



## Re-imagining Norfolk – budget consultation 2016-19

### Overview

**Our priorities for Norfolk are** Excellence in Education, Real Jobs, Improved Infrastructure and Supporting Vulnerable People.

**Re-imagining Norfolk** is our strategy to balance achieving our priorities and delivering services with less money. This will see us radically change our role and the way we deliver services.

**Our forecasts show** we have a further £111m savings to find in order to balance our budget for the next three years.

**Since 2011** we have already made £245m of savings due to a reduction in funding from central government, increasing demand for our services and inflationary pressures.

**Recognising tough times all round** we have not increased our share of the council tax you pay for Norfolk County Council's services for five years now.

**We have put together** proposals to balance our budget for 2016-17 as well as our approach to close our budget gap up to 2018-19.

**We are also consulting on our draft Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP)** which shapes the work of Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service.

### Why we are consulting

**We want your views on:**

- Council tax - should we increase it to protect essential services.
- Our proposals to balance our budget for 2016-17 that involve changes or cuts to our services.
- Our approach to making savings in 2017-18 and 2018-19 through our Re-imagining Norfolk strategy.
- The Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service draft Integrated Risk Management Plan.

## Who we are consulting

We are consulting all Norfolk residents and relevant stakeholders on our budget proposals. To make sure that our consultation is representative of our community we are taking extra steps to engage with underrepresented groups.

We will also be consulting people and organisations that may be directly affected by our proposals.

## How we are consulting

You can give us your views:

- by email at [haveyoursay@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:haveyoursay@norfolk.gov.uk)
- on Twitter using #norfolkbudget
- by phone on 0344 800 8020
- via your county councillor - contact details at [www.norfolk.gov.uk/councillors](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/councillors)
- In writing to Freepost Plus RTCL-XSTT-JZSK, Norfolk County Council, Ground floor - south wing, County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich NR1 2DH. However, if you want to help the council save money please use a stamp and send to this address: Budget Consultation, Norfolk County Council, Ground floor - south wing, County Hall, Martineau Lane, NR1 2DH

To make our consultation as accessible as possible, we are hosting a series of events aimed at anyone who may be affected by our consultation proposals, but may find participating via our website difficult. For example, those with a physical disability, learning disability, sensory impairment, people whose first language isn't English or people who do not have access to online facilities. These events will be held at different locations across the county.

### **Monday 16 November - Norwich**

Time: 2–4pm

Venue: The Space

Address: Roundtree Way, Norwich NR7 8SQ

### **Wednesday 18 November – King's Lynn**

Time: 2-4pm

Venue: King's Lynn Professional Development Centre

Address: Kilham's Way, King's Lynn, Norfolk PE30 2HU

### **Monday 30 November – Mattishall**

Time: 2-4pm

Venue: South Green Park, Mattishall

Address: 48 South Green, Mattishall, Dereham NR20 3JY

### **Monday 7 December – Great Yarmouth**

Time: 2-4pm

Venue: King's Centre, Great Yarmouth

Address: Queen Anne's Road, Southtown, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, NR31 0LE

## Tuesday 8 December – Sheringham

Time: 2–4pm

Venue: Sheringham Community Centre

Address: Holway Rd, Sheringham, Norfolk NR26 8NP

## Information about accessibility

Each event will be fully accessible. We will do this in the following ways:

- Our presentation will be in an easy read format to help people with learning disabilities
- A palantypist will make a transcript of the presentation for people who are hard of hearing
- We will have a BSL signer for Deaf / hearing impaired people
- There will be a Hearing Loop
- We will support people to have their say

## How do I book my place?

Please book your place at least a week before the event you want to attend. This is to help us manage each event and understand any needs you have to enable you to attend. It is very important that you tell us of any special requirements you may have including transport needs when contacting us – we cannot cater for your needs without this information.

- You can book a place online at:  
<http://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/ReimaginingNorfolkEvents/>
- You can book a place by emailing us at: [consultationteam@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:consultationteam@norfolk.gov.uk)

When you email please tell us:

- Your full name
- Which event you want to attend
- Your telephone number so we can contact you about the event
- Any access needs you have

If you need transport to the event please also tell us your home address – or your pick-up and drop off points, if these are different from your home address. Please note, to save money, we will try and share transport, so you may be sharing with other people who are going to that event.

- You can also book a place by calling our Customer Services Centre on **0344 800 8020**

If you have any questions about these events please call our Customer Services Centre on 0344 800 8020.

## **When we are consulting**

We would like to hear your views by Thursday 14 January 2016 so we can consider them and use them to inform the decisions we will make on our budget.

## Re-imagining Norfolk

Central Government has made it clear that it will continue to reduce the amount of funding available to local government over the next three years. To work with a smaller overall budget we have established a programme to change the way the council works called **Re-imagining Norfolk**.

At the end of the three years the council will still be spending over £1 billion and providing services for people of all ages in Norfolk.

We still expect to be a major employer with our staff focused on delivering our key Re-imagining Norfolk priorities. In 2018, for instance, we expect to employ more social workers than we do today.

The County Council of 2019 will be different in other ways.

There will be a strong focus on running services more efficiently, getting things right first time so we can run better services with less money. We will work more closely with other councils and public services in the county, looking to avoid duplication and overlap in services. The council will operate out of fewer buildings and will look to deliver more of our services online, letting residents access the council 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There will be a very different relationship between the council and the communities we serve, with the public more involved in delivering services.

In preparing a budget for consultation, the council has taken a decision not simply to retreat to those services that is it our statutory responsibility to deliver. We believe that the council has a responsibility to future generations as well as current residents. Our priorities of Excellence in Education, Real Jobs, Improved Infrastructure and Supporting Vulnerable People are intended to shape the future of Norfolk. We want a well-educated Norfolk where young people are prepared for real jobs that pay well and work with our partners, in both the public and private sectors, to shape a county that welcomes business and supports a quality of life that makes Norfolk a great place to live as well as work.

- 1. Re-imagining Norfolk is our approach to meeting our priorities while cutting costs. Do you think that this is the right approach? Why do you say that?** Please tell us below.

## **Working differently, being efficient and getting better value for money**

Re-imagining Norfolk is all about changing the way that we work and looking for better ways of doing things. As part of this we are putting a strong focus on cutting our own costs, changing our processes, getting better deals and generating income.

Here are some of the ways that we are proposing to save money over the next three years through our Re-imagining Norfolk approach.

### **Better ways of working**

We are proposing to save **£54m** (£7m in 2016-17, £22m in 2017-18 and £25m in 2018-19) by reviewing how we do things, improving our processes and delivering services in a different, more cost-effective way, for example by:

- Changing how we provide support to families so that we can help them early on
- Using new technology, for example mobile devices for highway inspectors
- Encouraging more people to use our website as their first point of contact
- Reducing the running costs of our buildings
- Using fewer agency staff.

### **Getting better value for money on what we spend**

We are proposing to save **£9m** (£3m in 2016-17 and £6m in 2018-19) by looking for better deals from our suppliers for the things that we buy, without affecting our services. We also plan to make savings by negotiating better contracts for;

- Our passenger transport contracts
- Waste disposal
- Our fleet of vehicles.

### **Being more commercial**

We are proposing to save **£22.2m** (£13.4m in 2016-17, £6.4m in 2017-18 and £2.4m in 2018-19) by looking at ways of selling products and services to external customers and generating more income. This will include:

- Looking for other sources of funding to support our services
- Making sure we are collecting all the council tax we are owed
- Making sure we charge the right amount for our internal services e.g. ICT support
- Developing opportunities in our Registration Service to generate money
- Taking another look at our investments and loans
- Charging people a fee if they use a credit card to pay for our service.

## How we organise our staff and resources

We are proposing to save **£15m** (£2m in 2016-17, £7m in 2017-18 and £6m in 2018-19) by reducing staff costs across all departments and saving money on paper transactions and processes by doing more online. This will involve:

- Reducing the number of staff and removing budgets for vacant posts
- Automating our processes
- Changing some staff teams to work differently e.g. base staff in local areas.

## Council tax

Recognising tough times all round, we have not increased our share of the council tax you pay for Norfolk County Council's services for five years now.

Given our stark financial position and potential impact of further funding cuts on some services, one option county councillors could consider is increasing the council tax and using the income raised to protect a specific service or department from further funding cuts.

In recent years, the most we could increase council tax, without triggering a referendum, was by 1.99%. We are currently unsure if the Government will impose a referendum limit on increasing council tax in 2016-17.

We are considering increasing our share of the council tax by up to 1.99%. This would mean, for example, that a family living in a Band D property would pay £22.79 more council tax in 2016-17 - that's around 44p a week.

Raising the council tax by 1.99% would generate £6.2m. Currently we receive a grant from the Government for freezing our council tax. We are at present unsure if a council tax freeze grant will be offered by Government in 2016-17. If a grant was offered and we increased council tax we would lose the grant. This could mean that we would be left with £2.7m to spend on services and to help balance the budget in 2016-17. From 2017-18 onwards the whole of the £6.2m would be available to use to fund services each year.

- 2. Should Norfolk County Council raise its share of the council tax by up to 1.99% in 2016-17 in order to protect essential services and reduce the level of cuts? Please tick one only (✓)**

Yes

No

Don't know

## **Protecting services**

If we increased our share of the council tax we could protect some service areas and not have to make all the savings we are proposing.

## **Information about our services**

### **Adult Social Services**

Services include:

- Prevention - including services to help people to continue living independently in their homes and services that help people to get back on their feet after an illness or crisis
- Provision of care - includes supporting people that need additional help day to day
- Planning social care services.

### **Children's services**

Services include:

- Early years and childcare - including working with nurseries, childminders, and Surestart Children's Centres. Plus providing a family information service
- Support for children and young people with special educational needs / disabilities and their families
- Caring for children who are unable to live with their birth parents and supporting vulnerable families so more families can stay together.

### **Fire and rescue**

Services include:

- Prevention, fire protection and emergency response.

### **Roads, transport, waste, environment and planning**

Services include:

- Maintaining 6,000+ miles of roads
- Disposing of household waste after it is collected by the district councils and providing recycling centres
- Coordinating local journeys for vulnerable adults and school children and supporting local bus services including Park and Ride and community transport
- Working with partners to protect and improve the natural environment
- Supporting the Norfolk economy by working to attract new jobs and businesses to the county
- Protecting the public through services such as Trading Standards and emergency planning.



## Museums, records and the arts

Services include:

- The Norfolk Museums Service - including running 10 visitor attractions
- Adult education
- Norfolk Record Office
- Strategic arts development, including funding support.

## Libraries

Services include:

- 47 libraries and nine mobile libraries.

- 3. Please take a look at the service areas below and prioritise the ones you think we should protect if we did decide to increase the council tax.** Please prioritise the services by writing the numbers 1 – 7 against the services below, with 1 being your top priority:

Adult social services

Children's Services

Fire and rescue

Roads, transport, waste, environment and planning

Museums, records and the arts

Libraries

Other service area (please write in below)

## **Our proposals**

We want to hear your views about our proposals. We want to know:

- If you agree or disagree with our proposals
- The reasons behind your view

## **Adult social services**

The core of the Adult Social Services department's plans for the next three years is to support a larger proportion of Norfolk residents with social care needs in their own homes. Through our Promoting Independence Strategy, the department will work with local community groups and voluntary organisations to reduce dependence on traditional care services and to help people to remain as independent as possible, rather than moving them to residential care. This will involve a major redesign of the way in which social care services are delivered in Norfolk.

We are going to start by making these changes next year:

- Change the way we organise social care so that more people get early support in communities and don't need council services – this will save £1.3m next year.
- Spend more on reablement services so that more people can live independently. Our reablement service provides focused care for people for up to six weeks, usually after a hospital admission. Over 50% of people need no further care after using this service. This means we will save £3.2m in the longer term.
- Improve equipment and assistive technology services so that more people can live independently – this will save £500,000.
- Enable more people to stay in their homes so that they don't need residential care – this will save £120,000.

This strategy means that social care support will feel very different, with less use of traditional care services and a focus on getting more support from technology or people's own personal networks and communities in the first instance. We believe that this can be achieved without affecting the quality of the social care they receive.

There will be no change in the eligibility criteria for social care services which are now set nationally.

## 1. Reduce the Council's funding for Supporting People services.

We are proposing to reduce the Council's funding for Supporting People services (also known as housing-related support services). These are prevention services that help people who are vulnerable or who have a disability, to live independently and to remain in their home, including:

- Sheltered housing, community alarms and home improvements advice for older people
- Supported housing
- Visiting support for people who are at risk of losing their accommodation, and
- Crisis housing and support for those who may have lost their accommodation such as:
  - Young people hostels which support young people to move safely into adulthood and set up home for the first time
  - Hostels for people who have been homeless with support to enable them to re-establish a secure home
  - Refuges for women experiencing domestic violence.

We currently spend £12.4m each year on these housing related support services. We decide how to spend the money, but do so in consultation with the Supporting People partnership. The Supporting People partnership includes: District Councils, Health, Probation, Norfolk Constabulary, Youth Offending and the Norfolk Drug and Alcohol Partnership.

Hostels, refuges and sheltered housing services receive some other funding through rent, housing benefits and district councils. **This proposal will have a significant impact but would save us approximately £5.1m in 2016-17, because it means reducing the funding we currently provide by about 40%.**

The proposal would add to savings that we have already made on Supporting People services:

- In 2011-14 we made approximately £3m savings from Supporting People services as part of an overall reduction in spending on prevention and community support services.
- In February 2014 we agreed to save £2.4m in 2014-16 by working with other agencies to review all the services offered and looking for ways to deliver them more efficiently. These savings were delivered over two years.

The Care Act says that we have to make sure there are prevention services available in Norfolk but we do not have to provide Supporting People services specifically. We recognise the value of these services in helping people to remain independent but are reluctantly having to consider reducing the funding we put into them. This is so that we can prioritise funding for services that the law clearly says we do have to provide, like adult social care services.

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

The Supporting People partnership helps 11,000 people a year, including those who are homeless, victims of domestic abuse, ex-offenders and people misusing drugs and alcohol.

The main help offered is housing related support which includes help with claiming benefits, support to prevent people losing their accommodation, and support to tackle issues such as poor mental health or social skills, which can make it difficult to live independently.

Most of the people receiving Supporting People services are not eligible for adult social care services and many will be on the margins of society or feel excluded from their communities. Removing some of these services could lead to an increase in demand for adult social care and other services.

If our proposal went ahead this would affect people who get, or would be eligible to receive, housing related support funded by the council. It would also affect providers of housing related services paid for by the council. The proposal may have a particular impact where services are provided in accommodation, such as young people or homelessness hostels.

In the past we have been able to make Supporting People savings by changing the way we organise services and working with the organisations that provide them to refocus the support they are able to offer and reduce costs. We don't think we can make any more savings through this sort of work and would now need to make more difficult decisions about what Supporting People services will look like in the future.

To make the proposed saving of £5.1m we would:

- Remove funding for supported living and visiting support for people with learning disabilities and mental health needs. We think people should be able to get the housing support they need through their personal budgets.
- Change the focus of services for older people so they provide less general advice and more specialist support to prevent people needing social care or health related services
- Reduce adult social care funded housing support for young people aged 16-24
- Reduce our support for people who are homeless or people at risk of losing their accommodation
- Reduce funding that we give district councils for home improvement agencies and instead focus on supporting existing handyperson services to become self-sustaining.

This could mean that more people become homeless or go into crisis and require other services, such as adult social care, children's services, housing and health services.

If we decided to reduce the funding we currently provide for Supporting People services to save £5.1m, this would leave £7.3m and we would therefore need to refocus and prioritise this spending.

**We will work with organisations that currently provide Supporting People services to plan specific consultation with people that are currently using these services. Many people using these services are excluded or on the margins of mainstream society already so it is particularly important to consult with them and the organisations that represent them about reducing services available to them.**

**4. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the Council's funding for Supporting People services? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

**5. Why do you say this? Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.**

**6. Do you currently use this service? Please tick one only (✓)**

Yes

No

Don't know

**2. Stop all transport funded by adult social services by 2019.**

We are proposing to phase out the funding for, and provision of, transport services that help people to get to services – usually day care.

Currently people that receive a personal budget, and who cannot transport themselves to services, receive an amount to pay for transport. However, in addition to this, many people receive money to help them to get around through the mobility

element of their Disability Living Allowance (DLA) and through the Department of Work & Pension's (DWP) Personal Independence Payment.

If our proposal went ahead it would mean that we would withdraw adult social services funding for transport. We would continue to provide information, advice and signposting to help people organise transport, and to pay for it using their payments from DLA and DWP or their own money.

The proposal would add to savings that we have already agreed to make on providing transport to adult social care service users:

- In February 2014 we agreed to make savings of £2.1m in 2014-17 by changing the way we allocate personal budget funding for people so that they get less money for transport.
- Last year we considered making more savings on transport – we decided not to make any extra savings in 2015-16 but did agree to save a further £1.7m in 2016-18 by trying to meet people's needs locally and making more use of community transport and public transport.

The current proposal, with the two savings above, would remove the entire Adult Social Services transport budget by the end of 2018-19.

**This would save us an extra £1m in 2017-18 and £3.78m in 2018-19: so £4.78m in total.**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

If it went ahead, this proposal would affect all those people who receive a transport service from Adult Social services including those who use their personal budget (including Direct Payments) to pay for transport. It would affect older people, disabled people (including people with a learning disability and some people who use mental health services) and it would also affect transport providers who currently have a contract with us.

(A Direct Payment is where the person takes their Personal Budget as money from the Council and arranges and pays for their services themselves.)

We do not currently collect data on the number of people using their personal budgets to access transport services. We do however know that Transport Plus, the business that arranges transport for many social care service users, supports around 3,000 people and arranges around 568,000 individual journeys each year. This figure doesn't include all people who use their Direct Payment to arrange transport – some people will make their own arrangements – but this gives an idea of how many people may be affected.

If our proposal went ahead:

- We would signpost people to information and advice about transport options so that they can arrange their own transport. Where a person is not able to do this for themselves we would help them with making the arrangements.
- We would encourage people to use their Motability vehicle or mobility allowance for their transport.
- We would support people to use public transport or community transport where we assess that they are able to do this. We would provide travel training if appropriate.
- We would support and encourage people to use the service that is closest to them if this will meet their needs, for example, their local day centre.

If this proposal goes ahead we would start using the new policy from 1 April 2017. In practice this means that it would apply to all new service users from 1 April 2017. We would re-assess existing service users, who use their personal budget to buy transport or who the department pays for transport for, at their annual review.

In line with the Promoting Independence Strategy, we would help people find transport when they need it but we will not fund it. In time we would no longer have any contracts with providers of transport.

It would be similar to our arrangement for meals for people who live in their own homes, where we no longer have contracts with providers of meals but provide information to people about who can provide meals in their area. People then arrange and pay for their meals direct. We help to make the arrangement for the person if they are not able to do it but do not fund it.

A number of other local authorities have already taken a similar approach to what is proposed here.

We have limited alternative options for finding savings in Adult Social Services and have to prioritise funding for services that the law clearly says we have to provide and that cannot be met in other ways.

**We will be writing to all those directly affected by this proposal to encourage them to have their say. We will also be consulting through existing partnership forums and user groups – these are comprised of professionals, local people, carers and service users.**

**7. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to stop all transport funded by adult social services by 2019? Please tick one only (✓)**

- |            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Agree      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8. **Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

9. **Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No

Don't know

## **Our ideas for saving money from 2017-19**

We are at an early stage of thinking about our ideas for saving money from 2017–19. When we have developed our ideas further, we will have more detail about how they might affect people. If these ideas become formal proposals and those proposals involve changes to services, we will consult people on them at the appropriate time and before any final decisions on those proposals are made by the council.

In the meantime, however, we are interested to hear any views you may have about **three** of our ideas for future savings.

### **Idea 1 - Spend less on traditional day care by helping people join in with community activities.**

We have had a lot of discussion about day care in Norfolk in recent years. The council's day care services are now run by a social enterprise called Independence Matters. In addition we work with a number of voluntary and private organisations who provide day care.

We would like to work with these organisations to help more people who have a disability or mental health needs into employment. Some authorities have had more success than Norfolk at this to date. Where employment is possible for individuals, there is some evidence to show that being in work can help people with disabilities and mental health needs enjoy a better quality of life and, in doing so, it can reduce the cost for adult social care services.

What that means in practice is the council wanting to look at how we might be able to spend less on traditional day care services in buildings and invest more in helping people find work if they are able to. We also want to help more people get the



company and stimulation they need in their local communities and from services that are open to everyone to use, not just people with social care needs.

We think this could have multiple benefits. In part they are as described above, but could also assist in stopping people having to travel long distances to get to special services and helping them to feel more connected to people living around them. Whilst plans are yet to be finalised, it is important to be aware that this could mean that some day care services people currently receive could change or close in the future.

**10. If there is anything you want to tell us now to help us develop this idea, please write in below:**

**Idea 2 - Become the county council with the lowest number of people in residential care.**

We have compared our services with other councils and know that more people go into residential care in Norfolk than in other places. If we could reduce the numbers of people in residential care so we are the same as the average of comparative councils it would help us save almost £2.4m. If we could reduce the number to the same level as the county council with the lowest number of people in residential care we could save a further £2.4m.

We don't think this would be easy to do but it might be achievable if we can make sure a lot more people receive support in their communities instead of in residential care. We would of course always meet our statutory duties under the Care Act.

We would try to do this by:

- Making sure only people whose needs cannot be met by any other community based solution go forward for permanent residential care
- Making more use of the Shared Lives scheme where people get care and accommodation from families in the local community
- Helping more people with learning disabilities to live in supported housing
- Making more use of equipment and assistive technology that can help people live independently
- Providing more housing with care
- Providing people paying for their own care with good information about alternative options to residential care so more people making their own care choices opt for services that support independence.

11. **If there is anything you want to tell us now to help us develop this idea, please write in below:**

### **Idea 3 - Continue to change the way we organise social care so more people get early support in communities and don't need council services.**

We have already described how we plan to save £1.3m this year by working differently so that more people get the support they need without needing to use social care services, through our Promoting Independence Strategy.

By developing this strategy and fully implementing it over the next three years we believe that we can make even more savings between 2017-2019. These could be worth up to £25.6m. We would need to continue to improve our processes and the way we work so that we engage more with local communities and ensure that everything we do promotes independence. We also hope spending on reablement services will help us save a further £2m between 2017-19 and improving equipment and assistive technology services will save a further £500,000 between 2017-19.

We have looked at other councils that are doing well at helping people live independently with less direct help from social care and are thinking about using some of their ideas in Norfolk.

One idea we are thinking about is setting up community clinics. This would mean that people would get their needs met by having appointments at clinics in communities instead of a home visit. These might be in convenient places like doctor's surgeries or village halls.

Please be assured that people who can't attend our clinics would of course still receive home visits, and these changes would not affect our response to safeguarding or other urgent needs.

We would like to come up with a proposal to give people who can attend clinics immediate face-to-face advice about help in their community from a social worker or occupational therapist, working with district council colleagues and local voluntary groups. Experience elsewhere has shown that this is a good way of helping people in an efficient and cost effective way. We would then propose to follow up with service users in some way, such as by telephone, to ensure that they are satisfied with the arrangements and have successfully accessed the help they need.

We think that using community clinics could have multiple benefits for people and help more people get support from their communities. For example, we could create opportunities for people with similar needs to meet each other or for voluntary sector organisations to come and give people information about support available in the local area.

- 12. If there is anything you want to tell us now to help us develop this idea, please write in below:**

**We will consult on our ideas in due course if they are to be put forward as formal proposals. Don't worry if you can't or don't want to make a comment now - there will be plenty of opportunity for you to have your say in the future.**

## Children's services

Early support is at the heart of Children's Services changes for the next three years. Norfolk County Council currently has more children in care than our neighbours. The department wants to change this. We believe that getting things right first time for families allows us to give better support and to use our budget more effectively.

Supporting families earlier means being able to help families to meet their child's needs and where that is not possible taking clear, timely and decisive action to secure a permanent alternative to care wherever possible. We know that it is very difficult to 'repair' the damage that takes place when children are harmed and neglected, particularly over a period of time. We can produce better outcomes for families and children by carefully targeting support when problems first appear.

Services and contracts will follow this route. While children's centres will all remain, their contracts will be more tightly focused on delivering support for families at risk. This picks up on the success of similarly focused work by the council's troubled families team.

### **3. Change how we provide parenting support.**

We have contracts with four organisations to provide parenting support programmes. They offer advice, one-to-one support and group programmes for parents and carers. We are proposing to not renew these contracts when they end in March 2017. We would continue to provide parents and carers with parenting support. Targeted family support activities would be provided by our early help teams. Other organisations that run services on our behalf, such as children's centres, health visitors and school nurses, would also support families.

**This would save approximately £427,000 per year from 2017-18.**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

We have contracts with four organisations to provide parenting support programmes. They offer advice, one-to-one support and group programmes for parents and carers. Whilst we have four organisations who run these services, there is currently no support to families living in Great Yarmouth.

We are proposing to not renew these contracts when they end in March 2017. We have reorganised our teams in Children's Services and created an early help team whose role is to support families with the challenges they face before they turn into more serious problems. The early help team covers all parts of the county, which means that there is parenting support available to families living throughout Norfolk.

In addition to our early help team, we also have contracts with other organisations who can provide parenting support. We have a network of children's centres, health visitors and school nurses who can support parents and carers across the county. By April 2017 the early help team will be well established and the organisation now

providing health visitors and school nurses will have been working in Norfolk for 18 months.

The contracts which are coming to an end are:

**Action for Children (covering West Norfolk, Breckland, South Norfolk)**

Between April 2014 and March 2015, Action for Children received 80 referrals for one-to-one parenting support and ten referrals for one-to-one therapeutic support for children. They ran 15 full parenting programmes, as well as six short parenting programmes. The service also co-facilitated three ante-natal 12 week programmes for pregnant teenagers, in partnership with a specialist midwife in West Norfolk.

**Family Action (covering Breckland)**

Between April 2014 and March 2015, Family Action offered individual support to 20 families. They ran two parenting programmes specifically for parents of children age 3- 1 years old, as well as two other shorter parenting programmes.

**Family Action (covering North Norfolk)**

Between April 2014 and March 2015, Family Action offered individual support to 30 families. They ran two parenting programmes specifically for parents of children aged 3-11 years old, as well as two other shorter parenting programmes. Family Action also ran drop-in sessions for parents in various venues in North Norfolk.

**Ormiston (support for families with children aged 11-19 in Greater Norwich)**

Ormiston offer one-to-one support to parents, as well as group sessions. Between April 2014 and March 2015, they supported 11 teenage parents using their Strengthening Families parenting programme. Four families also went on their Triple P parenting programme.

**Family Matters (support for families with children aged 6-11 in Greater Norwich)**

Between April 2014 and March 2015, Family Matters provided individual support to 37 parents. They also gave specific support to eight fathers and male carers. Forty four parents attended their drop-in sessions, where they got information and peer support and 50 families were part of their parenting programmes.

**We will consult with the four organisations that provide these services.**

**13. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to change how we provide parenting support? Please tick one only (✓)**

- Agree
- Disagree
- Don't know

14. **Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

15. **Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

#### 4. **Reduce our funding for youth work.**

We support activities for young people and youth work in Norfolk. Our seven youth advisory boards (YABs) are one way we do this. They are a partnership of local organisations and young people. Their role is to work together to understand what young people in different parts of Norfolk need and whether there are sufficient activities and services on offer locally for young people.

We also work closely with the voluntary and community sector to support people to set-up and run safe, sustainable and high-quality youth groups and projects.

We have to make significant savings over the next three years. So we have to think again about how we make sure there are sufficient positive activities for young people, how the youth advisory boards work and how we support youth work in Norfolk.

We are proposing to:

- Gradually stop the funding we give to our youth advisory boards to pay for local activities for young people, whilst they find alternative sources of funding over the next three years
- Stop the funding we give to our youth advisory boards to pay for positive activities for young people that are at risk of becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) or at risk of coming into care
- Stop funding the young people and debt project in Norwich
- Reduce our funding for Momentum Norfolk by 45%
- Reduce our funding for promoting activities to young people.

**This proposal would save us approximately £605,000 in 2016-17, £105,000 in 2017-18 and £105,000 in 2018-19. A total of £815,000 each year by 2018-19.**

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

### **Youth Advisory Boards**

There are seven youth advisory boards (YABs) in Norfolk. They are a partnership of local organisations and young people. Their role is to work together to understand what young people in different parts of Norfolk need and whether there are sufficient activities on offer locally for young people to do in their leisure time. The law says that the council must make sure there are sufficient positive activities for young people in Norfolk. Each YAB is supported by a youth and community worker who is paid for by us, but employed by a local voluntary organisation.

We give each YAB a budget of £45,000 per year that it can use to pay organisations to run activities for young people to do locally. Our aim is that they use their money to increase the number and range of activities in their area, so they might use it to help a project get started or to significantly expand.

We also give each YAB a share of £330,000 per year to fund projects that are for young people at risk of becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) and young people at risk of coming into care. Each YAB gets a different amount because each area is different and the young people living there have different needs.

We are proposing to gradually stop the funding we give to the youth advisory boards to pay for local activities for young people, whilst they find alternative sources of funding over the next three years. There are opportunities to bid for funding from the Big Lottery, national government departments and European funding opportunities. Gradually reducing the funding would give them time to adjust to the new way of working and to find alternative funding.

We are also proposing to stop the funding we give to our youth advisory boards to pay for positive activities for young people that are at risk of becoming not in education, employment or training (NEET) or at risk of coming into care. We would stop giving the YABs this funding from 2016-17. As part of their move to find alternative sources of funding, the YABs could bid for money to help local projects that work with these two groups of young people.

Some of the youth advisory boards have already been successful in bidding for money from other sources, but we would support all the YABs with this transition. For example we would offer them all our training on how to bid for funding. We would also share information about appropriate funding opportunities that they could apply for. We have submitted a bid to the Cabinet Office's Delivering Differently fund to secure funding to explore how else we can make the youth advisory boards more sustainable and effective.

We would continue to pay for each youth advisory board to have support from a dedicated youth and community worker. Their role is important in terms of making sure that the partnership works well together and is focused on improving local services for young people. They help to make sure that young people are at the heart of the YAB's decision-making.

It is likely that the youth and community worker role would need to adapt to the new way of working though. For example they would need to have the skills to apply for funding. We would also need to explore whether it would be helpful to change the legal status of the youth advisory boards from partnerships to legal entities so that they could apply for funding.

How successful each youth advisory board is depends on how well the different organisations involved work together. There is a risk that if a YAB is not successful at attracting a lot of funding, then it might not appear to be worthwhile to other organisations and for young people to get involved in. There is also a risk that if alternative funding cannot be secured, more young people might end-up not in education, employment or training or coming into care.

In addition to continuing to pay for youth and community work to support the YABs, we also plan to continue our support for young carers and to invest in services that respond to young people's mental health needs. The support and activities that we fund for young carers and young people with mental health needs are not organised by the YABs.

### **Young people and debt project in Norwich**

We have jointly funded a project with Norwich City Council to provide benefits advice and support to young people that are at risk of receiving unemployment benefit sanctions for doing things such as arriving late to appointments at the Job Centre. We set the project up because there was an increase in the number of young people being sanctioned and this was putting them in real difficulty. The project has also considered what other support young people more generally need to prevent them from getting into financial trouble.

In the three months between April and June 2015, 25 young people received benefits advice because they had received sanctions and 29 young people received money management and debt advice.

We are proposing to stop funding the young people and debt project in Norwich. We have learnt a great deal from the project that we will share with our workforce and other organisations. If our proposal went ahead then people working for the council, such as our early help team, would be able to provide debt advice to young people who need it. This would mean that there would be more people who are able to give advice to young people. Norwich City Council could decide to continue to fund the project if this proposal goes ahead.

### **Momentum Norfolk**

Momentum Norfolk support voluntary and community groups that work with young people. They employ a small team of community development workers to:

- Give advice on how to set-up and run a youth group or project
- Develop and share tools and resources for working with young people
- Provide training on working with young people
- Help youth groups get Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks to make sure their staff and volunteers are safe to work with young people.



- Run a small grants programme
- Support youth groups to find funding.

Momentum Norfolk work with 270 youth groups across Norfolk – 220 of which pay to receive full membership benefits. Between April 2013 and March 2014, they offered advice and support to 624 people setting-up or running a youth group, processed 1,224 DBS checks, ran or organised training for 273 people and awarded grants to 21 youth groups.

We are proposing to reduce our funding for Momentum Norfolk by 45%. This would save £50,000 per year from 2016/17. If this proposal goes ahead, we would work with Momentum Norfolk to prioritise the work it carries out and the service it offers.

### **Funding for promoting youth activities**

We have a small budget that is used for raising awareness of the activities on offer for young people in Norfolk. This helps us with our legal duty to make sure there are sufficient positive activities for young people in Norfolk. For the past two years we have given each youth advisory board £3,500 to promote leisure activities locally and in a way that appeals to young people. We are proposing to reduce how much we spend on this by 50%.

The youth advisory boards have spent some of the previous funding on things that they will continue to benefit from though, for example they have used it to create websites and to get training to help them write policies and procedures so that their social media accounts are used safely.

**We will also be consulting Momentum Norfolk, members of the youth advisory boards (YABS) and the organisations that employ the youth and community workers who support the YABS.**

**16. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce our funding for youth work?** Please tick one only (✓)

- |            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Agree      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**17. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

**18. Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

## **5. Change how we provide support to families who are struggling to cope with the challenges they face.**

We have contracts with two organisations to run Family Intervention Projects. They work with families who have multiple challenges in their lives, such as unemployment, homelessness, poor school attendance, substance misuse, domestic abuse and mental and physical health problems.

We are proposing to not renew the contracts we have for the Family Intervention Projects when they end. Instead our Troubled Families and early help teams would continue to provide support to these families.

**This would save approximately £580,000 per year from 2017-18.**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

We have contracts with two organisations to run Family Intervention Projects. They work with families who have multiple challenges in the lives, such as unemployment, homelessness, poor school attendance, substance misuse, domestic abuse and mental and physical health problems.

Norwich City Council and Stonham Homestay run these services. Our arrangement with Norwich City Council will come to an end in March 2017. Children's Services contributes £150,500 of funding, with Norwich City Council providing £300,000. Children's Services contributes £430,000 to the Stonham Homestay Family Intervention Project.

Since we commissioned Norwich City Council and Stonham Homestay to run these services, the government has launched its nationwide Troubled Families programme to work with families facing multiple challenges. The government identified 1,700 families in Norfolk with multiple challenges. Over the past year our Troubled Families team, called Norfolk Family Focus, has successfully worked with all of these families. They will now be working with an additional 500 families.

Children's Services has also been recently reorganised into different teams that work with families depending on the level of support that they need.

Our reorganisation and the expansion of the Troubled Families programme in Norfolk has resulted in new opportunities for supporting families differently. We are proposing to not renew the contracts we have for the Family Intervention Projects when they end. Instead our Troubled Families and early help teams would continue to provide support to these families. This would mean that families would continue to

be supported, but they would receive the support from a different person providing an alternative intervention.

**We will also be consulting Norwich City Council and Stonham Homestay.**

- 19. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to change how we provide support to families who are struggling to cope with the challenges they face? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

- 20. Why do you say this? Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.**

- 21. Do you currently use this service? Please tick one only (✓)**

Yes

No

Don't know

**6. Keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most.**

Children's centres offer all families with children under five a range of services, information and support in their local community. The support varies but most offer advice from pregnancy and when your baby is born, play sessions, parenting support, information about your child's health needs, training courses for adults, as well as support finding specialist groups and services.

Children's centres help to reduce inequality and improve children's health, education and social development so that they are ready to start school. However we need to make significant savings over the next three years and so we need to think again about how our children's centres work.

We are proposing to keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most. **This would save approximately £3,044,000 (£1,826,000 in 2016-17, £609,000 in 2017-18 and £609,000 in 2018-19).**

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

There is a network of 53 children's centres across Norfolk. They offer all families with children under five a range of services, information and support in their local community.

Children's centres have to work with families and their local community to decide which services and activities to offer. This means that the support varies, but most offer advice from pregnancy and when your baby is born, play sessions, parenting support, information about your child's health needs, training courses for adults, as well as support finding specialist groups and services. Children's centres help to reduce inequality and improve children's health, education and social development so that they are ready to start school.

Some of the councillors on the Children's Services Committee formed a task and finish group to consider how well our children's centres were performing and the future of children's centres. They reported their findings to the committee in January 2015.

As a result of the work carried out by councillors on the Children's Services Committee, we are proposing to keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most. For example families who are struggling with unemployment, substance misuse, domestic abuse, mental or physical health problems.

Our current revenue budget for children's centres is approximately £12,540,000 per year. We would reduce the funding for children's centres by 25%, whilst at the same time asking them to focus their work on these families and to make their service more efficient. We would gradually reduce the funding over the three years, reducing it by £1,826,000 (15%) in 2016-17, a further £609,000 (5%) in 2017-18 and a final £609,000 (5%) in 2018-19. This would save a total of £3,044,000 per year from 2018-19.

Other organisations run our children's centres on our behalf. All of the current contracts for running our children's centres end in March 2016. We are asking all the organisations that run the children's centres whether they would like to extend their contact until the end of March 2019. If there are any organisations that do not want to extend their contract under the proposed new arrangements, we would go out to tender for a new organisation to run the centres between April 2016 and March 2019.

We will discuss with the organisations that run the children's centres what changes they would need to make if this proposal goes ahead. It might mean that some families would have to pay for some activities run by children's centres. It might also

mean that some services stop. It would be up to each children's centre to work with families and their local community to decide which services and activities to run.

**We will be consulting children's centres and the organisations that run them.**

- 22. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to keep all children's centres open and focus their work on supporting the families that need them most?** Please tick one only (✓)

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

- 23. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

- 24. Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No

Don't know

## **Fire and rescue (Integrated Risk Management Plan)**

The council is seeking the public's views on proposals for the Fire and Rescue service as it revises its service to reflect the drop in house fires (by almost 50% in the last 20 years) and a rise in its work in road traffic accidents.

Our challenge is how we meet these changing demands in a large rural county with reduced resources. The draft Integrated Risk Management Plan shows our ideas of how we can provide the service of the future.

In this consultation we have provided a summary of the options our plan contains. However, if you would like to read the proposals in full please click below.

**You can read a copy of the draft Integrated Risk Management Plan by visiting the Norfolk Fire and Rescue service website: [www.norfolkfireservice.gov.uk](http://www.norfolkfireservice.gov.uk)**

### **Our proposed strategic vision.**

**Our draft Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) 2016-20 sets out our proposed vision for the fire and rescue service to 2020 and how we will achieve it. Our strategic vision is:**

In 2020, Norfolk's Fire and Rescue Service will be at the heart of community protection for Norfolk. Its focus will be on saving lives, rendering humanitarian assistance, protecting property and the environment and safeguarding the local economy. It will plan, prepare for and support the end to end management of every risk that has been identified by the Fire and Rescue Authority through its Integrated Risk Management Plan. Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service will provide an 'All Hazards' service covering the current spectrum of prevention, enforcement and emergency response.

Our contribution to sustainable economic development and the health and well-being of Norfolk will be recognised and valued.

The Fire and Rescue Service will be locally accountable through Norfolk County Council as the Fire and Rescue Authority. Operational delivery will be joined up seamlessly with the partners we work with on the ground and we will play a leading role in the multi-agency management of emergency incidents.

When measuring our performance, we will, for those risks that most affect Norfolk, such as flooding or forest fires, seek best practice wherever it can be found. In terms of cost-effectiveness and joined up service delivery, we will measure ourselves against all UK emergency services. For operational capability and competence, we will measure ourselves against all UK fire and rescue services.

Whether full-time, part-time, retained or volunteers, our people will be respected as professional, able to operate independently, competently, and flexibly to deliver the right result, in the right place, at the right time, every time.

We will be trusted by the people of Norfolk to be there when they need us and to deliver for them.

*Aestimemur Agendo – Let Us Be Judged By Our Actions*

In the past our service focused on responding to fires and road accidents. Our current role, as expressed in our strategic vision, is much broader than that. We now work in communities to prevent fires, reduce the impact of fires and emergencies and respond to a wide range of emergencies.

**25. Do you agree or disagree with our proposed strategic vision?** Please tick one only (✓)

- |            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Agree      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**26. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

**7. Reduce the amount we spend on fire and rescue operational support – the services that help firefighters in carrying out their emergency response duties (IRMP option for change 1a).**

This proposal is to reduce the amount we spend on fire and rescue operational support. These are the services that help firefighters in carrying out their emergency response duties, for example, senior and middle managers (including those who manage incidents), training, equipment and supplies.

We propose to change the composition and ways of working of our management and technical teams whilst also making staff reductions in other support services. This would include reducing layers of senior and middle management and reducing our operational training budget.

We currently spend around £5m on operational support. This proposal would save us up to £1.2m over three years - around £1m from operational support staff reductions and £150,000 from the operational training budget.

**We would save £600,000 in 2016-17 and £600,000 in 2018-19.**

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

We need to deliver a Fire and Rescue Service with a smaller budget. This proposal would save up to £1.2m over three years with minimal direct impact on our emergency response service – the number of fire crews, fire engines and fire stations would not alter under this proposal.

This proposal would remove posts by reducing and merging teams and removing layers of management. Full-time firefighters affected by these changes would be moved to other public safety activities. Other non-operational staff would be made redundant.

If our proposal went ahead we would have fewer officers to manage complicated incidents such as large building fires, aircraft crashes or chemical spills. However, if we change our officers' shift patterns we could still provide similar levels of 24/7 incident command cover.

If this proposal went ahead we would also continue to provide prevention and protection services but would need to use our staff in a different way, so that we can focus more energy on road safety. Over the last ten years the number of fires have been reduced through a range of prevention and protection activities whilst the number of road accidents we are being called to is increasing. We are working with colleagues in Highways and Transport, Norfolk Constabulary and other partners to develop this area of work.

Our operational training budget is used to train firefighters. Up until now, we have protected this budget during previous rounds of budget cuts, but the pressure on our budgets is now so great that we cannot continue to do this. We will make some limited reductions in operational training where it is safe to do so.

**We will also consult other emergency services and civil protection agencies through the Norfolk Resilience Forum.**

- 27. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the amount we spend on fire and rescue operational support – the services that help firefighters in carrying out their emergency response duties? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know



28. **Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

**8. Move full-time firefighters from King’s Lynn and Gorleston to Thetford, Dereham and other market towns and introduce a 12 hours shift pattern for all full-time firefighters (IRMP option for change 1b).**

Risks in Norfolk have changed and we are proposing to move our resources to where they are more useful after studying the evidence available.

If this proposal went ahead then King’s Lynn North and Gorleston would stop being staffed 24 hours a day. Instead these stations would have firefighters permanently located there 12 hours a day. Outside these hours emergency response cover would be provided by on-call (retained) firefighters who live within five minutes of the station. This would free up 12-14 full-time firefighters that we could use in our other market towns to deliver public safety advice and training in communities whilst also keeping the local fire engine available.

This proposal includes increasing emergency response cover at Thetford and Dereham.

We also propose to introduce 12 hours shifts for all full-time firefighters so that each full-time station has the same start and finish times. This will make it easier for us to manage emergency response cover across the county.

This proposal does not save any money but it would allow us to locate our emergency response resources better to risk and demand.

The changes to the way we use full-time firefighters could not be implemented if the additional savings set in our proposals **9. Redesign of Fire and Rescue on call (retained) emergency response resources, including closing two fire stations (IRMP option for change 2a)** and **10. Redesign of Fire and Rescue full-time (wholetime) emergency response resources (IRMP option for change 2b)** are also required in full. This is because the posts we want to move would be removed as a saving instead under these two proposals.

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

At the moment, full-time firefighters work two days (9am-6pm) then two nights (6pm-9am) followed by four days off. This system requires four shifts known as 'watches' to provide guaranteed fire cover 24/7.

We are proposing to change to 12 hour shift patterns for all full-time firefighters with a suggested start time of 8am and finish at 8pm for day shifts and 8pm-8am for night shifts. We will consult on the proposal with firefighters. A 12 hour shift pattern is used by other emergency services as it is easier to manage and allows people to be moved between places e.g. to cover absence for sickness or training.

We are also proposing to relocate full-time firefighters to other fire stations. This would improve the availability of fire engines in some of our market towns and allow us to do more public safety advice and training in communities. Our emergency response resources would be in better locations for dealing with the rising number of road traffic collisions we are having to deal with. These are the incidents where we rescue the most people.

Thetford station is currently staffed by firefighters during the day between 8am and 5.30pm Monday to Thursday and 8am-4pm on a Friday. It has on call (retained) cover at night. We are proposing to introduce 12 hour day crew shifts at Thetford for seven days a week. Overnight emergency response cover would continue to be provided by on-call (retained) firefighters that live within five minutes of the station. This would mean we could respond more quickly to more calls as we would have more resources when incidents tend to happen.

Our Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) team carry out specialist rescue operations both in Norfolk and nationally. They are based in Dereham which is an on-call (retained) fire station with two fire engines. If there are not enough on-call (retained) firefighters to respond to an emergency then members of the USAR team will make up the numbers. We are proposing that we make this arrangement more formal with USAR crewing the first fire engine at Dereham 12 hours a day seven days a week. This would mean that Dereham would have a full time firefighter service during the day and an on-call (retained) firefighter service at night. The on-call (retained) service would also be used during the day for the second appliance, or if USAR were unavailable.

If our proposal went ahead it would mean that we could get to an increased number of life risk calls more quickly, improving our emergency response standard.

**We will also consult other emergency services and civil protection agencies through the Norfolk Resilience Forum.**

29. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to move full-time firefighters from King's Lynn and Gorleston to Thetford, Dereham and other market towns and introduce a 12 hours shift pattern for all full-time firefighters? Please tick one only (✓)

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

30. Why do you say this? Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

## 9. Redesign Fire and Rescue on-call (retained) emergency response resources, including closing two fire stations (IRMP option for change 2a).

We are proposing to redesign our emergency response resources - both our on-call (retained) service and our full-time firefighter service. This proposal outlines the changes to the on-call (retained) service. Please see our other proposal for details of changes to the full-time service.

Over the next three years we are proposing to save up to £525,255 by reducing the number of on-call (retained) firefighters we employ by 86. We would make this saving by:

- Reducing the number of firefighters at the following on-call (retained) stations down to a minimum level: Great Yarmouth, Hethersett, King's Lynn North, Thetford and Dereham
- Removing the second fire engine and its crew from the following on-call (retained) stations and replacing it with a 4x4 vehicle: Cromer, Diss, Fakenham, Sandringham, Wymondham.

These two proposals combined would save £197,348 and the reduction of 30 on-call (retained) firefighter posts.

- Removing on call (retained) fire engines and crews from Great Yarmouth and North Earham fire stations. This proposal would save £181,444 and the reduction of 32 on-call (retained) firefighter posts

- Closing two on-call fire stations. The proposal is to close Heacham fire station and either West Walton or Outwell. This proposal would save £146,463 and the reduction of 24 on-call (retained) firefighter posts.

If we make these changes we would still be able to make the changes to the way we use full-time firefighters set out in proposal 7. **Reduce the amount we spend on fire and rescue operational support - the services that help firefighters in carrying out their emergency respond duties (IRMP option for change 1b)**

In 2015-16 our revenue budget was £27.7m. If we went ahead with both the on-call (retained) changes and full-time firefighter changes in proposal 10. **Redesign Fire and Rescue full-time (wholetime) emergency response resources (IRMP option for change 2b)** the maximum total we could save is £1.165m over three years. We would save £200,000 in 2016-17, £200,000 in 2017-18 and £765,000 2018-19.

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

In proposing these changes we have examined the profile of our incidents in terms of where they occur in the county, the type of emergency incidents we attend and the demand these incidents place on our fire stations, engines and crews. We have developed our proposals using a nationally agreed framework for making changes to fire and rescue services.

There are 520 retained firefighters in Norfolk. They are employed on the Retained Duty System (RDS) providing on-call cover. They are paid a yearly retainer fee and are then paid on a "pay as you go" basis for each call that they respond to. RDS cover varies from station to station, hour to hour, as these firefighters combine their on-call commitments with their primary employment and personal lives.

We are proposing to reduce the number of on-call firefighters we employ by 86.

In identifying which stations could be closed, we have taken into account how close the next available fire engine is, how busy the station is, and whether the station is able to provide a crew when it needs to do so. We are proposing to do **one** of the following two options:

**EITHER Close Heacham and West Walton and save £146,463:** If they were closed, cover for Heacham would be provided by Hunstanton, approximately 2.5 miles or six minutes travel time away from Heacham. We would pay Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service to provide cover for West Walton from Wisbech station (approximately 4.8 miles or 12 minutes travel time away from Wisbech) and still make a saving.

**OR Close Heacham and Outwell and save £132,741:** Outwell currently does not have enough retained firefighters to safely attend all incident types. This means its availability is low at less than 30%. We have tried to recruit more retained firefighters at this station but it has been difficult to find enough people living within the required five minute travel time of the station that are willing to take on this role. If we close this station then Wisbech and Downham Market would provide cover.

## Impact of proposals to reduce on-call (retained) firefighter numbers

At present retained fire engines are available for 81.4% of the time. This would reduce if this proposal went ahead as there would be a smaller number of on-call firefighters available to crew the fire engine. It would take us slightly longer to respond to some emergency calls, particularly in areas where we close stations. These changes could lead to increased chance of loss of life, property, damage to the environment and economic cost of fire. It could also impact on our ability to respond to emergencies such as flooding and forest fires which place a high demand on our service when they occur. This option is likely to mean that some on-call firefighters would be made redundant.

**We will also consult other emergency services and civil protection agencies through the Norfolk Resilience Forum.**

**You can read more about the options contained in this proposal by visiting the Norfolk Fire and Rescue service website: [www.norfolkfireservice.gov.uk](http://www.norfolkfireservice.gov.uk)**

- 31. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to redesign Fire and Rescue on-call (retained) emergency response resources, including closing two fire stations? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

- 32. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

## **10. Redesign Fire and Rescue full-time (wholetime) emergency response resources (IMRP option for change 2b).**

We are proposing to redesign our emergency response resources - both our on-call (retained) service and our full-time (wholetime) firefighter service. This proposal outlines the changes to the full-time (wholetime) service. Please see our other proposal for details of changes to the on-call (retained) service.

Over the next three years we are proposing to save up to £640,595 by

- **Reducing the number of full-time firefighters we employ by 12 with the option of moving six of these to Thetford.** King's Lynn North and Gorleston currently have full-time crews 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This proposal would reduce that to 12 hours a day, seven days a week. Both stations also have on-call (retained) firefighters who would continue to provide 24 hours a day cover. King's Lynn South station is not affected by this proposal. Moving six firefighters to Thetford would increase fire cover there to 12 hours a day, seven days a week. This proposal would save £315,245 if we reduce the number of full-time firefighters we employ by 12, or £160,250 if we moved six to Thetford and reduced full-time firefighters by six.
- **Changes to our Urban Search and Rescue team.** The choices are to either make more use of our USAR team where they are already based at Dereham to provide emergency response cover 12 hours a day, seven days a week or to move them to North Earlham fire station in Norwich and merge them with the fire crew already there. This proposal would improve fire cover if USAR remain located at Dereham or save £325,350 if they move to North Earlham where full-time firefighter numbers would reduce by 12. This would require a one off £150,000 investment to make this move.

If we implement this proposal then we would reduce full-time firefighter numbers by staff turnover. We would not be able to move full-time firefighters to other roles as contained in our proposal **8. Move full-time firefighters from King's Lynn and Gorleston to Thetford, Dereham and other market towns and introduce a 12 hours shift patten for all full-time firefighters (IRMP option for change 1b).**

In 2015-16 our revenue budget was £27.7m. If we went ahead with both the on-call (retained) changes in proposal **9. Redesign Fire and Rescue on-call (retained) emergency resources, including closing two fire stations (IRMP option for change 2a)** and full-time firefighter changes in this proposal the maximum total we could save is £1.165m over three years. We would save £200,000 in 2016-17, £200,000 in 2017-18 and £765,000 in 2018-19.

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

In proposing these changes we have examined the profile of our incidents in terms of where they occur in the county, the type of emergency incidents we attend and the demand these incidents place on our fire stations, engines and crews. We have developed our proposals using a nationally agreed framework for making changes to fire and rescue services.

King's Lynn North and Gorleston are our least busy full-time stations and the calls they receive are concentrated within a 12 hour period which is when we will still have full-time firefighters there. We have the option to move six firefighters to Thetford to bring it up to the same level of cover. This would mean our emergency response resources would be in better locations for dealing with the rising number of road traffic collisions we are having to deal with. These are the incidents where we rescue the most people.

Thetford station is currently staffed by firefighters during the day between 8am and 5.30pm Monday to Thursday and 8am-4pm on a Friday. It has on call (retained) cover at night. We are proposing to introduce 12 hour day crew shifts at Thetford for seven days a week. Overnight emergency response cover would continue to be provided by on-call (retained) firefighters that live within five minutes of the station. This would mean we could respond more quickly to more calls.

There would be a slower emergency response in King's Lynn North and Gorleston areas between 8pm-8am as we would use on-call firefighters to cover these calls. On-call firefighters take up to five minutes to get to a station and depart, compared to around one minute for full-time firefighters who are located at the station during their shift. If we improve cover at Dereham and Thetford we would get a faster emergency response time in these areas.

## **Changing how we use our Urban Search and Rescue Service**

In Norfolk we have an Urban Search and Rescue team (USAR) carrying out specialist rescue operations, both in Norfolk and nationally. They are funded by a Government grant to provide this national cover but we could also use them for local firefighting when they are not needed nationally. The projected saving depends on the Government continuing to make the grant available. If the grant stops we would not be able to implement this proposal and no savings would be made.

North Earlham is one of the busiest fire stations in Norfolk. The USAR team can be called away to urban search and rescue incidents anywhere in the country and when this happens we would not be able to use the North Earlham full-time fire engine. This would affect around 100-150 calls a year. Other fire engines in Norwich would have to attend these calls. Norwich has more fire engines than other areas of the county so calls can be covered more easily than anywhere else.

If we deliver all the options in this proposal then King's Lynn North, Gorleston, Dereham, Thetford would all have the same 12 hour a day, seven days a week cover with on-call (retained) back up.

We hope to reduce full-time firefighter numbers by staff turnover over three years, rather than needing to make any redundant.

**We will also consult other emergency services and civil protection agencies through the Norfolk Resilience Forum.**

**You can read more about the options contained in this proposal by visiting the Norfolk Fire and Rescue service website: [www.norfolkfireservice.gov.uk](http://www.norfolkfireservice.gov.uk)**

**33. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to redesign of Fire and Rescue full-time (wholetime) emergency response resources? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

**34. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

### **Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service role in responding to flooding emergencies.**

As part of our consultation on our Integrated Risk Management Plan we are interested in your views on what the role of the Fire and Rescue Service should be. Currently a key part of our emergency response is the ability to respond to major incidents, such as transport accidents, wide area flooding, environmental contamination and collapsed buildings.

After the floods of 2007 we received grant funding from Government to help us respond to flooding - this was in addition to a grant allocated by the County Council. This allowed us to set up a specialist water rescue and flooding service. In return for this grant, we were expected to attend incidents outside Norfolk, providing specialist expertise across the country. However, this national funding is coming to an end in 2017.



By law we do not need to provide a specialist water rescue and flooding service so we could end the specialist service. If, however, we want to keep providing a flood response for Norfolk after 2017, we would have to save money from elsewhere in order to fund it.

To help us with our plans for the future we are interested in your views on this.

**35. Do you agree or disagree that it is the role of Norfolk Fire and Rescue to provide a water rescue and flooding service? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

## **Libraries, museums, arts, records and registration services**

The council is examining how we maintain library services while reducing costs. We plan to keep all libraries operating and will invest in new 'open-plus' technology that will maintain opening hours with swipe card entrance to libraries and self-service. This has already been successfully trialled at Acle Library.

While this will maintain overall opening hours, there is a proposed reduction in staffed opening times at the Millennium Library in Norwich. There would also be a reduction in the amount spent on library stock. The mobile library service remains although it is proposed that the extra Saturday service in some areas will stop. The council will review whether other services can be run from library buildings or mobile libraries.

This could include some registration services as the council is proposing to close four part time registration offices at Downham Market, Fakenham, Watton and Swaffham and find alternative local accommodation. Opening hours and archival work at Norfolk Record Office could be reduced to 24 hours a week. There would be less conservation work and new items could only be accepted with an appointment.

There would also be a reduction in the scope of the Museums Service which, over the course of three years, will concentrate its work at three key sites; Norwich Castle, Gressenhall and Time and Tide. The remaining seven museums would work more closely with community groups and schools.

### **11. Reduce grants provided by the Norfolk Arts Service.**

Arts organisations provide cultural activities across Norfolk for residents and visitors. We provide financial investment to arts organisations to run annual programmes of events and activities.

Since 2010, we have reduced the grant funding we award to arts organisations from £271,240 to £85,000. However, we need to make further significant savings over the next three years and **we are proposing to reduce the amount of grant funding we award to arts organisations by a further £10,000 in 2016-17.**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

Norfolk has a vibrant arts scene and a high profile as a leading cultural destination. Across the county, participation and engagement in the arts is high, involving people of all ages and backgrounds as audiences, participants and volunteers.

Arts organisations provide cultural activities across Norfolk for residents and visitors. They help to raise the profile of Norfolk as a leading cultural destination, both to visit and invest in.

Whilst the majority of funding for arts comes from national bodies, fund raising, sponsorship, income they earn, for example from ticket sales, and commercial

activities, we have a grants budget of £85,000 which arts organisations can bid for funding from.

The grant funding we awarded to arts organisations last year was used to support 5,515 events across the county. These events engaged a total audience of 805,660 people. The organisations that we gave grants to worked with a wide range of people, including some vulnerable and/or disadvantaged people.

We are proposing to reduce the grants we award to arts organisations by £10,000 in 2016-17. If we reduce funding for arts grants, this could mean:

- Residents and visitors could have fewer opportunities to participate in arts events
- Children and young people may have fewer opportunities to participate in learning and skills development opportunities
- Some arts organisations may find it difficult to get further funding from national funding bodies (e.g. Arts Council England and Heritage Lottery Fund). This is because less money will be available for match funding. Some key sources of arts funding will only give grants if there is financial support from the local council
- Some larger organisations may not be able to continue their outreach work with other groups, including vulnerable older people.

The Norfolk Arts Service has a total budget of approximately £308,000 per year. Whilst this reduction would further reduce our grants budget, we would continue to support the arts in other ways. For example we will continue to manage and promote the Norfolk Arts Forum, a free cross-sector membership organisation with more than 800 members. We will also continue to develop and manage partnerships with regional and national bodies to promote and support the cultural infrastructure in Norfolk.

**We will write to all local arts organisations that may be affected to understand what impact this proposed reduction might have and consider options for how best to minimise it.**

**We will also consult other organisations including: Norfolk Arts Forum, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership Cultural Board, Arts Council England, Norwich City Council and Norfolk District Councils.**

**36. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce grants provided by the Norfolk Arts Service? Please tick one only (✓)**

- |            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Agree      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**37. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

**38. Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No

Don't know

## **12. Install technology to enable libraries to open with self-service machines, reduce the staffed opening times for the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library and reduce how much we spend on new stock for our libraries.**

Our libraries play an important role in communities, however the significant savings that we need to find over the next three years mean that we have to modernise how the library service is run.

We are proposing to:

- Spend £920,000 on installing technology to enable libraries to be used without any staff being present
- Reduce the staffed opening times for the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library; and
- Reduce the amount we spend on library stock.

**This would save approximately £981,000 (£121,000 in 2016-17 and £860,000 in 2017-18).**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

Over four million people visited our 47 libraries between April 2014 and March 2015. During that time, they borrowed over five million items, they logged on to the public computers over 805,000 times and over 37,000 people joined the library.

We are proposing to install self-service technology to enable people to use libraries at certain times without staff being present in up to 39 of our libraries. We are currently trialling self-service technology at Acle Library. The technology automatically controls and monitors access to the building, the self-service kiosks,

access to the public computers, lighting, alarms and public announcements. It would cost approximately £920,000 to install self-service technology in 39 libraries. However this proposal would save approximately £622,000 per year.

Over a million people visited the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library between April 2014 and March 2015. During that time, they borrowed 757,993 items and 8,562 people joined the library. We are proposing to save £100,000 per year by reducing its staffed opening times. This would mean the staffed opening hours of the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library would be reduced by approximately two hours per day.

We propose to introduce technology to enable the first floor of the library to open for longer than it currently does though, but without staff present.

The Library Service has a budget of £1,353,122 to spend on new books and other stock. We are proposing to reduce how much we spend on new stock by £300,000 per year. If we did this, we would need fewer staff to manage new stock. However there might be a reduction in the income we get from people hiring items, so we anticipate that this proposal would save £259,000 per year.

If our proposals went ahead:

- People would be able to use our libraries at more times that are convenient to them. This should have a positive effect on the number of visits to our libraries, items we issue and the number of people joining the library.
- However reducing how much we spend on new stock might mean that some people will visit the library less often, as we won't have the same range of new books, magazines, newspapers and e-books to borrow. There will also be fewer e-subscriptions for information, business and research. It might also take longer for people to be able to borrow the item that they want. These two factors could result in a reduction in the income we get from people paying to reserve items or to hire chargeable items like audio-books and language courses.
- People would have more opportunity to use the library and the computers for studying, work and job hunting.
- The staffed opening hours at libraries with self-service technology would reduce over time. This would mean there would be fewer hours with staff present to support people who need help.

**39. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to install technology to enable libraries to open with self-service machines, reduce the staffed opening times for the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library and reduce how much we spend on new stock for our libraries? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

40. **Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

41. **Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No

Don't know

**13. Reduce the public mobile library fleet from nine to eight vehicles, reduce the frequency of some visits, stop the Saturday routes and change how we deliver books to residents of care homes.**

We are committed to helping all Norfolk residents to be able to use the library service. Our mobile library service is one way we do this. We run nine public mobile libraries which call at over 2,000 stops in 500 places across Norfolk. We also have a mobile library van which mainly supports older people by visiting places like nursing homes, residential homes, housing with care schemes and hospitals.

We need to make significant savings which means we need to look again at how the mobile library service operates and how we can make the best use of our resources. Our mobile libraries will continue to stop at all the places they currently do, however we are proposing to:

- Reduce the number of mobile libraries from nine to eight
- Decrease how often the mobile libraries visit some communities
- Stop the two Saturday routes which visit Bowthorpe, Queens Hills, Spixworth and Horsford
- Stop running the mobile library which visits care homes; and
- Allow care homes to pay for the service for their residents or use volunteers to provide books for individuals living in care homes.

**This would save approximately £20,000 per year from 2016-17 and an additional £88,000 per year from 2017-18.**

## **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

As part of the library service, we have nine mobile library vehicles which call at over 2,000 stops in 500 places across Norfolk. The majority of people who use mobile libraries are older people in rural areas. In 2014-15 there were 90,174 visitors to mobile libraries and 437,671 items were borrowed.

A survey of 1,572 mobile library customers carried out in 2013 showed high levels of satisfaction with the service. In addition to borrowing books and materials, people use the mobile library to find information and as a place to meet friends.

We are proposing to reduce the number of public mobile library vans from nine to eight. This would impact on how often the mobile library service would be able to visit some communities. We know that we can change the routes that the mobile libraries take to make them more efficient. This would limit how much we would need to reduce how often mobile libraries visit communities.

We would use the data we have about the service to work out which stops to alter. We anticipate the changes to the public mobile library routes to be relatively small, with some routes only changing the time or day the service calls. For a few people that currently have a weekly service, that would change to two weekly visits. Our mobile libraries will continue to stop at all the places they currently do. We would make the change from weekly to two weekly visits in April if the proposal is approved. The other changes would be in place by September 2016.

We currently have two Saturday routes that visit Bowthorpe, Queens Hills, Spixworth and Horsford. They are not as well used as the weekday routes and are more costly to run in comparison to weekday services. We are proposing to stop running these routes.

The budget for the mobile library service is approximately £500,000 per year. This proposal would save approximately £10,000 in 2016-17 and a further £44,000 in 2017-18. A total saving of £54,000 per year from 2017-18.

### **Supporting older people to use the library service**

We have one special mobile library van that supports mainly older people by visiting places like nursing homes, residential homes, housing with care schemes and hospitals. They regularly drop off a selection of books and they also deliver requests for particular books and other materials, like CDs, made by individuals living in care homes. The mobile library van also stops at some sheltered housing complexes where people can get onto the van to browse the collection and use the service.

The mobile library van supports older people across the county. It is based in Norwich and consequently spends a lot of time on the road. This does not make it particularly cost effective, because so much time is spent driving rather than delivering a service to people. Over the past three years, use of this special mobile library service for older people has declined by 20%. Our experience of deposit collections in homes is that they aren't well used in the majority of locations - drivers

can tell this by the fact that the books are very often in the same condition, location and order when they are exchanged.

We are proposing to stop running the service as it is from April 2016. Care homes would be able to pay for the service for their residents, so that they can continue to offer a small library in the care home alongside the other services that they provide for their residents. This would mean that we are only delivering a service to those care homes that really want and would use it.

We propose to use volunteers to provide books and other materials for individuals living in care homes that do not want to pay for the service. Volunteers would deliver books and other materials requested by individuals, rather than dropping off a whole selection for anyone at a care home to read.

Our experience is that when customers in residential care are visited by a volunteer, their enjoyment of reading increases as the volunteer develops a relationship with the customer and can tailor the books he or she brings to their individual tastes. We propose that we work alongside Royal Voluntary Service volunteers that deliver our Home Library Service to improve the library service for individuals in residential care settings.

The service to people living in sheltered accommodation would be picked up by the public mobile service.

The budget for the special mobile library van is approximately £54,000 per year. This proposal would save approximately £10,000 per year from 2016-17 and a further £44,000 per year from 2017-18.

**42. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the public mobile library fleet from nine to eight vehicles, reduce the frequency of some visits, stop the Saturday routes and change how we deliver books to residents of care homes?** Please tick one only (✓)

- |            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Agree      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**43. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.



**44. Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No

Don't know

## **14. Reduce the opening hours, staffing and work of the Norfolk Record Office.**

The Norfolk Record Office collects and preserves unique archives relating to the history of Norfolk and makes them accessible to people in the county and across the world. Our team conserve documents, run education programmes, provide research advice and act as a first point of contact for people who are new to using the archives.

We are committed to making sure that Norfolk's history is accessible to the public. However we need to make significant savings and so we have to think again about what we can do. As a result we are proposing to:

- Reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office to approximately 24 hours per week
- Only accept new items for the archives on two days a week by appointment
- Stage exhibitions when they are funded externally
- Stop purchasing documents to add to our collection
- Reduce the amount of conservation work we do; and
- Stop the archive specialists working at the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library.

**This would save approximately £148,000 (£86,000 in 2016-17, £20,000 in 2017-18 and £42,000 in 2018-19).**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

The Norfolk Record Office collects and preserves archives relating to the history of Norfolk and makes them available for people to see or use. The Record Office has a search room to consult original documents and microform copies, as well as an exhibition gallery. The team offers a research service, as well as an education and outreach service.

The Norfolk Record Office is currently open 41.5 hours per week, between Monday and Friday. We are proposing to reduce the opening hours of the Norfolk Record Office to approximately 24 hours per week.

The Record Office holds over 12 million documents relating to Norfolk. In future, we do not plan to add further to this collection by purchasing additional records, for example at auctions.

We will still continue to expand the collection by accepting items that are donated to us by local authorities, government bodies, people and organisations. At the moment they can do this five days per week. Our proposal is to move to two days a week when we can receive such items, and ask people to make an appointment.

We have three conservators who are responsible for the preservation of over 12 million documents. They conserve documents, which otherwise would not be accessible to the public, as well as help to manage the preservation of the collection. We are proposing to reduce the amount of conservation work we do.

We employ two archive specialists who are based in the Norfolk Heritage Centre at the Norfolk and Norwich Millennium Library. They run archive education and outreach programmes, provide research advice, answer queries and act as a first point of contact for people who are new to using the archives. In total, they work 51.48 hours per week. We are proposing to delete these posts.

Some support would continue to be available from library staff, and for anyone needing more specialist advice, they would need to contact the Record Office. We would not be able to hold our regular talks or outreach sessions at the Millennium Library.

The Norfolk Record Office has a gross budget of approximately £1,060,000 per year. This proposal would save approximately £148,000 per year by 2018-19.

**45. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to reduce the opening hours, staffing and work of the Norfolk Record Office?** Please tick one only (✓)

- |            |                          |
|------------|--------------------------|
| Agree      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**46. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

**47. Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**15. Close four part-time registration offices at Downham Market, Fakenham, Watton and Swaffham and look for ways to provide services in other public buildings at no cost.**

By law we have to provide a face-to-face registration service for births, deaths and marriages. We currently do this through 11 offices across the county, some of which provide venues for weddings.

We have looked long and hard at how we can make savings to our current budget for this service and are proposing to close four part-time registration offices from April 2016 that are least used and offer the least value for money. These are Downham Market, Fakenham, Swaffham and Watton.

However, we would try to find other places in those towns where we could share accommodation at no cost, and still offer a registration service for local people.

An alternative for people would be to use any of our seven remaining offices, but clearly they would need to travel for this. The closest offices to those we propose to close are Dereham and King's Lynn.

**This proposal would save £25,000 a year from 2016-17.**

**More information about this proposal to help you decide**

We are required by law to provide face-to-face registration services to register births, deaths and marriages. There are currently 11 offices across the county that provide this service, some of which offer venues for weddings.

We have looked at the number of people who use our 11 registration offices for registrations of births, deaths and marriages, and as wedding venues, and how much each office costs to run. Based on this information about use and which offices are providing good value for money, we are proposing to close the four that rank overall as the least efficient.

If our proposal went ahead:

- We would seek to honour all existing bookings for these venues, although people would not be able to book the ceremony rooms at the Fakenham and Downham Market offices from April 2016
- The proposal would not result in fewer staff and we would move staff from the four offices we are proposing to close to our other offices where they are most needed

- We would increase opening hours at our other offices which are in Dereham, Diss, Great Yarmouth, King's Lynn, North Walsham, Norwich and Thetford
- We think that waiting times will be reduced at our busier offices
- We would look at increasing the time registration staff spend at Norfolk's three main hospitals where we think they are most needed
- We would try and find other places in public buildings that we could use to deliver our registration service without having to pay for accommodation costs
- North Norfolk District Council and Downham Market Town Council would not receive the service charge / rent that we currently pay them.

At the time of writing this proposal the registration service has been pursuing a number of no-cost accommodation options for delivery of a registration service at the four locations where we are proposing to close offices.

Find below more information about the opening times of the offices we propose to close and the amount of money we would save.

### **Downham Market**

Opening hours 9.30am-12.30pm Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday and 9.30am-3.30pm Wednesday

We currently rent this office from Downham Market Town Council

Annual saving £10,000

### **Fakenham**

Opening hours 9.30am-12.30pm Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and 9.30am-3.30pm Thursday

We pay a service charge on this building to North Norfolk District Council

Annual saving £13,500

### **Swaffham**

Opening hours 9.30am -12.30pm Tuesday only

Annual saving £500

### **Watton**

Opening hours 10am-1pm Monday and Friday

Annual saving £1000

We will monitor the registration service and will carry out a further review to assess which sites are running efficiently and offering value for money before 2018-19.

**We will consult with town and parish councils in the locations, with funeral directors and HM Coroner.**

- 48. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to close four part-time registration offices at Downham Market, Fakenham, Watton and Swaffham and look for ways to provide services in other public buildings at no cost? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

- 49. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

### **Our ideas for saving money from 2017-19.**

One idea we've had for saving money between 2017-19 is to change how the Norfolk Museums Services operates, by creating three main museums (at Norwich Castle, Gressenhall and Time and Tide) and reclassifying the other seven museums as community sites. These community sites would have regular opening hours, but offer a more basic service.

We are at an early stage of thinking about this idea and have not yet decided how we will take it forward. We need to understand which services our museum visitors value most and would like our community sites to offer. When we have developed this idea further, we will formerly consult Norfolk residents. However, we are interested to hear any views you may have about our idea now to help us develop our plans.

- 50. If there is anything you want to tell us now to help us develop this idea, please write in below:**

## **Roads, transport, waste, environment and planning**

The big changes in roads and other environmental services will take two years to gather momentum. For the coming financial year we propose to revise non-safety critical based road maintenance and gritting fewer minor roads. The historic environment service would run only its statutory services from April 2016 onwards.

However in future years the organisation of these services will see major changes. Many staff may move out of County Hall and be located closer to the communities they support. We expect to be working far more closely with other councils and parts of the public sector, avoiding duplication of services and saving back office costs.

### **16. Change our Historic Environment Service so that we only do what we have to by law.**

Under the National Planning Policy Framework and other legislation we have to make sure that planning applications take account of the historic environment, which includes both historic buildings and archaeology. The Historic Environment Service (HES) provides information and expert advice to all of Norfolk's local planning authorities (District Councils as well as the County Council). For example, if a new road scheme or development is being planned HES would determine what archaeological or other heritage work was required and would manage the process on behalf of Norfolk County Council.

In addition to this service HES also currently provides other services which include:

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

Under this proposal we would stop providing these additional services in order to focus only on the planning service which we have to provide by law.

**This proposal would save us approximately £172,000 on staffing costs in 2016-17 through reducing staffing by 5.5FTE**

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

Under this proposal the Historic Environment Service (HES) would stop providing some services in order to focus only on the planning service which we have to provide by law.

This would mean that the service would no longer offer advice and record findings associated with historic buildings. It would also no longer be able to support projects on historic buildings through report writing, examples of which include Gressenhall Museum's 'Voices from the workhouse' project and churches applying to Historic England for grant aid repairs.

The team currently organises heritage events and open days as well as working with communities to deliver heritage projects, such as archaeological surveys (in 2014-15 the team helped support 147 events which involved 5,800 people). The team also advise local communities who are putting together funding bids, for example, to the Heritage Lottery Fund and then help them to deliver the project.

If the proposal went ahead it would mean that if someone or an organisation (including Norfolk County Council) needed this type of support they would have to go to another organisation such as a district council, a national body like Historic England or a local organisation such as the Norfolk Historic Buildings group, which could incur additional cost.

We currently fund an Identification and Recording Service (I&RS) for archaeological finds. This is run in partnership with the national Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) which is funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. The service records around 15,000 objects a year and handles well over 100 cases of Treasure.

If the proposal went ahead we would stop funding this service and reduce the support given by the council directly to the PAS.

This would mean that although the PAS would continue it would be at a reduced level of service (estimated that this would mean a shift from 15,000 objects to 1,500 objects recorded). Based upon the reduced service level the Department for Culture, Media and Sport may reduce funding given to the council which is currently used to fund three posts. If this happened we would seek to mitigate the impact by increasing our use of volunteers and by encouraging more self-recording.

We also provide a service to the Coroner through providing information which helps them to determine through an informed inquest whether a find is Treasure or not. At the moment there are more than 100 cases of Treasure in Norfolk each year. We will be discussing with the Coroner how we move forward.

If the proposal went ahead the Historic Environment Service would no longer provide this information.

**We will consult users of the finds identification and recording service through all the local metal-detecting clubs and societies, and the Portable Antiquities Scheme.**

**We will also consult the Coroner, Historic England, local planning authorities, local heritage and archaeological organisations, museums, trusts, groups and communities who use our services.**

**51. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to change our Historic Environment Service so that we only provide statutory services?** Please tick one only (✓)

- Agree
- Disagree
- Don't know

**52. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

**53. Do you currently use this service?** Please tick one only (✓)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

## **17. Spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk.**

We currently monitor traffic flow and traffic hotspots and use the information this provides to help us decide how a road should be designed/adapted. This is usually triggered by a particular concern such as speeding or congestion often raised by a parish council or business. For example when Norwich city centre traffic suffered serious delays at Christmas time because of extra traffic, we paid for traffic marshalls to help monitor and maintain traffic flow at peak times.

We are proposing to:

- Focus the work of the team on projects where we receive funding for analysing traffic (this would mean we would no longer be able to support parish councils or businesses with traffic counts or speed measurements for free)
- Stop providing traffic marshalls in Norwich city centre.

**This proposal would save us approximately £40,000 in 2016-17.**



## More information about this proposal to help you decide

If the proposal were to go ahead we would continue to monitor road casualties and carry out strategic traffic monitoring to identify safety and congestion issues across the network.

We would also continue to carry out additional work but only where this was paid for from external funding or from our capital budget. This would mean we would no longer be able to support parish councils or businesses with traffic counts or speed measurements for free and we would stop providing traffic marshalls in Norwich city centre.

We would still provide support and advice to parish councils and businesses about traffic problems but as mentioned above, if a traffic count or speed measurement was needed in order to justify changes to roads it would be unlikely that we could do this unless we received funding. This means we might not be able to reassure local communities or businesses that are concerned about congestion or speeding.

If the proposal went ahead we would stop providing traffic marshalls in Norwich city centre at peak times like Christmas. We have already implemented a variety of city centre traffic management measures e.g. the closure of St Stephen's street to general traffic, with enforcement cameras to support the changes, which should mean that we no longer need to provide traffic marshalls and therefore people should not be affected by this change.

There would be potential for traffic marshalls to continue if local businesses were willing to fund them.

**54. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to spend less money measuring and analysing the traffic in Norfolk?** Please tick one only (✓)

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

**55. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

## **18. Use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance.**

Our revenue budget is the money we use to pay for the day-to-day running of our services, including the majority of highways maintenance.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) allows us to pay for some highways maintenance from the capital budget which is money we have for one-off projects, such as building roads or improving our services. This is because some highways projects, like replacing non-illuminated signs, patching potholes and maintaining bridges are seen not just as maintaining but improving our road network.

We are proposing to switch the use of £3m from our capital budget to highways maintenance activities so that we can save that money from our revenue budget.

If our proposal went ahead it would mean that:

- We could maintain the road network that we currently have and continue to respond to day-to-day maintenance problems that arise, like potholes
- We would have less money to build new things (highway schemes) such as roads and crossings. This would reduce the number of minor improvements and major structural schemes, such as re-surfacing roads.
- We would do fewer improvements, such as new footpaths and road crossings that often come from local community requests
- Overall, we would be investing less in the highways network.

**This proposal would save us approximately £3m in 2016-17.**

Please note: You may find it useful to think about this alongside our proposal **19. Spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting** as they are closely linked.

### **More information about this proposal to help you decide**

If the proposal went ahead, the long term effect would be that we would have less money to maintain and improve the highway network. This is because when we spend money from our capital budget it doesn't get replaced as it comes mainly from Government.

The condition of the highway network has been deteriorating since 2007 as we have had less money to spend. If we used some of our capital budget to pay for day-to-day highways maintenance we would need to find more capital investment to pay for major schemes in the future. Therefore this proposal helps us now but does not solve the long-term funding issue.

It is also possible that if our proposal went ahead, the costs of our day-to-day highways maintenance could go up because we might have to patch some roads and fill potholes, whereas before we might have been able to use our capital budget to pay for the roads to be completely resurfaced.

**56. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to pay for some highways maintenance from our capital budget to make a one-off saving? Please tick one only (✓)**

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

**57. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

## **19. Spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting.**

We are proposing to spend less on maintaining roads and verges, (known as the 'highway') and bridges. The proposal, if agreed, would mean reviewing the activities that make up this work to determine where we can safely deliver a lower level of service. This would include doing things like:

- Doing less grass cutting, weed spraying and work on verges, hedges and trees (in 2015-16 we spent £2.68m on this)
- Doing less work on road drainage (in 2015-16 we spent £1.39m on this)
- Replacing road markings less often (in 2015-16 we spent £0.52m on this)
- Reducing non-essential bridge maintenance (in 2015-16 we spent £0.80m on this)
- Reducing the winter service, including gritting fewer minor roads and no longer filling grit bins provided by town and parish councils (in 2015-16 we spent £3.42m on this).

Some of these changes would take time to implement and may require further consultation so we estimate this **proposal would save £245k in 2016-17 and a further £735k in 2017-18.**

Please note: You may find it useful to think about this alongside our proposal **18. Use our capital budget to pay for some highways maintenance** as they are closely linked.

## More information about this proposal to help you decide

By law we have to maintain the highway, making it safe for users both of the road and pathways. To meet our legal duty we carry out a wide range of activities including pothole and path repairs, road patching, drain cleaning, grass cutting, weed control, sign cleaning, winter gritting, bridge and culvert repairs and emergency response to incidents on Norfolk's roads. We prioritise this work by the strategic importance of the road and how severe the problem is.

In realising this proposal there are a number of activities where we could look to deliver a lower level of service. Some examples have been included below. As part of your response it would be useful to know which activities you think we should do more or less of.

### Examples

1. To meet our duty to keep roads safe in winter we currently grit around a third of the highways network in accordance with our policy which sets out which types of road are a priority for gritting. If the proposal went ahead we could grit fewer minor roads.

We would achieve this by carrying out an in-depth assessment of the road network in Norfolk against our policy in order to re-prioritise which roads should still be gritted. The changes would not be implemented until gritting routes were re designed ready for the winter gritting season starting in October 2016. This would also mean that any requests received from communities to add roads to our gritting list would be unlikely to be included in the future. The proposal could result in people having to change their journeys to use alternative routes along treated roads.

2. We currently fill grit bins that have been provided by town and parish councils but do not charge them for this service. In the past we have been happy to do this as we can see that it benefits communities, although we don't have to do this by law.

If the proposal went ahead then we could stop doing this and ask communities to provide their own salt (potentially this could be purchased from our salt supplier through our Highway Depots).

3. Our current grass cutting standard says that verges should be cut five times a year in urban areas and weeds should be sprayed twice a year. In some areas we pay district, town or parish councils to cut grass verges for us and councils who want their verges cut more often can carry out extra grass cutting themselves at their own cost. (EDT Committee at its November meeting are due to consider changing the standards for cutting verges in rural areas. For this reason the rural grass cutting service is not being considered as part of this proposal.)

If the proposal went ahead we could change our standards to cut grass less often and do fewer weed sprays. However, other councils (districts, town or parish) could

choose to continue the activity in some other way or communities could decide to cut them themselves at their own cost.

4. The proposal could also mean reducing other standards such as replacing road markings less often, only doing essential maintenance of bridges and less clearing of culverts, drains and pipes.

If the proposal went ahead we could change our standards to carry out these activities less often. In general this would mean that over time people may notice that we are taking less care of our roads.

The proposal, if agreed, would mean reviewing the activities that are identified to determine where we can safely deliver a lower level of service.

- 58. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to spend less on maintaining roads, maintaining bridges and gritting?** Please tick one only (✓)

Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 59. Why do you say this?** Please briefly write in below, including how the proposal might affect you.

## Other savings planned for 2016-17

We are planning to make savings through redesigning how we work and getting better value from our contracts to ensure we are as efficient as possible. In addition to the proposals we are consulting on we plan to:

- Redesign the way we work on activities associated with highways and transport as well as how some activities are funded – this will save us approximately £332k
- Getting the benefit from savings to existing contracts associated with Norwich Park and Ride bus service and site management at Norwich bus station and contracts associated with Waste management – this will save us £2,350k
- Remove posts in our Business Support team that are no longer needed – this will save us £133k.

## **Our ideas for saving money from 2017-19**

Our ideas for 2017-19 are to:

- Work differently to support economic development projects by increasing the use of existing expertise to help identify alternative sources of funding rather than directly funding them ourselves
- Increase external funding for environment services and expanding the existing volunteer base
- Move to a locality way of working, combining some teams and functions to reduce duplication and reduce staff numbers
- Review how much we spend on transport, services, supplies and contracts.

A separate piece of work is being carried out to look at how we can improve Waste management and Recycling in Norfolk. A separate consultation will be carried out in 2016 to establish our overall Waste Management Strategy.

**We are at an early stage of thinking about these ideas and have not yet decided how we will take these forward. When we have developed our ideas further, if they involve changes to services we will consult with people who may be affected by them. However, we are interested to hear any views you may have about our ideas now to help us develop our plans.**

- 60. If there is anything you want to tell us now to help us develop this idea, please write in below:**

## About you

### Personal information, confidentiality and data protection

We will process any personal information we receive from you in line with the Data Protection Act 1998. This means that Norfolk County Council will hold your personal data and only use it for the purpose for which it was collected, being this consultation. We use this information to see how representative the feedback is of Norfolk's population. We also use it to see if any particular groups of people are especially affected by our proposals. Under our record management policy we will keep this information for five years.

We will also, under normal circumstances, not pass your personal data on to anyone else. However, we may be asked under access to information laws to publish or disclose some, or all, of the information you provide in response to this consultation, including any personal information. We will only do this where such disclosure will comply with such relevant information laws which include the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

**61. How are you responding?** Please tick one only (✓)

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| As a member of the public                    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| On behalf of a voluntary or community group  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| On behalf of a statutory organisation        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| On behalf of a business                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| On behalf of a school, college or university | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| As a Norfolk county councillor               | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| As a district or borough councillor          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| As a town or parish councillor               | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**62. If you are responding on behalf of a group, organisation or business, what is the name of the organisation you represent?** Please write in here:

**63. Are you?** Please tick one only (✓)

Male

Female

**64. How old are you?** Please tick one only (✓)

0 - 15

16 - 29

30 - 44

45 - 64

65 - 84

85 +

**65. Do you have any long-term illness, disability or health problem that limits your daily activities or the work you can do?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No

**66. Are you an informal (unpaid) carer for someone who has a long-term illness or health problem?** Please tick one only (✓)

Yes

No



**67. How would you describe your ethnic background?** Please tick one only (✓)

White British

White Irish

White other

Mixed

Asian or Asian British

Black or Black British

Chinese

Other ethnic background - please describe below

**68. What is the first part of your postcode? (e.g. NR4)** Please write in here:

## How our proposals will affect people in practice

Our budget proposals for 2016-19 will have implications for how we deliver services in the future. As such it is important for us to make sure we understand what this means for people in practice. The process we use to work this out is called an equality and rural 'impact assessment'.

We have put in place a comprehensive assessment process to help us make an informed decision. This means that we will be carrying out:

- A high-level assessment of all the proposals, to identify whether they will particularly impact on people with protected characteristics in Norfolk, such as disabled or older people, or people in rural areas, and if so, what the implications are; and
- A more detailed assessment of the impact of each individual proposal, which looks at a wide range of evidence and takes into account the views of residents and service users, as well as community, voluntary organisations and stakeholders.

We will produce a final impact assessment report that summarises the findings of equality and rural assessments and sets out any potential equality or rural issues for county councillors to consider before they make a final decision. This will include any steps that could be taken to remove or lessen the impact of the proposals. Councillors will consider this report at the relevant service committees in January and Full Council on 22 February 2016.

## How we will make our decision and report back to you

Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read and respond to our consultation. We have now received your response.

We are sorry but, given the scale of the responses anticipated and our timescale, we are unable to respond to individual questions or comments. However, we assure you that we will use your views and the information you provide to help inform any decisions that we take.

Our county councillors will consider the consultation responses we receive very carefully. In particular, they will take into account:

- The impact of any proposal on individuals, groups or communities and in particular on people identified as having 'protected characteristics' under the Equality Act 2010. The protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation. As well as this equality impact assessment, councillors will consider the impact of proposals on rural areas
- The views of people and stakeholders consulted
- The evidence of need and what is proven to work effectively and well
- The financial and legal positions and any constraints at the time
- Any potential alternative options, models or ideas for making the savings.

In January 2016 each service committee will discuss the consultation findings as well as the impact assessments. Our Policy and Resources Committee will look at all the proposals as a whole and then recommend a budget for the whole council.

Full Council will meet on 22 February 2016 to debate the proposed budget and then vote on and agree the final budget for the 2016-17 financial year. The final budget will be published on our website ([www.norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk)) shortly after this meeting.

**Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read this document and respond.**



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact us on: 0344 800 8020  
Email: [haveyoursay@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:haveyoursay@norfolk.gov.uk) and we will do our best to help

**October 2015**