

Cabinet

14 January 2015



Medium Term Financial Plan 2015/16 to 2017/18 (MTFP5) and 2015/16 Budget

Key Decision CORP/R/14/02

Report of Corporate Management Team
Don McLure, Corporate Director Resources
Lorraine O'Donnell, Assistant Chief Executive
Councillor Alan Napier, Cabinet Portfolio Holder Finance
Councillor Simon Henig, Leader of the Council

Purpose of the Report

- 1 To provide Cabinet with an update on the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP(5)) 2015/16 to 2017/18 and the 2015/16 Budget following the Government's Local Government Finance Settlement announcement on 18 December 2014 and feedback from the budget consultation process.

Executive Summary

- 2 The financial outlook for the Council continues to be extremely challenging. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's December 2014 Autumn Statement confirmed that funding cuts to the public sector will continue until 2019/20. It is now forecast that Government funding to Local Government will have reduced by over 60% between 2011 and 2019.
- 3 The Autumn Statement confirmed that due to the deterioration in the forecast for the national deficit, additional public expenditure funding cuts would be required in 2016/17. To reflect this, the Council has increased the forecast of Government funding reductions in 2016/17 from £33m to £38m.
- 4 Overall the forecast for total savings between 2011 and 2018 up to the end of the MTFP(5) period is £224.8m. Based upon analysis of public expenditure funding reductions in the Autumn Statement however it is forecast that the savings figure will exceed £250m by 2018/2019.
- 5 The provisional financial settlement was received on 18 December 2014 and details are included within this report. The main points are:
 - (i) Revenue Support Grant will reduce by £39.4m to £99.3m. This is in line with Council forecasts.
 - (ii) Specific grant allocations are broadly in line with Council forecasts.
 - (iii) It is still apparent that deprived areas will continue to see higher levels of funding reduction in 2015/16.

- (iv) Although the Government's Spending Power figures are unrepresentative of actual funding reductions faced by local authorities, they do highlight the regional variation in settlements. The published average spending power reduction for England is 1.8%, for Durham it is 2.7%.

Background

- 6 The MTFP(5) update report to Cabinet on 17 December 2014 identified the Council faced £225.4m of savings across the period 2011 to 2018. Although the Council would have delivered £136.9m of savings by the end of 2014/15, there was still £88.5m of savings required to balance MTFP(5).
- 7 It was reported that an additional report would be brought to Cabinet on 14 January 2015 which would provide details of the provisional settlement and provide an analysis of the MTFP(5) consultation process.
- 8 The draft Council Plan and Service Plans for 2015/16 – 2017/18 continue to be developed within the context of the financial settlement and budget planning, and will be presented to Cabinet in March once the budget has been set.

Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement

- 9 The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement was published on 18 December 2014. The final settlement will be confirmed in late January/ early February 2015. The settlement is for 2015/16 only. It is hoped that in the future local authorities will receive multi-year financial settlements to aid effective financial management.
- 10 The Council Tax Referendum Limit is confirmed at 2%. The Government has also confirmed that a 1% Council Tax Freeze Grant will be paid to any authority which freezes Council Tax in 2015/16.
- 11 The settlement includes details of core grants e.g. Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and Business Rates 'Top Up' Grant. In addition confirmation was received in relation to specific grants. The table below highlights the reduction in the Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA). It is important to note that the Business Rates figure below is a 'notional' figure published by the Government.

Funding Stream	2014/15	2015/16	Variance	
	£m	£m	£m	%
Revenue Support Grant	138.710	99.274	(39.346)	(28.4)
Business Rates	54.045	55.050	1.005	1.9
Top Up Grant	59.357	60.491	1.134	1.9
SFA	252.112	214.815	(37.297)	(14.8)

- 12 The table above highlights that the SFA has reduced by 14.8% in 2015/16. In addition to the above 'core' grants the Council continues to face reductions in other Specific Grants as detailed overleaf.

Specific Grant	2014/15	2015/16	Variance	
	£m	£m	£m	%
Education Services Grant	7.523	6.002	(1.521)	(20)
Housing Benefit Admin Grant	4.091	3.765	(0.326)	(8)
Extended Free Rights to Transport	1.086	0.999	(0.087)	(8)
Local Welfare Assistance	1.900	-	(1.900)	(100)

- 13 In relation to the withdrawal of Local Welfare Provision Grant (£1.9m), the Government have notionally identified a sum of £1.4m in the Council's RSG for Local Welfare Provision but have not transferred additional funding into RSG in this regard.
- 14 It is disappointing to note that the 2015/16 Public Health Grant has been announced unchanged at £45.780m. At a time when health budgets are being protected and receiving above inflation increases it is disappointing that the Public Health budget has not increased in 2015/16.
- 15 The Council has been forecasting the outcome of the settlement and the table below identifies where the settlement in relation to core grants varies from the forecast.

Grant/Income	2015/16 Settlement	2015/16 Forecast	Difference
	£m	£m	£m
Revenue Support Grant	99.274	98.665	0.609
Town and Parish RSG Adjustments	0.270	0.285	(0.015)
Business Rate RPI Increase	1.005	1.203	(0.198)
Top-Up Grant RPI Increase	1.134	1.365	(0.231)
Section 31 Grant Increase	0.509	0.080	0.429
New Homes Bonus (NHB) Increase	1.538	1.500	0.038
NHB Re-imburement	0.377	0.390	(0.013)
Total Variance	103.822	103.203	0.619

- 16 The main issues to note in relation to the table above are as follows:-
- (i) The Government had originally top-sliced £300m from RSG to finance the additional 2015/16 New Homes Bonus. Nationally only an additional £250m has been allocated. The Government has re-instated the £50m difference to RSG resulting in a £0.609m increase in RSG for the Council.
 - (ii) The Government has capped the increase in business rates for 2015/16 at 2%. The forecast was 2.3%. This reduction of £0.429m in Business Rate income and Top Up Grant will be reimbursed via an increase in Section 31 Grant.
 - (iii) The additional New Homes Bonus allocation for 2015/16 of £1.538m is in line with the Council forecast.
- 17 The table above highlights that although overall Government funding has reduced by circa £40m, the settlement is £0.619m better than forecast.

Impact upon 2015/16 Budget

- 18 The variance detailed in the above table of £0.619m has been utilised in the 2015/16 Budget at this stage by reducing the call on the contingency budget. A revised MTFP(5) model is attached at Appendix 2.
- 19 Based upon the above the savings target for 2015/16 remains unchanged at £16.283m.

Spending Power

- 20 The Government has published data on the national Spending Power variations. Spending Power includes certain Government grants, Council Tax income and health funding. The national average Spending Power reduction in 2015/16 has been published as 1.8%. This calculation is not representative of the actual challenge faced by local authorities for the following reasons:
- (i) The totality of the Better Care Fund revenue allocation of £39.193m is included in 2015/16 for the first time. The majority of this funding however, is either already being expended by the Council or will be expended within the national health sector. Showing the figures in this way is skewing the data and is masking the actual level of government funding reductions faced by local authorities.
 - (ii) Certain grants are excluded from the Spending Power calculation e.g. the Education Services Grant. In 2015/16, the council has lost £1.521m of Education Services Grant funding but this is not included in the Spending Power calculation.
- 21 Although the actual level of funding reduction is not fairly represented in the Spending Power figures, the government's analysis does reflect the regional variations in the funding settlement. Detailed below are a number of examples of 2015/16 Spending Power variations.

Area	Spending Power Variation
England	-1.8%
Durham	-2.7%
Newcastle	-4.9%
Middlesbrough	-5.6%
North Yorkshire	+1.1%
Wokingham	+2.6%
Surrey County	+3.1%

- 22 The Government has also published details of Spending Power 'per dwelling' for all local authorities. Areas of deprivation like Durham naturally require higher funding levels than affluent areas for a range of reasons including the following:
- (i) In affluent areas, more service users, especially in adult care can afford to contribute to the cost of services. This is especially the case for residential care and home care services for the elderly. In these circumstances the budget required in affluent areas is lower than in deprived areas.

- (ii) Demand for services in deprived areas such as Children’s Social Care is significantly higher than in affluent areas and therefore deprived areas need higher budgets.

23 The logic therefore that local authorities which have higher Spending Power or are more reliant upon Government grant should face higher funding reductions should continue to be challenged.

24 The Spending Power per dwelling data does however highlight that the funding for an area such as Durham is now lower than the national average and lower than affluent areas such as Surrey and Reading. The table below highlights the 2015/16 Spending Power per dwelling for a range of local authorities.

Area	Spending Power Per Dwelling
	£
England	2,083
Durham	2,049
Bristol	2,128
Reading	2,070
Wokingham	1,931
Surrey County	1,863
Surrey County and Districts	2,184

25 It is significant that if the pace of funding reduction continues as forecast, then the Spending Power of Surrey County Council excluding the Surrey Districts will exceed that of Durham by 2017/18 notwithstanding that the Spending Power for Durham is already below that of Surrey County consolidated with the Surrey District Councils. We will continue to challenge how a deprived area such as Durham should have a lower Spending Power per dwelling than an affluent area such as Surrey.

MTFP(5) – 2015/16 to 2017/18 Update

26 The MTFP(5) strategy report to Cabinet on 17 December 2014 provided an update on the savings required to balance MTFP(5). The forecast savings for 2016/17 and 2017/18 at that time were as follows:

Year	Savings Requirement
	£m
2016/17	32.389
2017/18	39.829
TOTAL	72.218

27 At that point for planning purposes the Council was forecasting Government funding reductions of circa £33m for both 2016/17 and 2017/18. The Chancellor of the Exchequer’s Autumn Statement published on 3 December 2014 provided an update on the likely level of public sector funding reductions up to 2019/20. The Autumn Statement detailed that:

- (i) The national deficit at the end of 2014/15 will still be £91bn;
- (ii) Even greater reductions would be required in public expenditure than previously forecast;

- (iii) Funding reductions would continue until 2019/20 enabling a national budget surplus of £23bn to be generated in 2019/20 which could be utilised to repay national debt;
- (iv) The Government intention is still to save £12bn from welfare spend.

28 The table below highlights the impact of the deterioration in public sector expenditure forecasts over the last two years upon the 2016/17 and 2017/18 national budget, based upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget and Autumn Statement announcements. The variance detailed below is in relation to the Departmental Expenditure Limits (DEL). These budgets relate to Government departmental budgets and exclude expenditure such as for the state pension, welfare, debt repayments, etc.

Year	FORECAST DEL REDUCTION			
	March 13 Budget	Dec. 13 Autumn Statement	March 14 Budget	Dec. 14 Autumn Statement
	%	%	%	%
2016/17	(3.00)	(2.17)	(3.20)	(5.46)
2017/18	(2.64)	(3.79)	(3.43)	(3.74)
Total DEL Reduction	(5.64)	(5.96)	(6.63)	(9.20)

29 The table highlights that the forecast reduction in DEL for 2016/17 and 2017/18 in the March 2013 Budget was 5.64% whereas the reduction announced in the Autumn Statement 2014 has increased to 9.20%. Of particular note is the increase in the 2016/17 reduction between the March 2014 Budget and the December 2014 Autumn Statement from 3.2% to 5.46%.

30 This increase in the need to reduce public expenditure has resulted from the national deficit not being eradicated and still expected to be £91bn at the end of 2014/15.

31 The size and scope of the funding reductions facing local authorities however are greater than the sums identified in the table above. This is due to significant budgets in DEL being protected. The table below identifies the 2014/15 DEL budgets of protected and unprotected government departments.

Government Department	2014/15 Budget
	£bn
Health	108.3
Education	53.5
International Aid	8.3
Scotland	25.8
Wales	13.7
Northern Ireland	9.7
Unprotected Departments	99.4
TOTAL DEL	318.7

32 The table above highlights that unprotected Government Departments which will face the brunt of funding reductions only have a total budget of £99.4bn or

31% of the total. The major Government departments in the 'Unprotected' category are as follows:

Government Department	2014/15 Budget
	£bn
Defence	25.3
Business Innovation & Skills	13.8
Local Government	13.8
Home Office	10.4
Justice	6.7

33 If the required public expenditure reductions are achieved in line with the 2014 Autumn Statement forecasts the budgets of 'unprotected' departments would fall to circa £64bn by 2018/19, a reduction of 36%. This would result in Local Government losing in excess of 60% of Government funding between 2011 and 2019.

34 The Council has forecast the reductions in Government funding likely to be faced for 2016/17 to 2018/19 based upon the 2014 Autumn Statement. Previously the Council's forecasts assumed that the £12bn of welfare savings would not be achieved. It is now felt appropriate to revise this assumption and forecast the achievement of the £12bn welfare savings.

35 The forecast of the future funding reductions for the Council, are based upon the following assumptions:

- (i) Health budgets annually receiving above inflation budget increases;
- (ii) Education funding increasing at 1% per annum;
- (iii) International Aid, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland budgets staying constant;
- (iv) Unprotected Government departments receiving the same percentage reduction;
- (v) Durham receiving a 1.5% higher reduction than the local authority average in line with the last four years settlements.
- (vi) £6bn of welfare savings are realised in each of 2016/17 and 2017/18.
- (vii) Other specific grants e.g. Education Services Grant, Housing Benefit Grant, continue to be reduced.

36 Based upon these assumptions, the forecast Government grant reductions for the Council for 2016/17 to 2018/19 would be as follows:

Year	£m
2016/17	38
2017/18	28
2018/19	25
TOTAL	91

- 37 Based upon this calculation the Council's RSG would reduce to less than £15m in 2018/19.
- 38 In the round, across the MTFP(5) period, the impact upon the current savings requirement is neutral as the funding reduction forecast is £5m higher in 2016/17 and £5m lower in 2017/18. This is as a result of the following:
- (i) The public expenditure reductions in 2016/17 now being significantly higher than previously forecast.
 - (ii) The assumption of the achievement of £12bn of welfare savings partially offsets the 2016/17 position but benefits 2017/18.
- 39 Overall therefore the total savings required for the period 2011 to 2018 is broadly unchanged at £224.8m. It is likely however, once the 2018/19 forecast is included, that savings required by March 2019 will exceed £250m.
- 40 The table below details the revised savings targets for 2016/17 and 2017/18.

Year	Savings Requirement
	£m
2016/17	36.770
2017/18	34.829
TOTAL	71.599

Consultation results

- 41 During autumn 2013, the Council attracted over 10,000 people to take part in the largest public engagement programme of events ever held in County Durham. These events were managed through the Area Action Partnerships (AAPs) and were held across the county. They provided the opportunity for the public to allocate grants to local projects, set AAP priorities and provide views as to how the Council should manage its budget challenges up to March 2017.
- 42 At these events, almost 1,300 people took the time to take part in 270 budget setting group exercises where, over 30-45 minutes they deliberated with other members of the public as to how the Council should allocate savings of £100 million over the next few years. Feedback from those taking part in the activities was very positive, with 97% of participants feeling that it was a good way to involve local people in decision making.
- 43 In addition to the group exercises, comments as to how the Council should achieve its savings target were also provided through different forms. There were 2,074 completed paper questionnaires and a further 517 completed online.
- 44 The results of this budget consultation, which included over 4,000 responses, were reported to Cabinet on 12 February 2014. A clear message from the consultation was the requirement to minimise the impact upon frontline service provision wherever possible. These have influenced the development of the budget proposals for 2015/16 as set out in this report and it is

anticipated that they will help inform the budget setting process for the next two to three years.

- 45 Having completed such a comprehensive budget consultation in 2013, this year's budget consultation concentrated on seeking views from the 14 AAPs and the key partner agencies that make up the County Durham Partnership. This involved two distinct phases. The first focussed on the AAP Boards and Forums where attendees were asked specific questions, namely:
- Since the public consultation in 2013, has anything changed in your area that you feel would affect which services should have larger or smaller reductions?
 - Where a local organisation has shown interest, should the council explore the opportunity of them managing a facility or service to reduce the impact of budget savings on communities?
 - Are there any council facilities or services in your area that could be managed by local people?
- 46 The second phase of the consultation which will conclude on 15 January 2015, sought views on the draft 2015/16 budget proposals (as reported to Cabinet on 17 December 2014) from AAP Boards and partner agencies.

Phase I – Public Consultation

- 47 The first phase of the consultation which concluded on 12 December 2014 and involved presentations to all 14 AAP Boards as well as the completion of questionnaires at the 14 AAP Forum events. A total of 602 hard copy questionnaires were collected at the AAP Forums and a further 110 were submitted online bringing the overall total to 712.
- 48 Overall, a majority of respondents (65%) said that nothing changed in their area that would affect which services should have larger or smaller reductions. Where respondents did identify change they were more likely to identify services or issues that should be **protected** from larger budget reductions (86%), rather than those to be cut by more (14%).
- 49 Most commonly and in order of priority, respondents who did identify change tended to say the following services should be protected from larger budget reductions:
- Subsidised Bus Travel
 - Roads, footpaths, traffic and lighting
 - Job Creation
 - Support for Community Projects, Centres, Partnerships and Groups.
- 50 Respondents identified the following services that should have larger budget reductions:
- Finance, Legal, information Technologies and Human Resources
 - Gritting and Snow Clearance
 - Roads, footpaths, traffic and lighting

- Democratic Support - Decisions and Elections
- Social Work and Protecting Vulnerable Children and Adults.

51 A full list of the services identified by respondents is available in Appendix 3.

52 Older respondents tended to be more likely to identify change than younger ones and most commonly they identified the following issues:

- Subsidised Bus Travel
- Roads, footpaths, traffic and lighting
- Social Work and Protecting Vulnerable Children and Adults

53 As with the consultation carried out in 2013/2014, there was a general understanding of the scale of the financial challenge facing the council. In the light of this situation, a large majority of respondents (93%) felt that the council should explore opportunities for local organisations to manage council facilities or services as being promoted through The Durham Ask.

54 The services respondents felt there could be most scope for transfer, included:

- Libraries
- Community centres
- Grass Cutting, flower beds.

55 Similar to the questionnaire responses, AAP Boards were in favour of progressing with The Durham Ask. However, in reaching their conclusion, it was suggested the council needed to:

- Ensure the focus includes established organisations (including local councils and other partners) in addition to smaller voluntary organisations and groups.
- Ensure that groups are confident that they can operate appropriately post transfer.
- Provide training/support so groups understand the full scale and responsibilities and are able to apply for funding. This support could be offered by council staff or the VCS.

56 A number of other suggestions for achieving the necessary savings whilst maintaining community services and facilities were highlighted by AAP Boards. These included proposals that:

- More work should be undertaken to consider whether joint arrangements could be developed with neighbouring authorities and other private sector organisations.
- Consideration should be given to ensure there is sufficient executive housing across the County to help attract new businesses to the area.
- When considering service provision/withdrawal, account should be taken of the varying levels of need across the county, in terms of population size (current and planned growth) as well as deprivation levels.

- 57 In general, the most common response from AAP Boards was concern at the level of the cuts facing the council and the need to develop innovative solutions such as The Durham Ask to try to safeguard frontline services.
- 58 Finally, in addition to the consultation set out above, the opportunity was taken to supplement this consultation by seeking views of children and young people at a series of school based events in the east of the county. Overall 724 took part from various schools. Overall, a large majority of children and young people consulted supported last year's results with respect to services that should have a smaller reduction. However, a small majority of respondents disagreed about the services that should receive larger reductions. This was most so with **subsidised bus services** where 62% of children and young people disagreed that the council should save money on this service.

Recommendations and Reasons

- 59 Cabinet is asked to:
- (i) Note the 2015/16 budget and Medium Term Financial Plan update in relation to the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement announced on 18 December 2014.
 - (ii) Note that the Council continues to face funding reductions in excess of the national average.
 - (iii) Note the impact of the 2014 Autumn Statement upon the Medium Term Financial Plan.
 - (iv) Note the results of the phase 1 consultation.

Background papers

Contact: Jeff Garfoot 03000 261946
Gordon Elliott 03000 263605

Appendix 1: Implications

Finance – The report highlights that the Local Government Finance Settlement is broadly in line with forecasts. A savings target of £16.283m is still required for 2015/16.

Staffing – The savings proposals in MTFP(5) could impact upon employees. HR processes will be followed at all times.

Risk - Risk will be continually assessed throughout the budget-setting process especially in relation to funding reduction assumptions and risk assessment of savings plans.

Equality and Diversity/Public Sector Equality Duty – Equality considerations are built into the proposed approach to developing MTFP(5) as a key element of the process.

Accommodation – None.

Crime and Disorder – None.

proposals as they are developed and decisions made to take these forward.

Consultation – The consultation outputs to date are detailed in the report.

Procurement – None.

Disability Issues – All requirements will be considered as part of the equality process followed as part of MTFP(5) planning.

Legal Implications – None.

Appendix 2: Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP(6)) 2015/16 - 2017/18 Model

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Government Funding			
Government Net Funding Reduction	32,599	38,000	28,000
Town and Parish Council RSG Adjustment for LCTSS funding	-270	-196	-211
Business Rates - RPI increase (2%/2%/2%/2%)	-1,005	-1,070	-1,090
Top Up Grant - RPI increase (2%/2%/2%/2%)	-1,134	-1,210	-1,240
Section 31 Grant	-509	-70	-70
Other Funding Sources			
Council Tax Increase (2% per annum)	-3,370	-3,440	-3,510
New Homes Bonus	-1,538	-1,000	0
Council Tax Base increase	-1,891	-1,000	-750
Business Rates Tax Base Increase	-850	-500	0
Business Rates 2014/15 Collection Fund Surplus	-500	500	0
Replenishment of 2014/15 Use of General Reserve	933	0	0
NHS Funding - Social Care Transformation	-15,864	-4,432	0
Estimated Variance in Resource Base	6,601	25,582	21,129
Pay inflation (2.2% (15 months) - 1.5% - 1.5% - 1.5%)	2,750	3,300	3,200
Price Inflation (1.5% - 1.5% - 1.5% - 1.5%)	2,650	2,450	2,400
Corporate Risk Contingency Budget	-598	-2,802	0
Base Budget Pressures			
Employer National Insurance increase - State Pension changes	0	4,700	0
Single Status Implementation	0	0	4,500
Council Housing - costs related to Stock Transfer	3,550	0	0
Additional Employer Pension Contributions	760	940	1,000
Energy Price Increases	500	500	500
Durham Living Wage	250	0	0
Concessionary Fares	320	100	100
CAS Demographic and Hyper Inflationary Pressures	1,000	1,000	1,000
Use of Earmarked Reserve in CAS	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
Prudential Borrowing to fund new Capital Projects	2,000	2,000	2,000
Capital Financing for current programme	-2,500	0	0
TOTAL PRESSURES	9,682	11,188	13,700
SUM TO BE MET FROM SAVINGS	16,283	36,770	34,829
Savings	-16,283	-36,770	-34,829
Deferred Savings (Utilisation of PDP)	0	0	-10,000
SAVINGS REQUIREMENT	-16,283	-36,770	-44,829
Planned Delivery Programme (PDP)	0	10,000	10,000
REVISED SAVINGS REQUIREMENT	-16,283	-26,770	-34,829
Cumulative Use of PDP Reserve To Support MTFP	0	10,000	20,000

Appendix 3 - Council Budget Consultation

Full Tables of responses

Q1 Since the public consultation in 2013, has anything changed in your area that you feel would affect which services should have larger or smaller reductions?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	224	34.5%
No	425	65.5%
Total	649	100.0%

Q2 If so, please outline the changes.

Smaller Reductions	Number of mentions
Subsidised Bus Travel	36
Roads, footpaths, traffic and lighting	26
Job Creation	21
Support for Community Projects, Centres, Partnerships and Groups	20
Collection, disposal and recycling of waste	13
Street Cleaning	13
Social Work and Protecting Vulnerable Children and Adults	11
Grass cutting, trees and flower beds	10
Services to keep people safe	9
School Support and Education Services	8
Sports, parks and play areas	8
Day Centres and support for families	7
Gritting and Snow Clearance	6
Libraries	6
Support for Adults in their Homes	3
Art, museums and theatres	2
Other	6
TOTAL	237

Larger reductions:	Number of mentions
Finance, Legal, information Technologies and Human Resources	7
Gritting and Snow Clearance	4
Roads, footpaths, traffic and lighting	4
Democratic Support - Decisions and Elections	2
Social Work and Protecting Vulnerable Children and Adults	2
Street Cleaning	2
Other	11
TOTAL	237

Q3 Where a local organisation has shown interest, should the council explore the opportunity of them managing a facility or service to reduce the impact of budget savings on communities?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	573	92.7%
No	45	7.3%
Total	618	100.0%

Q4 Are there any council facilities or services in your area that could be managed by local people? If so, please outline them below.

Facilities which could be managed by local people	Number of mentions
Libraries	59
Community centres	40
Grass Cutting, flower beds	19
Sports facilities	16
Leisure centres	12
Parks	11
Street Cleaning	10
Surestart/Day centres	8
Litter pick/Dog waste (emptying)	6
Other	27
TOTAL	225

Equalities Breakdown

Responses were broadly representative of all age groups (shown in the table below), although older people were more likely to take part and make reference to experiencing changes since the last consultation than younger people.

In addition, supplementary consultation with 724 children and young people at a series of school based events was conducted in the east of the county.

What is your age?	Frequency	Percent
Under 16	16	3.0%
16-24	36	6.8%
25-44	125	23.5%
45-54	110	20.7%
55-64	113	21.3%
65-74	92	17.3%
75+	39	7.3%
Total	531	100.0

The responses from the different age groups to the question asking if anything had changed in the area are shown below.

Since the public consultation in 2013, has anything changed in your area that you feel would affect which services should have larger or smaller reductions? * What is your age?				
What is your age?		Yes	No	Total
Under 45	Frequency	55	108	163
	Percentage	33.7%	66.3%	100.0%
45-64	Frequency	71	132	203
	Percentage	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
65+	Frequency	49	71	120
	Percentage	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
Total	Frequency	175	311	486
	Percentage	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%

When asked to outline those changes Over-65s responded to changes affecting the following services. These focused mainly on applying a smaller reduction with only three respondents citing services for a higher reduction.

Smaller Reductions:	Number of Responses
Subsidised Bus Travel	9
Roads, footpaths, traffic and lighting	5
Social Work and Protecting Vulnerable Children and Adults	5
Services to keep people safe	4
Collection, disposal and recycling of waste	3
Libraries	3
Street Cleaning	3
Support for Community Projects, Centres, Partnerships and Groups	3
Grass cutting, trees and flower beds	2
Gritting and Snow Clearance	2
Job Creation	2
Support for Adults in their Homes	2
Other	3
TOTAL	49

Other protected characteristic groups

We received feedback from individuals from various protected characteristic groups such as:

- Gender
- Disability
- Religion or belief
- Sexual orientation
- Ethnicity

However, there were no discernible differences in the responses they made.