response to Norfolk County Council's budget reduction proposals

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

- 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 adverse impacts of the proposed withdrawal of financial support for park and ride and the impact this could have on the business community and visitors and shoppers to the city. The city council would wish to see a commitment

from the county council to continue to support the delivery of the Norwich Area Transport Strategy. Any decision that would preclude its delivery in the short to medium term would be of great concern. This would include the disposal of any park and ride site that is closed as part of a cost saving exercise.

- 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.